A Report submitted in partial fulfilment of
the regulations governing the award of

the Degree of

# Cyber-Security & Computer Networks

at the University of Northumbria at Newcastle

Project Report

# An investigation into infrastructure defence in relation to emerging threats

Carl Slatter

2020/ 2021

General Computing Hybrid Project

# Declaration

I declare the following:

1. that the material contained in this dissertation is the end result of my own work and that due acknowledgement has been given in the bibliography and references to ALL sources be they printed, electronic or personal.

2. the Word Count of this Dissertation is ⟨len⟩
   (result of shell command `texcount total inc Dissertation.tex`)

3. that unless this dissertation has been confirmed as confidential, I agree to an entire electronic copy or sections of the dissertation to being placed on the eLearning Portal (Blackboard), if deemed appropriate, to allow future students the opportunity to see examples of past dissertations. I understand that if displayed on eLearning Portal it would be made available for no longer than five years and that students would be able to print off copies or download.

4. I agree to my dissertation being submitted to a plagiarism detection service, where it will be stored in a database and compared against work submitted from this or any other School or from other institutions using the service.

   In the event of the service detecting a high degree of similarity between content within the service this will be reported back to my supervisor and second marker, who may decide to undertake further investigation that may ultimately lead to disciplinary actions, should instances of plagiarism be detected.

5. I have read the Northumbria University/Engineering and Environment Policy Statement on Ethics in Research and Consultancy and I confirm that ethical issues have been considered, evaluated and appropriately addressed in this research.

SIGNED: Carl Slatter . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

# Acknowledgements

# Abstract

A summary of the entire project. From background to conclusions. I recon on about half a page as the upper end of the summary.

This is an example structure for the Terms-of-Reference and the Dissertation. Along with some notes.

You can start by forking the repository on github `https://github.com/dr-alun-moon/cs-dissertation`. Then you have a working copy of this document as a starting point.

# Contents

# Part I

# Introduction

# Part II

# Analysis

# Chapter 1

# Historic Attack & Defence

## 1.1 The Importance Of Computing History

## 1.2 Heartbleed

A heartbeat request asks for a open ssl session to be checked of a given length and content. The length was never checked though so it would read from outside the buffer potentially revealing passwords. Thousands of webservers were vulnerable, including yahoo. A patch was needed to fix this

## 1.3 Loveletter

## 1.4 SQLSlammer

# Chapter 2

# Modern Security Landscape

## 2.1   The Cat & Mouse Game

Technology is always changing, often to the needs of the growing world. Changes range from potential to aid traditional sectors to common conviniences that are taken for granted everyday. Software usually has a purpose, and that purpose is normally pure in nature. Software is there to solve a problem, to make life easier. A problem arises in implementation however, as mistakes can happen. The software development process has various stages, the most important of which being testing. Usually testing is conducted in order to identify any potential bugs that might cause issues later. The quality and extent to which a given piece of software is tested varies from sample to sample, and sometimes bugs slip through.

Bugs can be minor or disterous in nature, and can lead to major problems for those who use it. The solution is usually to send out an update so that a given bug cannot be exploited any further, but this is not a perfect process. There can be reluctance to update, complacency to the maintaining infrastructure or disregard to the issue at hand. Once software is out in the wild, it cannot be retrated. Corporate implementations are already built, and can be abused by criminals who take note of the out of date software.

Both issues of a buggy release and slow update responce can essasibated by corporate culture that put strain on the process. Underfunded, unmotivated and untrained workers will struggle to work to their capability and as a result, security can suffer. Another poten-

tial pitfall is mission critical infrastructure. There could be potential issues with implementation, that cannot be fixed easily due to a 24/7 use window. Another issue is legacy reliance; software may work for a certain OS version only, and the new version that is safe could be too expensive or not exist at all. Careful consideration must be give to defence policy, strategy and potential responce in order to stay ahead of the cat and mouse game that is cyber-security.

## 2.2  Responce Theory

Responce in security is just as important as any other layer. No system or person exists is perfect, mistakes will happen eventually. Those msitakes should be managed by proper training, as will be discussed in the evaulation. If issues are inevitable, even with a good culture; what is the proper responce? It varies, but typically a good approach would include simualtions planned out ahead of time of what may happen, with best practise as a responce. Scenarios are planned out ahead of time in order of likelyhood, preferbly with people dedicted to incident responce. Serperation of duties and planning ahead of time can reduce much of stress and anxiety that can come with cyber attacks or downtime.

