





As if there was any doubt left, we call also consult a few of the particular Snort IDS alerts, which are more clearly defined in [Table 3](#) below. These prove that the communications were indeed using the IRC protocol, not just ports associated with it. This is not a comprehensive list of the alerts, but it should be representative of the actions with which we are concerned. The interesting mix shows inbound connections to port 113, the auth protocol, which is probably the remote server trying to verify the identity of the user who is trying to join a channel. We see the JOIN channel and CHAT IRC alerts, which can be expected, but also the Shellcode and Mymdoom.ah alerts are very interesting. Shellcode rules cause false positives frequently when binary files are being transferred and this might suggest that the attacker is downloading new toolkits over the new IRC channel rather than using the web.

This proves that, yes, there was further exploitation of the system aside from downloading and executing code. For a period lasting several days or more, the system actively joined an IRC bot network and participated in any commands issued by the channel operator. In our final subsection of this, we want to determine if any attackers actually connected to the back door 'a' after it was installed on the victim system. Our gut feeling is "of course they did," but some proof would be nice.

First, a quick search through inbound connection logs to destinations from IP60666 shows about 50 attempts between February 26 and March 12, by four unique source addresses. This is interesting since [Table 1](#) shows that ‘a’ was not downloaded and installed until March 23. This would suggest one of two things: 1) 60666 is a common back door port and scripters are searching for remnants of other attacker’s victims or 2) the ‘a’ file was transferred and installed by some other means that our logs don’t show, such as by using the IRC channel. Nonetheless, attempts after March 2 were very likely to have succeeded, whereas attempts before March 2 had only a small chance. As mentioned before, the firewall logs only show connection initiation packets not connection completion. We did not see any log entries for the IRC channel, so we cannot say whether it was used for the download. However, we do not see any log entries for the synlog, so activity isn’t recorded. In [Question 1](#), [Table 1\(f\)](#), [synlog/maillog based noise](#), and [Outbound Connection Rate Limiting](#), we present evidence that unauthorized users were indeed active on the servers, which implies that they did login<sup>8</sup> at some point.

\*Note that in the [syslog/secure based noise](#) section of [Question 4](#) we show that the 'test' user account was used by at least 21 remote attackers. We have no way of telling if the user obtained control via the back door or the 'test' account.

3. If this were the evidence from a production system, how would you learn that the machine was compromised, given the data available? For this question, assume you do not have the honeynet-specific data streams, such as sebek2 or bash logger, just like in this challenge.

The answer to this question ties in pretty tight with some of the other issues we presented in [Question 2](#). Given the logs from bridge and bastion, we really don't need sebek2, badge logger, a Tripwire report, or the confession of any attacker to determine if the machine was compromised. In a production environment, we would not expect (at least I hope not) for the machine to initiate outbound connections to IRC servers in remote locations of the Internet. Thus, the evidence lies in egress filtering logs. Even with the incoming bridge logs (to, say, port 80), the assorted Snort IDS alerts of Awstats exploits from bastion, and combo's own Apache access/error logs, we can only speculate compromise. It is not until we consult the outbound bridge logs that this is verified - without exception. The fact that the bastion logs show a large number of outgoing connections to IRC servers (6667 connections were a result of an insider who decided to use the production server for a quick IRC chat over lunch. Once again, the egress filtering alone could have taught us that this machine was being compromised beyond repair.

4. What else was going on at the system at the same time? What times of "Internet noise" can you categorize, given the data? Is there anything out of the ordinary with the noise levels? What attack and probe types observed actually had a chance of affecting the target?

There was a lot going on at the same time. The Internet noise was, well, noisy, and we can determine out-of-the-ordinary values by correlating our information with a distributed intrusion detection system like Dshield, [5]. Our method of determining background noise was consistent with our procedures used to answer the first few questions (see [Bonus Question](#)). Essentially, we shifted through the data via command line or small Perl scripts, eliminating what we knew was irrelevant. This left us with the outstanding entries, which will be covered here.

a) iptables/iptableslog based noise

The firewall logs within iptables/iptableslog revealed heavy scanning for well-known services popular among Windows systems such as DCE endpoint (135), Netbios Session Service (139), Win 2K Server Message Block (445), MS-SQL (1433), MS-SQL Monitor (1434), Netbios Name Service (137), and Radmin (4899). Also among the top 10 attacked TCP ports there are several not associated with any particular platform such as MySQL (3306), SSH (22), and HTTP/WWW (80).

