Network Incident Severity Assessment

Automatic Defense Mechanisms

Luis Francisco Servin Valencia Till Dörges Klaus-Peter Kossakowski

ls,td,kpk@pre-secure.de



© 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH

Outline



Introduction and motivation

POSITIF

- Assessment Model
- Outlook & Future Work







Information Security







Information Security

attempts to preserve







- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality





- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality
 - Integrity





- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality
 - Integrity
 - Availability





- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality
 - Integrity
 - Availability
 - depends on





- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality
 - Integrity
 - Availability
 - depends on
 - Intrusion Prevention (isolation, data encryption, anti-virus software)





- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality
 - Integrity
 - Availability
 - depends on
 - Intrusion Prevention (isolation, data encryption, anti-virus software)
 - Intrusion Detection (IDS, IPS, Honeypots, Log analysis)



- Information Security
 - attempts to preserve
 - Confidentiality
 - Integrity
 - Availability
 - depends on
 - > Intrusion Prevention \rightarrow reactive
 - \blacktriangleright Intrusion Detection \rightarrow reactive







Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated







- Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated
 - Different output formats





- Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated
 - Different output formats
 - Alert flood





- Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated
 - Different output formats
 - Alert flood
 - False Positives





- Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated
 - Different output formats
 - Alert flood
 - False Positives
 - Repeated alerts (same alert, different sensor)



- Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated
 - Different output formats
 - Alert flood
 - False Positives
 - Repeated alerts (same alert, different sensor)
 - Alert Correlation reduces information amount





- Intrusion Detection solutions work isolated and uncoordinated
 - Different output formats
 - Alert flood
 - False Positives
 - Repeated alerts (same alert, different sensor)
 - > Alert Correlation reduces information amount \rightarrow doesn't provide knowledge!





Incident Severity Assessment





Incident Severity Assessment

Incident's effect on "health" of





- Incident Severity Assessment
 - Incident's effect on "health" of
 - Affected system(s)





- Incident Severity Assessment
 - Incident's effect on "health" of
 - Affected system(s)
 - Network as a whole



- Incident Severity Assessment
 - Incident's effect on "health" of
 - Affected system(s)
 - Network as a whole
 - Manual Method





- Incident Severity Assessment
 - Incident's effect on "health" of
 - Affected system(s)
 - Network as a whole
 - Manual Method
 - Time between alert and reaction



- Incident Severity Assessment
 - Incident's effect on "health" of
 - Affected system(s)
 - Network as a whole
 - Manual Method
 - Time between alert and reaction
 - Evaluate impact on network





- Incident Severity Assessment
 - Incident's effect on "health" of
 - Affected system(s)
 - Network as a whole
 - Manual Method
 - Time between alert and reaction
 - Evaluate impact on network \implies Topological knowledge helps, but challenging for big networks



Problem Statement



Extract knowledge from information in alerts



Problem Statement



- Extract knowledge from information in alerts
- Determine influence of individual events on network



Problem Statement



- Extract knowledge from information in alerts
- Determine influence of individual events on network
- React to detected anomalies



Outline



- Introduction and motivation
- POSITIF
 - Goal
 - Workflow
 - Structure
 - Proactive Security Monitor
- Assessment Model
- Outlook & Future Work









Policy-based Security Tools and Framework (POSITIF)







- Policy-based Security Tools and Framework (POSITIF)
- Goal: Provide a network administrator with tools for:





- Policy-based Security Tools and Framework (POSITIF)
- Goal: Provide a network administrator with tools for:
 - Centralized network management





- Policy-based Security Tools and Framework (POSITIF)
- Goal: Provide a network administrator with tools for:
 - Centralized network management
 - Definition of Security Policies



- Policy-based Security Tools and Framework (POSITIF)
- Goal: Provide a network administrator with tools for:
 - Centralized network management
 - Definition of Security Policies
 - Policy Monitoring





- Policy-based Security Tools and Framework (POSITIF)
- Goal: Provide a network administrator with tools for:
 - Centralized network management
 - Definition of Security Policies
 - Policy Monitoring
 - Reaction to intrusions


POSITIF Workflow





Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.8/28



POSITIF Structure





© 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH - p.9/28





Proactive Security Monitor



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.10/28





- Proactive Security Monitor
- Functions:



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.10/28



- Proactive Security Monitor
- Functions:
 - Monitor violations to policies





- Proactive Security Monitor
- Functions:
 - Monitor violations to policies
 - Report detected problems





- Proactive Security Monitor
- Functions:
 - Monitor violations to policies
 - Report detected problems
 - Situational assessment



- Proactive Security Monitor
- Functions:
 - Monitor violations to policies
 - Report detected problems
 - Situational assessment
 - Corrective actions







Components:



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.11/28





Components:

 Reactive Elements: IDS and Policy violation sensors (PVS)