Some sensible steps include:

- Airgapping of existing infrastructure

- Checking of logs

- Aqquisition of audit trails

- Checking of open connections / malware

### 2.2.1  Zero-Days

When people think of the exploit-update cycle, the first thought would be of patching. Patching is incredibly important, it allows for security issues to be rectified; to an extent in which it's then up to maintenance. Zero day attacks are incredibly potent due to the distinct lack of a patch available. A zero day is essentially a brand new exploit that is suddenly sprung upon the blue team. These exploits can do any amount of damage, with their severity depending

on the exploit at hand. Zero days are often sold on the dark net for prices that are in accordance with the severity. Zerodium - A company that tracks the pricing of various kinds of exploits prices a Windows 10 remote code execution exploit at around $1 million. The price tag pertains to the huge amount of systems running windows as a base, with an incredibly large surface to implement on.

## 2.3   Emotet

## 2.4   WannaCry

## 2.5   NotPetya

## 2.6   Mimikatz

# Chapter 3

# Defence Technologies

## 3.1 Variation of Defence Systems

### 3.1.1 Network Monitoring Capability

Monitoring is rather important. Particually in a manual capacity; having the ability to analyze the flow of the network can aid in both troubleshooting and manual anomaly detection. The difference in human congnition to a machine's is massive; A machine will think as you tell it to think, and will not act dynamically unless you tell it how should learn. Humans on the other hand have excellent learning and analysis potential as is. This means it is important to utilize the human element to further harden a network via manual monitoring.

There are many ways to do this, perhaps with grafana dashboards which import all the key data metrics into one. Another avenue could be to use wireshark (or a similar implementated program) to check what is happening at a particular time.

For example, if there is suddenly lots of half open TCP or ICMP requests, there may be a DDoS attack. Another reason that a human brain is benefitical is that it has the capacity of content. A flood of HTTPs traffic may look like a DDoS attack, but may actually be a holiday like black friday in which you may expect hightened traffic.

### 3.1.2 Firewall Rules

A firewall acts as a device between hosts and the internet and filter incoming and outgoing traffic. They can be in hardware and software

form.

An ACL is a series of IOS commands that control whether a router forwards or drops packets based on information found in the packet header. They can limit network traffic to increase performance, provide traffic flow control to restrict delivery of routing updates to ensure they are from a known source, and allow us to restrict part of the network from communicating with another part of the network, while allowing another. We can also block based on traffic type, e.g telnet, while allowing email. ACLs can also be used to tag traffic as priority. A VIP pass of sorts. We have inbound and outbound ACLs. Inbound filters packets coming from a specific interface, outbound does the same independant of the inbound interface, there could be multiple. An ACL uses a wildcard mask to select specific groupings to allow or deny access.

The above system uses the idea that only the vpn port is open, with everything else requiring local or vpn access. We use firewall rules to block everything else that is on the same device, such as my dns server. Additonal firewall rules could be used internally to stop priv esc but unlikely in a home lan setup. I only allow local devices to even access the public IP other than for the VPN so it is a whitelist, very strong. The firewall is on the same device as the VPN purposely, if the device goes down, the firewall rules do sure, but so does the VPN which eliminates the access anyway.

## 3.2   Threat Definition

It becomes incresingly important in defence to know what the opposition might try. There are an obsurdly large amount of malware out there, and as such; it's quite important to be able to classify them based off their traits.

### 3.2.1   Classification of Threats

Malicious software, often called 'Malware' is an ever growing problem for system administrators.

**Viruses**

**Worms**

**Trojans**

**Rootkits**

**Dossers**

**Adware**

**Ransomware/Cryptors**

**Spyware**

**Fileless/Packetted**

## 3.3   Anomaly Detection

### 3.3.1   Machine-Learning

Machine learning is a relativly new technology, that aims to reform the programming process. Typically with software engineering, the end algorithm is explicitly laid out; often encompassing every concievable scenario. This methodology is easier to implement at a basic level but challenging to scale, and suscepitble to human bias. Machine learning differs in that an environment is given, a dataset assigned and simulations are ran. Tweaks are made on the fly, by both human and the program itself. This can help expose amazing discoveries that a human would struggle to find, along with a system created that can detect and prevent proactivly.

**Protocol Adaptation**

Different protocols work in varying ways. An approach that monitors them in the same capacity is sure to fail, due in large part to the variation of data handling. Defensive systems must be able to identify the protocol, be aware of it's legitimate use, as well as signs of tampering. For example, detection systems should not treat a HTTP packet the same as they would ICMP. Their threat potential is quite distinctly different, and as such; it is important that part of the learning process is dedicated to finding the normal. Anything that deviates from the "normal" is consiered an anomoly, and can

be acted upon in a given set of ways.