Frequency	Port	Service	% Daily	Dshield
56513	135	DCE Endpoint	32.8	8.0 - 16.0
27145	445	Win 2K SMB	15.7	13.0 - 27.0
16542	139	Netbios SSN	9.6	2.0 - 6.0
12369	4899	Radmin	7.1	0.6 - 2.0
9849	1433	MS-SQL	5.7	3.0 - 10.0
5979	1434	MS-SQL Monitor	3.47	2.0 - 4.2
5139	3306	MySQL	2.9	1.0 - 4.0
4047	80	WWW	2.3	1.5 - 2.3
3448	137	Netbios NS	2	2.3 - 4.7
2818	22	SSH	1.6	0.1 - 1.1

Table 2: Top 10 Attacked Ports In Relation To Dshield

Out of these top 10, the only ones that had a chance at causing any damage to our honeypot were 3306, 80, and 22, since we know these services were active (see [General Network And Systems Information](#)). The others were either not active or are almost definitely targeting Microsoft Windows machines. A dangerous aspect of concentrating on the top 10 attacked ports is that we miss the less obvious attacks, which is critical to the investigation at hand. For example, neither of the back doors covered in [Question 2](#) (4000 and 60666) are even in the top 50.

The Dshield column shows the minimum and maximum % daily total of records for the corresponding port over the 5 week period for which we have firewall logs (February 25 - March 21). The frequency of DCE Endpoint and Radmin traffic was highly disproportional according to Dshield, however all others seemed to be pretty normal. In the [Appendix 1](#), there is a copy of the script that generated our own data and a slightly more extensive list of the top attacked ports.

b) snort/snortsyslog based noise

We can identify 85 unique Snort alerts per the short Perl script in [Appendix 4](#), however only a handful concern traffic capable of successfully learning about or exploiting the honeypot system (combo). This made it obvious that the active Snort rule sets were not tuned for the environment they were monitoring. For example, SID 1256 (WEB-IIS CodeRed v2 root.exe) was triggered 60 times, but this only affects IIS servers on Windows and our honeypot web server application was Apache.

The majority of IDS noise can be classified into one of several groups:

- network reconnaissance attempts: ICMP echo requests, traceroutes, Spade output from scanning rarely used ports, evasive or stealth TCP traffic
- application reconnaissance attempts: SSH, named, and SQL version scans
- protocol or application specific attempts: IIS ISAPI, directory traversal, double encoding Unicode

For a complete listing of the unique IDS alerts and corresponding frequencies, see [Appendix 5](#). By removing alerts of this nature we can point out the more critical ones:

Frequency	Message	SID
5683	CHAT IRC message	1463
1009	BLEEDING-EDGE IRC - Channel JOIN on non-std port	2000340
541	BLEEDING-EDGE IRC - Nick change on non-std port	2000345
148	BLEEDING-EDGE WORM Mydoom.ah/ Infection IRC Activity	200143
51	BLEEDING-EDGE EXPLOIT Awstats Remote Code Execution Attempt	2001680
19	BLEEDING-EDGE IRC Trojan Reporting (Scan)	2001372
7	BLEEDING-EDGE POLICY IRC connection	2000356
5	WEB-ATTACKS wget command attempt	1336
5	WEB-ATTACKS rm command attempt	1363
4	ATTACK-RESPONSES id check returned root	498
3	BLEEDING-EDGE IRC - Private message on non-std port	2000347
1	WEB-MISC cat%20 access	1147

Table 3: Most Critical Snort IDS Alerts

Since these alerts were inherently in the foreground of suspicious activity (see [Question 2](#)), they cannot exactly be classified as background noise. Nonetheless, they are presented here to be complete.

c) httpd/ based noise

Using the Apache files, we can extract evidence of HTTP based attacks launched against the honeynet. The attackers tried several times to proxy mail and other web sites through the Apache server on combo. They intentionally tried to invoke server errors with known banner-grabbing techniques. There were attempts to exploit vulnerable versions of Awstats, OpenSSL, as well as fairly persistent scans for PHPBB pages and requests consistent with Code Red and Nimda.

The quick hint here was to assume that since this is a honeynet, unless the author has staged some legitimate seeming content (like Cliff Stohl did to his honeypot in *The Cuckoo's Egg*, [6]), practically everything should be considered suspicious. Since it was already pretty obvious that Awstats.pl had been accessed for malicious purposes, to learn what remains, we did a quick line count with those hits excluded:

```
# grep " 200 " access_log* | egrep -v astate | wc -l
```

This shows that throughout the 6 Apache access logs, with exception on the awstats.pl access (we know that file existed already), only 50 other requests returned an HTTP 200 status, [7]. Out of this 50, four were the server's default icons (powered\_by.gif, apache\_pb.gif) and the rest were OPTIONS requests for an index page at the root level /. So, essentially every other request to the web server was likely generated by some sort of malware or automated scanning tool. With this information, we can more confidently jump into the seemingly abundant collection of log files and strip away everything we can readily identify.