- Reactive Elements: IDS and Policy violation sensors (PVS)
- Proactive Elements: Proactive Security Scanner
 (PSC) and Proactive Configuration Checker (PCC)



- Reactive Elements: IDS and Policy violation sensors (PVS)
- Proactive Elements: Proactive Security Scanner
 (PSC) and Proactive Configuration Checker (PCC)
- Processing Elements: PSC & PCC Correlation,
 PSM-Assessment





- Reactive Elements: IDS and Policy violation sensors (PVS)
- Proactive Elements: Proactive Security Scanner
 (PSC) and Proactive Configuration Checker (PCC)
- Processing Elements: PSC & PCC Correlation, PSM-Assessment
- Communication:





- Reactive Elements: IDS and Policy violation sensors (PVS)
- Proactive Elements: Proactive Security Scanner
 (PSC) and Proactive Configuration Checker (PCC)
- Processing Elements: PSC & PCC Correlation,
 PSM-Assessment
- Communication:
 Format: IODEF messages





Components:

- Reactive Elements: IDS and Policy violation sensors (PVS)
- Proactive Elements: Proactive Security Scanner
 (PSC) and Proactive Configuration Checker (PCC)
- Processing Elements: PSC & PCC Correlation, PSM-Assessment
- Communication:
 - Format: IODEF messages

Protocol: BEEP (Blocks Extensible Exchange P.)

Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.11/28

PSM Structure





Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.12/28

Outline



- Introduction and motivation
- POSITIF
- Assessment Model
 - Preparation
 - Model
 - Reaction State Machine
 - Process



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH $\,-$ p.13/28







Separate essential - non-essential services/hosts



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.14/28





- Separate essential non-essential services/hosts
 - Sensitivity levels in SDL



Assessment - Preparation



- Separate essential non-essential services/hosts
 - Sensitivity levels in SDL
- Defined security levels in network (SPL)



Assessment - Preparation



- Separate essential non-essential services/hosts
 - Sensitivity levels in SDL
- Defined security levels in network (SPL)
- Current Security level



Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.15/28



- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.15/28



- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions





- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration





- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration
 - Check for vulnerabilities





- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration
 - Check for vulnerabilities
 - Initiate general network policy change (green level ↔ red level)



- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration
 - Check for vulnerabilities
 - Initiate general network policy change (green level ↔ red level)
 - Initiate service reconfiguration



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.15/28



- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration
 - Check for vulnerabilities
 - Initiate general network policy change (green level ↔ red level)
 - Initiate service reconfiguration
 - Emit alerts and warnings for human interaction





- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration
 - Check for vulnerabilities
 - Initiate general network policy change (green level ↔ red level)
 - Initiate service reconfiguration
 - Emit alerts and warnings for human interaction
 - Self-stabilization

Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.15/28





- Adaptation Dynamic Fusion Model
 - Use active & reactive elements
 - Incorporate event reactions
 - Check valid configuration
 - Check for vulnerabilities
 - Initiate general network policy change (green level ↔ red level)
 - Initiate service reconfiguration
 - Emit alerts and warnings for human interaction
 - Self-stabilization

Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECUR Com X市合和SHOA15718 OVERALL NETWORK health measure



PSM - State Machine





Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.16/28





Alert Prioritization



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.17/28





- Alert Prioritization
 - System's Sensitivity



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.17/28





- Alert Prioritization
 - System's Sensitivity
 - Impact Severity







- Alert Prioritization
 - System's Sensitivity
 - Impact Severity
 - Corroborating / Contradicting successive events






- Alert Prioritization
 - System's Sensitivity
 - Impact Severity
 - Corroborating / Contradicting successive events
- Alert Association



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.17/28

Assessment - Process



- Alert Prioritization
 - System's Sensitivity
 - Impact Severity
 - Corroborating / Contradicting successive events
- Alert Association
- System Situational Assessment





Assessment - Process



- Alert Prioritization
 - System's Sensitivity
 - Impact Severity
 - Corroborating / Contradicting successive events
- Alert Association
- System Situational Assessment
- Network Situational Assessment







Clustering



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.18/28



Clustering

Structural relations between alerts (\approx Content, \neq level)



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.18/28



Clustering

- Structural relations between alerts (\approx Content, \neq level)
- Generalization hierarchies: IP Address, ports, time





Clustering

Structural relations between alerts (\approx Content, \neq level)

- Generalization hierarchies: IP Address, ports, time
- Correlation



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.18/28



Clustering

- Structural relations between alerts (\approx Content, \neq level)
- Generalization hierarchies: IP Address, ports, time
- Correlation
 - Cause-effect relations in abstract cognitive model



Clustering

- Structural relations between alerts (\approx Content, \neq level)
- Generalization hierarchies: IP Address, ports, time
- Correlation
 - Cause-effect relations in abstract cognitive model
 - Correlates IDS Correlation with other sensor



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.18/28







*Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.19/28





- *Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering
 - Cluster alerts together