### 3.3.2  Signature & Pattern Matching

An interesting question could be made. What is considered a threat to a computer? The simplest answer is "something that is pre-defined". In computer science, a method of validating integrity is to use a process called hashing; a process in which no two pieces of data can return the same value. There are various algorithms out there, some of which are broken like MD5, meaning they can be abused to return the same value for multiple datasets. If data can be represented as a value, then that value can be checked conditionally for a match against a database. This is the fundamental idea behind signature analysis, most commonly used in anti-virus technologies, as static analysis.

### 3.3.3  Behavoural  Dynamic Analysis

Polymorphic encryption and malware versioning has historcly shown that static analysis is not enough, it is an important part but cannot stand on it's own. The idea behind dynamic detection is that rather than studying the data at rest, analysis is conducted on either the running malware, or a simulated version of it. Ultimatly malware across versions aims to do the same task, albiet in slightly differing ways. If the methodology can be identified; the malware can be defeated. This requires a much more skilled approach; A comparison of before and after. ProcMon on Windows is excellent for this; it will let you see what registry keys have changed, what files are new and any peculiar processes. Machine learning has been leading the charge in this field, as well as automatic siganture matching.

### 3.3.4  Whitelist vs Blacklist Approach

The choice of a white vs black list is one that depends on infra-structure design. Abstractly, it depends on the approach; if their are many unknowns in the system, a blacklist may have to be used. Similarly the inverse is true. Research shows that a whitelist approach is preferntial for security though more specific in implementation. Whitelistng in this sense refers to a predefined set of hosts that are

allowed access to a given device, rather than a "find and block" approach of a blacklist. Whitelisting requires full knowledge of present and future variables in the network, whereas blacklisting allows for easier expansion. Blacklisting is more suscepitble to hacking due to the nature of simply altering the threat to bypass checks; something that whitelisting may prevent. Zero day exploit control is highly dependant on systems only having required access, something that when planned properly, can use a whitelist approach. The approach will vary across the network and as such proritization of security and looseness of security for usability must be considered.

# Chapter 4

# Entry Vectors & Profiling

## 4.1 Exposure & Scanning

The internet is about freedom of oppotinity, and is why so many companies have succeeded. Services are accessible and convinient. The ability for anyone to access a service is 'double-edged'. If anyone is able to access it legitimatly, it allows potential for a threat actor to conduct their processes also. The first prcoess is often enumeration and scanning. Attacks are much more effective when they are meaninful, scoped and targetted. A criminal can use information gathered to hone in later attacks for full effect.

### 4.1.1 NMAP

Nmap is an extreamly useful networking application that allows for a great deal of network reconnaissance. It's main use being the mapping out of networks, as the name would suggest.

Host Discovery Scan (Subnet Scoped):

```
nmap sn 192.168.1.1254
```

Noisy Host Probing Scan:

```
nmap sC sV vvv oA  /Documents/nmapscan.txt 192.168.1.50
```

**Fingerprinting & Banner Grabbing**

A threat actor can learn much from a network, particularly if it is widely exposed to the internet. Valuable enumerated data includes: software names and versions, operating system patch numbers, open ports and typical responce. Much can be learned based off how software responds. It could respond in a way that is particularly unique, allowing for identification. This could be a message, or typical behavior for that piece of software. This probing is called banner grabbing and is one of the first steps in any hacking endevour. A typical example is a web server; if a http request is made on port 80, there will likely be a http responce (assuming the port is open). That page in such case would be a vector for identification, with the web server also having poptential for version disclosure with default files. Another potential way to identify wouold be to use a standard ping function. There is fingerprinting capability built into the variable implementation of the ICMP protocol. Different operating systems have differing ping responce times, which gives away the platform. This is impactful as OS version and architecture disclosure means exploits are filtered down to those more likely to work.

These are trivial examples, but show that exposure can lead to the "hacker mindset" being utilised.

### 4.1.2   Firewalking

### 4.1.3   Network Pivotting

One of the most potent traits of malware (particually worms) is their ability to spread rappidly. Once malware has a foothold in a network, it can take advantage of the networked nature of infrastructure to check what that machine can talk to. It can then conduct either manual or automatic network reconnaissance and enumeration, with the hope to find a vulnerable service to exploit. The advantage of hacking multiple machines is that they cna have different levels of security and access, leading to potential privilege escalation.

The Metasploit Framework has a program called meterpreter which allows you to run modules using the victim system, and push it through by binding to a process. The process binded to depends on

the architecture and software security level, but is dangerous because it means that the tools on the system are fairly irrelevant.

### 4.1.4 CVEs & Shodan

Exploits are common, and are numerous. There are way too many to know by name or nature. There is a need for a standardised classifcation; this exists in the form of "Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVEs)". A CVE is essential a unique record for a given vulnrability, often used in the cybersecuiryt industry for disclosures and reference. Each CVE is registed in the database (can be found at exploit.db) and is given a severity score, known as the CVSS score. Often exploit implentations and proof of concepts are provided with disclosure of a CVE, that sometimes vary. There is a culture in the security scene of who can have the most covert and efficent exploit for a given vulnerability. An outside perspective may use the argument that this is harmful to security. While this is true in some circumstances, tools and exploits are able to be created and exploited regardless of legality. The security consensus typically is around pushing security boundaries through testing and not leaving it up to chance.

