

Siri N Shetty

PES2UG22CS556_SIRI_N_SHETTY_SOLUTIONS_AC

 Quick Submit Quick Submit PES University

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::1:3060411619

Submission Date

Oct 30, 2024, 9:15 AM GMT+5:30

Download Date

Oct 30, 2024, 9:16 AM GMT+5:30

File Name

PES2UG22CS556_SIRI_N_SHETTY_SOLUTIONS_AC.pdf

File Size

365.5 KB

4 Pages

1,096 Words

6,468 Characters



0% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Detection Groups

- 
1 AI-generated only 0%
 Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.
- 
2 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%
 Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



UE22CS342AA4 – Applied Cryptography

Colonial Pipeline – Case Study

Siri N Shetty

PES2UG22CS556

1. There was a dual role of cryptography in this case:

Attackers used cryptographic techniques to encrypt Colonial Pipeline's data, preventing access to essential systems. The attacks employed a hybrid approach -encrypting most of the data using fast symmetric encryption first, and then encrypting them with asymmetric encryption for further security against decryption without having an appropriate private key. This technique ensured that only the attackers, holding the private key, could decrypt the files, effectively controlling access.

The attackers demanded a ransom for the decryption key, using cryptography to gain financial power over the victim. This situation shows how, in ransomware, the secrecy of encryption keys becomes a bargaining tool. It complicates the victim's data recovery efforts and pressuring them into paying for key access.

2. The way in which Colonial Pipeline handles the crisis had its own strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths: Colonial maintained closed systems within hours from the discovery of the attack and issued many public releases during the incident. This helped manage public opinion and kept stakeholders informed. Colonial involved federal agencies like the FBI to gather intelligence that would help understand what the DarkSide was and how the attack commenced and how to minimize damage.

Although the impact, Colonial continued pipeline operations a couple of days after the accident, which indicates effective management of the crisis for fuel supply re-stabilization.

Weaknesses: The Decision of Colonies to pay approximately \$4.4 million in ransom which allowed them to retrieve their decryption keys was controversial. Payment of the ransom may facilitate further attacks as it

validates the business model of ransomware. Furthermore, it was not known if the data was going to be fully restored or other security issues were in the pipeline. The crisis highlighted Colonial's lack of a robust cybersecurity response plan. Questions arose about whether the company had adequate incident response and backup protocols. Some stakeholders expressed concerns over Colonial's lack of transparency during initial stages. A more transparent, structured communication plan might have helped better manage public concerns, especially around fuel shortages.

3. The company did well in the following aspects:

- Upon detecting the ransomware, Colonial Pipeline quickly shut down operations to prevent further spread. This limited the attacker's reach and helped in reducing further data loss.
- Involving FBI and other federal agencies helped Colonial gain immense support for assessing the threat and minimizing the damage. This also helped in indentifying DarkSide's tactics.
- Colonial kept their stakeholders and the public updated, which helped in managing the information flow and also helped in addressing the concerns about fuel availability. This also helped in stabilizing public during the event.

The company could improve in the following areas:

- The incident highlighted the need for a more structured cybersecurity incident response plan. Colonial could streamline their efforts.
- The way Colonial resented on paying the ransom suggests that the backup systems were either insufficient or not implemented properly. A robust backup and recovery strategy would help in avoiding this.
- They could communicate more transparently to avoid public from panic.

Lessons learnt from Incident

- Importance of being prepared for a ransomware
- Organisations should think about the further consequences before paying huge ransom. It can fuel the ransomware economy and can have long term negative effects.
- Companies with high public impact must invest in cybersecurity measures. Regular security assessments must be conducted.

4. It can be done in the following ways:
 - Use Multi-Factor Authentication to access sensitive data. This adds an additional security layer.
 - Limit data access strictly to employees who need it for their roles, which minimizes the risk of internal breaches.
 - Use encryption both in transit and at rest to protect data.
 - Use a combination of symmetric and asymmetric encryption to balance efficiency and security.
 - Regularly audit systems for vulnerabilities, ensuring they meet the latest security standards.
 - Train employees to recognize phishing, social engineering and other common attack methods.
 - Conduct regular security simulations to prepare staff for breach scenarios, so that they can respond quickly and effectively.
 - Form an incident response team.
 - Invest in advanced security tools
 - Segment networks to prevent Lateral movement.
 - Backup data regularly with a Secure Strategy.
 - Ensure that antivirus and anti-malware solutions, as well as all software patches, are kept up to date to guard against evolving threats.
5. Blount's decision to pay the ransom to recover Colonial Pipeline's systems was a complex and controversial choice.

Paying the ransom allowed Colonial to rapidly regain access to their data and resume operations. Given that the pipeline supplies fuel to a significant portion of the U.S. East Coast, restoring service quickly was crucial to avoid severe economic and public disruptions. Colonial's shutdown had immediate consequences, including fuel shortages and panic buying. With pressure from the government and the public, paying the ransom mitigated the risk of prolonged supply chain issues. Also, Colonial did not have an adequate backup system that could restore services without the decryption key.

But, paying ransoms can encourage attackers by funding ransomware operations and encouraging more attacks on other organizations, contributing

to a cycle of cybercrime. There is no guarantee that attackers will honor their promise. Even after payment, Colonial faced issues with slow decryption and had to rely on its own resources to expedite the process. The decision to pay could negatively affect Colonial's reputation, as it suggests unpreparedness for cybersecurity incidents.

6. In general, organizations should avoid paying ransomware.

Paying ransoms directly supports the ransomware economy and industry, providing cybercriminals with resources and incentives to continue their attacks. Each successful ransom payment leads to more sophisticated and frequent attacks targeting other organizations.

Cybercriminals may not honor their promise to provide decryption keys, even after payment. Many cases have shown that victims either do not receive the promised decryption keys or receive keys that work only partially, leaving some data inaccessible.

In some cases, paying ransomware may violate legal and regulatory guidelines. If the attackers are on government sanctions lists, payment could lead to fines or other legal consequences for the organization.

Paying a ransom may make an organization a target for repeated attacks. Once criminals know a company is willing to pay, they or others might target it again, viewing it as a profitable victim.

Beyond the immediate financial cost of the ransom, paying can tarnish an organization's reputation, leading stakeholders to question the company's security practices and readiness to handle cyber threats.

References:

1. Regular Security Assessments: Safety, Security and Risk
https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-658-37182-1_4
2. How to protect businesses from ransomware
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/ransomware-growing-threat-how-protect-your-business-prabhu-nerurkar-sib6f/>