In this upcoming event, an attacker using the Undernet IRC Network Proxy Scanner, [9] asks the honeypot to make a connection to 193.109.122.67 over port 6668 on his behalf. Open proxies and those which support the HTTP CONNECT method would happily comply, however the honeypot was not susceptible to this. We know this because the bridge IPTables logs don't show any communication between combo and 193.109.122.67; and also because the HTTP status code returned by the request is 405 (method not supported).

```
access_log.3:193.109.122.45 - - [26/Feb/2005:14:14:18 -0500]*CONNECT 193.109.122.47:4448 HTTP/1.0" 405 992 "-"*polyboard/2.0
```

Multiple sources also tried using the CONNECT method to proxy mail through the honeypot web server:

```
access_log.61219.153.10.142 - - [05/Feb/2005:04:33:41 -0500]*CONNECT mx1.mail.yahoo.com:25 HTTP/1.0^ 405 946 "-"
access_log.61218.78.209.75 - - [05/Feb/2005:04:34:30 -0500]*CONNECT mailin-04.mx.aol.com:25 HTTP/1.0^ 405 998 "-"
access_log.61219.153.10.140 - - [05/Feb/2005:04:52:57 -0500]*CONNECT mail.hottieserver.com:25 HTTP/1.0^ 405 994 "-"
access_log.61218.78.209.77 - - [05/Feb/2005:07:42:10 -0500]*CONNECT mail-fwd.mx.aol.com:25 HTTP/1.0^ 405 997 "-"
```

As a quick comparison, attackers also (unsuccessfully) tried using the POST method, which is more widely supported by web servers than CONNECT:

In order to classify the remaining entries, we used a simple command sequence to print out each unique hit the web server and calculate the number of hits it received. The command line and output are shown in the [Appendix 3](#).

There were a large number (180) of attempts to access /sumthin on the web server, which is almost definitely a banner-grabbing attempt. The methodology here is to request a file you know doesn't exist on the server, which will invoke an error. Most default Apache configurations will return the version within the error message's body, which is probably what attackers are looking for. This is a reconnaissance step that will normally precede an attack calibrated for particular versions of Apache.

100 / *Journal of*

Additionally, there were several hits to `/default.ida?{buffer}[code]`, which is attempt to exploit a buffer overflow vulnerability in the IIS Indexing Service DLL (this is probably Code Red II). Since our honeynet was running Apache, it was not vulnerable to these attempts. Likewise, there are footprints from Nimda or custom tools designed to exploit the same vulnerabilities as Nimda. For example, using data from our quick classification scheme, these requests are looking for the back doors left by Code Red II:

```
50 /scripts/root.exe?/c=dir
```

These are attempts to exploit the same back doors left by Code Red II, this time by accessing `cmd.exe` from the virtual drives it creates.

```
49 /c/wint/system32/cmd.exe?/c+dir
```





25/03/2019, 3:29 pm





At offset 0x08048d8c we see the code push 0x0 onto the stack just before calling htonl(). According to the GLIBC manual, "This function converts the uint32\_t integer from host byte order to network byte order. This is used for IPv4 Internet addresses," [4]. As we already know, an IP of 0, or 0.0.0.0, will result in the process listening or binding to all available interfaces.

Next, the code calls `bind()` using the information gathered by the previous functions. The disassembly is very large and this is only the beginning. `perror()` is called several times throughout `main()`, which shows the author implements some error handling. What happens if the `socket()` call fails? Well, it's simple - `perror()` returns a failure code and the program jumps to `0x8049594` (see offset `0x08048d6d` with `<main+2148>`). The `main()` function ends at `main+2153`, so if the `socket()` call fails, the program essentially exits.

Now let's take a hike from all the static analysis and watch some real-time behavior. I'll start with an ltrace of 'a', but restrict the presentation to the section of code we looked at with gdb

## 11. Hacking t in Vmware (Just For Fun) [\[TOC\]](#)

The following Snort rule has a major error in it that we don't have an explanation for. There is an extra ' ' character after the source IP address, which may suggest an accident during log file sanitizing by the author; or it could be a result of tampering by one of the attackers. We don't have any proof one way or the other.