Shodan in conjuction creates a very deadly pair. Shodan is a internet connected device search engine that allows fine tuned filtering. Shodan does not explicitly scan, instead reporting back what is already publcially available, even if tricky to find naturally. What forms is a database that tracks operating systems, software and versions of devices all over the world. This can be used in conjuction with a compatiable CVE to potentially compromize a network. The inverse is true, it can be an asset to create awareness of exposure and help push security forward as a result.

## 4.2 Social Engineering

Social engineering is the art of exploiting the inherent vulnerabilities that lie within humanity. Access is most easily leveraged by manipulating someone, especially compared to finding the needle in the haystack regarding finding a relevant vulnerability at the machine

level. Consider the example in which the main company database
has been secured; all the software is up the date, the passwords
strong and properly stored as hashes. What if instead of traditional
hacking methodologies, someone simply walked in with a high visib-
ility jacket and walked out with the system, citing maintenance as
the reason. [Slatter, 2019b]

### 4.2.1   Phishing

There are two main strands of phishing. The kind you are most
likely familiar with is simply called phishing, and pertains to the act
of sending a victim to an impersonated site with the intention of
them putting real credentials and info down.

The second being spear phishing which is the same with one main
difference. That difference being the scope and scale. A normal
phishing attack tends to be widespread, generic and assuming. The
spear counterpart prefers to use reconnaissance to tailor make the
email into something that fits them. The goal being to exploit some
kind of weakness for a higher payoff via privileged users such as
CEOs and unsuspecting admins.

Every website uses HTML files in some form. These usually can
be replicated with proper CSS that is in public view. This means
you can create a site that looks exactly like paypal for example,
with the idea of the victim typing their real credentials in, which
goes directly to the hacker's server. There are usually entry points
to this, a sophisticated one is where "free wifi" is set up, someone
connects to it, is sent to a login page that you made where they
register and type their credit card info, as if they were the real hotel
for example. It can be used in conjuction with DNS phising below
to make them indistinguishable at times.

Such attack could also be used to distribute malware in a drive-by
attack as talked about. The legit site likely would never have such
code, but the custom one very much could. This can lead to much
greater consequences. The thing that is fairly scary about this is
how easy it is to setup a DNS server. You can even do so with a
raspberry pi in about 10 mins for example.

A combination of the above could be used here, to hijack a DNS server to point to this, a cloned website, with a different premade template:

Spear phishing is where you send email enmasse to lure people into clicking some form of link or file. They are often non targeted and usually aim to trick the victim with techniques like urgency, trust and fear. The idea of these campaigns are not to trick everyone, in fact as a whole very very few people fall for it. You will get your small minority that it works on, and that's what they rely on. The solution to this is proper email sanitization, with checks of email header tampering, some form of verifcation and file/link whitelists.

### 4.2.2 USB Dropping

USB devices carry data in a convinient way through flash storage. They are cheap, quiet and very portable. They can be encrypted and are a great asset to productivity. There are however security concerns around a specific use case of them. Some models of USBs allow for firmware altering; altering that allows some tools to configure it to trick devices it is plugged into it, that it is a keyboard.

Keyboards can obviously type, with keyboard input being inherintly trusted. Input is usually dictated by scripting (commonly 'ducky script') with typing that is far faster than a human can write, or even read often enough. A victim may plug it in, see a black command prompt window and have a potential compromise without even knowing. The script could do any manner of damage, usually a payload based off the topics covered in this paper.

The attack preys upon the human emotion of curiosity, as these usbs are usually either dropped outside randomly and picked up or given in seemingly good faith. Another interesitng point to consider is supply chain. Every usb has to be made, and therefore should be a trusted retailer with regular random testing. A cheap 2tb usb stick off ebay may not be the best idea, especially considering that reported device size can be faked to the operating system, where it will overwrite itself past it's threshold.

Autorun

## 4.3   Spoofing

### 4.3.1   ARP/MAC Spoofing

### 4.3.2   DNS Spoofing

### 4.3.3   IP Spoofing

# Chapter 5

# Malware Mechanisms

## 5.1  Command & Control

Malware tradiotnally is static, meaning that it executes a given task
and then finishes.  Malware that can be maleable is an asset to a
cyber criminal.  Some malware has since adapted a command and
control model, often shortened to CC or C2.  Such model dictates
there are 'zombie' machines and a respective master, a master whom
sends commands for the zombies to conduct.  A botnet.

No longer is malware a sequential process in such case, a threat
actor could order it's army to carry out any number of malcious
actions.  Such systems do have advantages; A large army can do
major damage to vulnerable systems, whether in the form of denail
of service or otherwise.  Another reason to use a system such as
this is that it creates a layer of pseudo anonmyity. The zombies are
conducting the attack; not the master technically.  Defence systems
would flag up the attackers directly, with the real threat actor getting
away with the attack potentially.

A few things of note; systems are usually zombies without knowledge
through some kind of botnet malware.  Additionally, if analysis is
conducted of a zombie machine (perhaps an aquisistion of a cloud
virtual machine), then the communiccation channel may be clear.
Proxy chains can help avoid this, creating more layers of relay.

### 5.1.1  Side/Control Channels

**Bind   Reverse Shells**

A Bind/Remote shell is you connecting from your machine to the shell. This is more of a backdoor. This is usually blocked by firewalls and can be ruined by change of ports, additionally DHCP and NAT cause IPs to change and as a result you do not know the IP of the listener you have setup. A reverse shell is the shell connecting to a listening service (Netcat) on your machine.

Netcat lets us set up connections between a host and a listener. You can also connect to any listener that is not yours also, which is referred to as banner grabbing, simply using nc on a ip port can do this. A useful.

Let's say we have found a remote code execution (RCE) vulnerability on the target host. We can than issue the Netcat command with –e on the target host and initiate a reverse shell with Netcat to issue commands.

MSFVenom

Reverse shells can be over TLS

### 5.1.2  Denial of Service

This attack makes use of the simple fact that downtime for a server or host can often cause frustration and in many cases loses people money. This means to some people there is an incentive to be able to do this. The general idea is that if you flood a host with enough ICMP (ping) traffic, it will halt and not be able to process anymore information, this is not only for the attacker but for everyone. This would be considered a DOS attack. This usually can't do nearly as much damage as the next version can.

The attack I am meaning is the Distributed Denial Of Service or DDOS attack. This uses the same concept but with a network of attacking machines all linked together. This could be a large number of machines the attacker owns or zombie machines that the attacker has gained control of with malware and is using for their attack. This multiplies the scale of the attack up to thousands sometimes and is

a real problem; it can take down industry standard servers if care is not taken to analyse what traffic is coming in.

A DoS attack in the confines of this paper, is the process of sending ICMP requests on mass to a host in the hope of slowing or taking down a service. The reason this is potent is that the host cannot ignore the echo request, it must respond to it by default. This creates overhead in the parsing processes which take resources, in the form of CPU time and RAM. The attack lessens the resource pool for other services, making them struggle. It tends to be that a great number of ICMP packets of moderate size must be sent for the desired outcome.

There is a concept of a distributed denial of service or DDoS attack which makes use of multiple attacker machines to take down a target host. The general idea is that when the number of attackers increases, the number of ping requests tend to as well. This brings about the result faster and for longer. This is possible in part because the machines each have their own network interface, which is flooding the target system as fast as possible. The fact they are coming from different sources creates a larger overhead. DDoS is very commonly conducted by hackers using a 'botnet'. A botnet being several machines that are under the control of the threat actor, usually through nefarious means like malware infections. This is normally without the real user's consent or knowledge. The botnet works for two reasons; distributed hardware for maximum potency and concealment of the true attacker. There are many forms of DoS. ICMP flood is the main focus, but others will be discussed for context and scale.

There are TCP based attacks in which a 3-way handshake is initiated and stopped after sending a SYN packet and receiving a SYNACK back. [Rao, 2020]. Do this enough and there are thousands upon thousands of half open connections that are taking resources. In some ways this is harder to spot that ICMP and simply disabling TCP could be very detrimental. TCP is so integral to even basic functionality in a lot of applications that infrastructure could just fall apart logically. [Us.norton.com, 2020] Then there is perhaps the deadliest form of digital DoS, custom packet crafting. In this attack the hacker would create custom packet headers that have certain flags enabled, that would never normally be enabled together. This

makes the recipient very confused, which is dangerous. An unpredictable system could do anything. It is equivalent to inputting a number into an upper-case check program. It would be hoped that the programmer would have accounted for edge cases of malicious or accidental input, but you cannot guarantee it. There are sometimes application specific exploits which take advantage of the fact that data is stored internally with overflow potential. Similarly, there used to be attacks around that sent malformed packet size in fragments to overload and bypass OS level size restrictions to take down systems. This is called the ping of death and has been fixed for a long while but remains to be good context none the less. [Harshita, 2017]

There are other more direct types of DoS, namely an attacker cutting off the internet or even stealing hardware to prevent service. There are even types that are legal, and unavoidable such as the concept of company competition. If a rival company who offers a similar service opens, that is denying service in a very abstract sense. The point being is that Denial of Service alone is a type of attack rather than an attack itself and should be considered in every facet of infrastructure and security development, rather than only in a single place. [Slatter, 2019a]

## 5.2  Data Cryptors

Data is our most valuable asset, with much of it being irreplaceable. This is true for both home and corporate users of technology. There is no feasible retaking of a deceased loved one's photo, or the reaqussition of millions of customer records. This is the sad reality of what data cryptors target. There are two main motivations for an attack of this kind, one in which access to given data is removed, often permenantly.