## 14. Outbound Connection Rate Limiting [\[TOC\]](#)



```
Feb 24 13:02:17 bridge kernel: Drop TCP after 17 attempts:src=195.115.0.11,79.47 dst=195.115.0.14,64 SRC=11.11.79.47 DPT=22 TO=195.115.0.14 LEN=60 TOS=0x00 TTL=64 ID=57025 DF SYN=0 RST=0 Seq=1000000000
Feb 24 13:02:18 bridge kernel:
Mar 5 13:42:39 bridge kernel: Drop TCP after 22 attempts:src=195.115.0.11,79.47 dst=195.115.0.14,64 SRC=11.11.79.47 DPT=22 TO=195.115.0.14 LEN=60 TOS=0x00 TTL=64 ID=57025 DF SYN=0 RST=0 Seq=1000000000
Mar 14 18:59:22 bridge kernel: Drop udp after 22 attempts:src=195.115.0.11,79.47 dst=195.115.0.14,65 SRC=11.11.79.45 DPT=65 TO=195.115.0.14 LEN=73 ID=0 RST=0 Seq=1000000000
```

Before describing what this really reveals, take a look at the actual entry as it relates to the "attemptsIN" section. This is interesting because it caused us to miss these lines with regular expressions that specified there must be a space between these two words. Undoubtedly, the administrator who configured IPTables on bridge did not place a space at the end of his -log-info argument. More importantly, this shows that although bridge was not filtering packets on header or payload, it may have been configured for rate limiting of outbound connections. With one of these rules in particular (the DPT=22 to DST=195.115.0.14) we can even guess what that rate limit was (10/second with a burst between 1-3). We can make this speculation because the first 13 packets during the second of 13:42:39, passed through bridge unhindered (to 195.115.0.1 - 195.115.0.13). This is a wise move on the part of the author because it allows the attackers to get just far enough so we can observe his actions, but not far enough to launch any denial of service attacks on innocent targets from the author's honeynet.

We can also observe here that combo is configured for remote syslog - to 11.11.79.65. We know that this is not one of combo's own IP addresses, so it probably belongs to bridge, bastion, or another host on the local network. In [Appendix 12](#), we determined that 11.11.79.64 was not responding to pings, yet we know it was the recipient of over 100 echo requests. This could of course mean that 11.11.79.64 does not exist, however we believe that .64 and .65 were intentionally configured to ignore this type of traffic to stay hidden from attackers (at least initially). These are two good candidates for the IP address of monitoring systems.

#### 15. References [\[TOC\]](#)

- [1]. This reference was used to determine the versions of standard Red Hat 9 packages. [Red Hat Linux FTP depository for default packages.](#)
- [2]. This documents and provides a PoC for the Awstats vulnerability. FrSIRT: [AWStats "configdir" Remote Command Execution Exploit](#)
- [3]. This software was used to analyze unknown malware in a controlled environment. [Vmware: Virtual Machine Software.](#)
- [4]. This reference was used to understand some of the C library functions used in the a and b back doors. [The GNU C Library Reference Manual](#)
- [5]. This reference was used to compare Internet traffic patterns logged by the honeynet with the rest of the world. [Dsheld Distributed Intrusion Detection System.](#)
- [6]. In his book, Cliff lures hackers with sensitive seeming data, so that he can observe them closely: Stohl, Cliff. *The Cuckoo's Egg*. New York, Pocket Books, 1990.
- [7]. This document describes the use and interpretation of HTTP status codes. [RFC 2616 - Hypertext Transfer Protocol - HTTP/1.1](#)
- [8]. This reference was used to single out the application that left unique User Agent strings in Apache's logs. FXYS - [IRC\(n\) Network ProxyScanner on SourceForge](#)
- [9]. This documents and provides a PoC for the mod\_ssl worm. CERT Advisory: [CA-2002-27 Apache/mod\\_ssl Worm.](#)
- [10]. This documents and provides a PoC for the rpc.statd vulnerability. SecurityFocus: [Multiple Linux Vendor rpc.statd Remote Format String Vulnerability](#)
- [11]. This reference was used to compare logs of successful rpc.statd exploits with our own. CERT Advisory: [CA-2000-17 Input Validation Problem in rpc.statd](#)
- [12]. This document describes the Transport Control Protocol. [RFC 793 - Transmission Control Protocol.](#)
- [13]. This is an online tool for free multi-vendor malware testing. [VirusTotal: Free, online, multi-vendor malware scanner.](#)
- [14]. This article shows some interesting facts about the .comment sections of ELF binaries: [http://www.trilithium.com/johan/2004/12/gcc-ident-strings/](#)
- [15]. Sun's mcs tool: [Manipulate the Comment Section of an Object File.](#)
- [16]. The authors of this book redirect the strtcp() call of malware to alter it's behavior. Farmer, Dan and Wietse Venema. *Forensic Discovery*. Addison-Wesley, 2005.