Firstly, Ransomware. The goal is to encrypt as much data as possible with a randomized key, rendering data unless without said key. The attackers then offer the key in exchange for a large ammount of money, often in cryptocurrency for anonymity. Distressed victims may then pay the ransom and may or may not get their data back.

There is controversy at the time of writing about paying the ransom, which gets even more complicated by the 'professionalism' tgat is evolving into the very lucrative ransomware buisness. The idea being that if an attacker group has 24/7 live chat and customer serivce, they are even more likely to hand over money.

Secondly, encryption for destruction. From time to time there are attacks that are not in it for direct financial gain, rather obstruction and distress. This variant encrypts just the same, with a few notable differences. There is no ransomw, the key often is not transmitted and it is more liked to corporate rivalry or hacktivism.

## 5.3   Buffer Overflows

# Chapter 6

# Malware Mechanisms - Obfuscation

The Idea being to muddle up the binary, making it really hard to analyze. There are certain details that are criticial, ip addresses, URLs, locations, registry keys.

## 6.1   Signature & Behavior Evasion

Antivirus systems rely on signatures. What is a way to fingerprint a piece of data? Hashes; they are unique to the dataset, assuming we are not using a broken hash algorithm. MD5 is a broken hash algorithm because it can be manipulated in a way that more than one data set gives the same hash. A MD5 collision In the same way, malware can alter it's own composition in a way that still works, but gives a different signature. If the AV does not have this new signature, it cannot be stopped assuming a blacklist approach. There are malware out there will add randomness each time, purely for this purpose. AV will only ever catch broad attacks, or default payloads due to this fact. AV will also sometimes scan a file, beyond a simple hash check for strings only normally used in malware, dynamic analysis. This process can be made harder be by splitting up regonizable strings. The new result becomes a new detection vector, hense the cat and mouse game.

## 6.2    Encoding & Compression

Base64 is a popular option. Used for compression, even further than hex. Can be decoded, is not secret but can help. Youtube URLs provide plenty of unique and random spaces that are hard to brute force unlisted videos.

- Can be used to hide malware, to provide it in a compressed way - Uses less bandwidth - Other compression includes gzip and deflate.

alongside ROT13

```
cat /etc/passwd  /tmp/secret.txt
↪  Y2F0IC9ldGMvcGFzc3dkID4gL3RtcC9zZWNyZXQudHh0
```

### 6.2.1    Shellcode

Simply programmatic code that is compressed down to it's essentials, and then encoded to be unreadable by anything until it's decoded. Can be used to bypass IDS/IPS and antivirus. This is an encoded string, it represents a given value without a transformative key, that is simply hidden to our understanding. Each part here represents a character,  H is 72 for example (in both ASCII and unicode). This can also be represented in a hex format, . a and b being hex values that resolve to the number in decimal relating to the character.

```
kx48 for H. Hello World!
↪  kx48kx65kx6ckx6ckx6fkx20kx57kx6fkx72kx6ckx64kx21.
```

Useful CyberChef Decoders:

- Unescape String

- From Hex

- From Charcode

- From XOR

- XOR Bruteforce

- Text Encoding BruteForce

- From quoted printable

- Magic

## 6.2.2 Steganography

## 6.2.3 Polymorphic Encryption

In this sense, the data, the encryption algorithm and the password can all change, while maintaining the goal of the algorithm. It is clear however that while hashing of the source will not work, you can fingerprint and monitor the actions it would take, and identify based from that. Sometimes the decryption methodology and code was actually hashed, and detected based on it. There are ways around this too in one of the links.

Polymorphic data that is muddled:

- Filenames

- Encryption keys

- Unsplit strings

- File types/extensions

- Anything that is identifiable

It is very common for malware to have an encrypted payload, with a stub decrypter that acts in memory and bypasses static analysis

Dynamic analysis may detect this based on the actions conducted. AV can set up a visualised environment in which it runs through what the program would do if ran, match it against known activities regardless of hash, and look at decrypted memory.

This can be defeated (like everything), by having abrupt delays to throw the system off, lets say before and after decrypting, or overloading memory with junk to throw it off

# Chapter 7

# Malware Mechanisms - Exflitration

Modern malware of often not static, it changes and morphs based on remote command. For this to work, there must be some form of communciation from victim to attacker. As discussed above, their is usually a side channel for this. In C2 structures, it is often advantagous for communciations to be covert and unreadable, as to not create a breadcrumb trail back.

## 7.1  Proxy Chains & VPNs

As discussed, it is important to conceal the location of the real attacker. It is common in a C2 structure for zombie machines in the botnet to conduct the attacks. This in essence is a proxied attack, as the zombies are attacking in place of the master. Proxy chains come in due to the need to remove the direct link from master to slave machies, adding multiple layers of proxy relays all around the world in between all communication either way. THis means if a zombie machine was captured, authorities may only see communciation to a random cloud host, whom then talks to another random cloud host. It increases the difficult expinentially for law enforcement to find the criminal, as there are a whole assortment of laws that cause issues for accessing cloud services, when traditionally a live capture was all that was needed.

### 7.1.1   ToR Routing

## 7.2   Data Breaching

### 7.2.1   Protocol Payload Abuse

**ICMP**

**DNS**

## 7.3   TLS

# Chapter 8

# Malware Mechanisms - Persistence

Important for malware to have continued access, even after a reboot. I will try a few of these with a reverse shell. We need triggers, these triggers should be fairly legit, with malformed payloads. These triggers should be automatic, or at least on something that would be done normally.

Windows works by leaving files for both reference, logs and to speed proccess up. These either are intrinsic to how the OS works or simply have been left behind. These are great for finding evidence and purpose. We can prove that the criminal acted at a given time, on a given file etc... These are some useful areas. This is windows 10, but older ones are still out there, 7 upwards are very similar. We need to be able to recreate.

## 8.1   Registry Manipulation

A hive that is normally maintained by the system. You can change values and implant whatever you want in there. Here are some strategic places. Many of these are ASEPs (AutoStart Extension Points), meaning they run without user interaction. The registry seems to have issues with wild wildcards, in that it will run essentially anything under a given hive at it's respective time and permissions. It's a rootkit waiting to happen. It's where forensic analysts will look first. When i'm testing this, I often use regedit.exe. Real malware

wouldn't do this, it would do it via scripting. A few example of the reg command are below. //expand upon with real scripting.

**Startup Keys**    Keys that point to folders, that can launch shortcuts and executables as the given user, often during login or reboot

```
HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionExplorerUser
↪   Shell Folders //will default to carl in my case
HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionExplorerShell
↪   Folders
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSOFTWAREMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionExplorerShell
↪   Folders //for public
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSOFTWAREMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionExplorerUser
↪   Shell Folders  //for users

Windows Startup folder  Anything here auto execs on startup, even
↪   shortcuts. run    shell:startup

C:kUsersUSERNAMEAppDataRoamingMicrosoftWindowsStart
↪   MenukProgramsStartup //seems to run as logged in user  waits
↪   for login, rather than boot level
```

**Services**    Winload.exe is the first to load in the OS, reads the hive to see what drivers need to be loaded. It is responsible for the "starting windows" message.

```
HKLMkSYSTEMCurrentControlSetServices


//view drivers (admin)
reg query hklmksystemcurrentcontrolsetservices /s | findstr
↪   ImagePath 2nul | findstr /Ri .*k.sysk


C:kWINDOWSTEMPINSTB64.SYS
↪   C:kUsersUSERNA1kAppDataLocalTempcpuz135kcpuz135n+nbx64.sys
↪   C:kWindowsTEMP0099471.EXE
↪   C:kUsersusernameAppDataLocalTempALSysIO64.sys
//temp or user folders would be very sus! Its about looking for
↪   anomalous locations.




ksubparagraphn+nbBrowser Helper Objectsn+nb
A DLL module that loads on internet explorer startup. Its
↪   reactionary, requires reasonable setup, but is fairly reliable.
↪   A favourite for data theft.
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSOFTWAREMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionExplorerBrowser
↪   Helper Objects
```

```
HKLMkSYSTEMCurrentControlSetControlhivelist
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSYSTEMControlSet002kControlSession M
```

**BootExecute Keys**

As far as locations in the registry where malicious processes or modules can be configured to launch from, the BootExecute key is the earliest. Smss.exe will load any programs it finds listed here. By default the only entry in this string array is autocheck autochk * which runs Autochk during boot."

```
//Decodes to this, loads this on boot. This is the view of an
↪   online sandbox analyzer
autocheck autochk * aHdqEPamx
```

**DLL Search Order Hijacking**   If a process is executed, it will look in it's own folder first, and use it's DLL, even over a windows one, to overwrite it. If not, it will read the location of root, to the destination with spaces, and means you can inject a dll where you know it will look before the real one. Even explorer.exe does this!

**AppInit$_D$LLs**   Everytime User32.dll is loaded by an exe, this string
is read and modules are loaded that are listed. This is invoked a fair
few times on system loadup from multiple initilized processes.

```
User (For then priv esc):
HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionRun
HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionRunO

Admin Level:
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSOFTWAREMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionRun
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSOFTWAREMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionRun
HKEYn+nbLOCALn+nbMACHINEkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionPol
//depending on architecture
HKLMkSoftwareWow6432NodekMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionRun
HKCUkSoftwareWow6432NodekMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersionRunOnce

reg add
↪   HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersion
↪   /v Pentestlab /t REGn+nbSZ /d C:kUserspentestlabpentestlab.exe
reg add
↪   HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersion
↪   /v Pentestlab /t REGn+nbSZ /d C:kUserspentestlabpentestlab.exe
reg add
↪   HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersion
↪   /v Pentestlab /t REGn+nbSZ /d C:kUserspentestlabpentestlab.exe
reg add
↪   HKEYn+nbCURRENTn+nbUSERkSoftwareMicrosoftWindowsCurrentVersion
↪   /v Pentestlab /t REGn+nbSZ /d C:kUserspentestlabpentestlab.exe
```

**Run  RunOnce Keys**

## 8.2   Priviledge Escalation

The idea behind privilege escalation is that under the assumption
that a user shell is granted, that shell can then be leveraged in a
malcious way to gain higher privilege. Permissions are often ex-
ploited in order to escape user level contraints, often due to poor
configuration. This varies from hijacking processes running as root
(system in windows) to abusing scheduled tasks to run user defined
code. The ultimate goal of priv esc is to leverge the highest user shell,
from there; system level persistance mechanisms such as rootkits can
be easily leveraged for deep persistance.

### 8.2.1   Command Injection

We can use command injection to run any command that user has available. This may include netcat or any allowed system command. This could all be prevented with a few steps. Proper input validation on the entry point.Lack of access that the web application has to system commands, as well as up the date packages of the languages that have this vulnerable. There is no reason that netcat should be on a target system.  The following is possible otherwise. We could use this attack in a input that runs a command, we end the command and run another as that user, in this case popping a shell for us to run commands more easily ourselves.

### 8.2.2   Scheduler Manipulation

Linux systems use cron, and windows systems use task scheduler. They both allow for administrators to automate tasks. The use case is usually for an on-boot task, or perodically ran for backups and other important jobs.  THey save the administrator from having to run it manually, leaving them to do other jobs. They are invaluable for backup hygiene, as well as autostarting important programs. While these schedulers can run single commands, they are often given scripts for which to run at their defined time. The programmer in this case does not have to worry about scheduling code, they let the OS sort it out with their defined settings. The script will do 'x' task, and will run through it's defined algorithm.

The problem arises in the permissions of the potentially variable file. The script will always run as the user chosen to run the task. This means that the script could be running as the system or root user without explicit knowledge, and as such , if exploited could also run arbitrary code. A particularly nasty attack vector is the write permission of the script. If not secured so that only system level permissions can edit it, potentially any user can alter it. A user account could be hijacked, and then attempt to write to a scheduled script file. The user writing to the file may not be the one running it periodically, and as such any changes could be ran as the system/root user.

### 8.2.3   SUID Manipulation

### 8.2.4   User Account Creation

## 8.3   Process Hijacking

## 8.4   Symbolic Locations

# Part III

# Synthesis

# Part IV

# Evaluation

# Bibliography

Harshita Harshita. Detection and prevention of icmp flood ddos attack. *International Journal of New Technology and Research*, 3 (3):63–69, 3 2017.

Subramani Rao. Denial of service attacks and mitigation techniques: Real time implementation with detailed analysis? *SANS Institute Information Security Reading Room*, pages 9–27, 2020.

Carl Slatter. Icmp based denial of service - threat and mitigation. *KF5007 - Northumbria*, 2019a.

Carl Slatter. Principles of digital security and forensics. *KF5005 - Northumbria*, 2019b.

Us.norton.com. What Are Denial Of Service (Dos) Attacks? Dos Attacks Explained, 2020. URL `https://us.norton.com/internetsecurity-emerging-threats-dos-attacks-explained.htm`.

# Part V

# Appendices

# Appendix A

# Terms of Reference

## A.1   Ethics Form

If you scan the Ethics form on one of the multifunction printers, you can get a pdf copy. This can then be included with the LaTeX command

```
cincludegraphicsethics.pdf
```

## A.2   Risk Assessment Form

Likewise you can scan and include the Risk Assessment Form

```
cincludegraphicsriskassesment.pdf
```