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.19/28





- *Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering
 - Cluster alerts together
 - Specific attributes first





- *Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering
 - Cluster alerts together
 - Specific attributes first
 - Generalize attributes





- *Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering
 - Cluster alerts together
 - Specific attributes first
 - Generalize attributes
 - Each belongs to only one (most specific attributes)





- *Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering
 - Cluster alerts together
 - Specific attributes first
 - Generalize attributes
 - Each belongs to only one (most specific attributes)
 - Calculate ea. cluster's elements "closeness"





- *Attribute-Oriented Algorithm" to do clustering
 - Cluster alerts together
 - Specific attributes first
 - Generalize attributes
 - Each belongs to only one (most specific attributes)
 - Calculate ea. cluster's elements "closeness"
 - Calculate effect of all clusters (Cluster)

Network Incident Severity Assessment Survey, 2007 Severite, Spain gth) © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH - p.19/28



Alert Clustering Hierarchies





Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.20/28

Alert Correlation



Correlate IDS-Correlation w. other POSITIF Sensors.



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.21/28

Alert Correlation



- Correlate IDS-Correlation w. other POSITIF Sensors.
- Determine effect on system "Compromise" and "Attack" levels



Alert Correlation



- Correlate IDS-Correlation w. other POSITIF Sensors.
- Determine effect on system "Compromise" and "Attack" levels





Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.22/28



Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength

Fuzzify values



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.22/28



- Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength
 - Fuzzify values
 - > Calculate Consensus ($h = sup(min(C_f, CAS_f))$)





- Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength
 - Fuzzify values
 - > Calculate Consensus ($h = sup(min(C_f, CAS_f))$)
 - Aggregate them





- Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength
 - Fuzzify values
 - > Calculate Consensus ($h = sup(min(C_f, CAS_f))$)
 - Aggregate them
 - Partial Agreement: additive



- Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength
 - Fuzzify values
 - > Calculate Consensus ($h = sup(min(C_f, CAS_f))$)
 - Aggregate them
 - Partial Agreement: additive
 - Partial Disagreement: compromising





- Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength
 - Fuzzify values
 - > Calculate Consensus ($h = sup(min(C_f, CAS_f))$)
 - Aggregate them
 - Partial Agreement: additive
 - Partial Disagreement: compromising
 - \blacktriangleright Total Agreement: h





- Fuse "Compromise" level w. Cluster Association Strength
 - Fuzzify values
 - > Calculate Consensus ($h = sup(min(C_f, CAS_f))$)
 - Aggregate them
 - Partial Agreement: additive
 - Partial Disagreement: compromising
 - \blacktriangleright Total Agreement: h
 - \blacktriangleright Centroid Defuzzification \rightarrow Overall Degree

© 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting Grade - p.22/28 STCM)



Network Degree of Concern (NDOC) → Weighted average of "healthy" and ODC of affected systems



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.23/28



- Network Degree of Concern (NDOC) → Weighted average of "healthy" and ODC of affected systems
 - weights are represented by their SDL Sensitivity





- Network Degree of Concern (NDOC) → Weighted average of "healthy" and ODC of affected systems
 - weights are represented by their SDL Sensitivity
- Information clutter reduced to single value: low, caution, elevated, high, severe



- Network Degree of Concern (NDOC) → Weighted average of "healthy" and ODC of affected systems
 - weights are represented by their SDL Sensitivity
- Information clutter reduced to single value: low, caution, elevated, high, severe
- Level changes can trigger (de-)increase in Network Security Level

Outline



- Introduction and motivation
- POSITIF
- Assessment Model
- Outlook & Future Work



Outlook



Network Situational Assessment is the process of winning knowledge from a set of heterogeneous sensors' output.



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.25/28

Outlook



- Network Situational Assessment is the process of winning knowledge from a set of heterogeneous sensors' output.
- Proposed method pairs-up alerts with actions through a Finite State Machine

Outlook



- Network Situational Assessment is the process of winning knowledge from a set of heterogeneous sensors' output.
- Proposed method pairs-up alerts with actions through a Finite State Machine
 Aims to:


- Network Situational Assessment is the process of winning knowledge from a set of heterogeneous sensors' output.
- Proposed method pairs-up alerts with actions through a Finite State Machine
 - Aims to:
 - Obtain confirming/denying evidence





- Network Situational Assessment is the process of winning knowledge from a set of heterogeneous sensors' output.
- Proposed method pairs-up alerts with actions through a Finite State Machine
 - Aims to:
 - Obtain confirming/denying evidence
 - Survivability





- Network Situational Assessment is the process of winning knowledge from a set of heterogeneous sensors' output.
- Proposed method pairs-up alerts with actions through a Finite State Machine
 - Aims to:
 - Obtain confirming/denying evidence
 - Survivability
 - Self-Stabilize

Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain $©~2000\mathchar`20$



Alerts aggregated into clusters and correlated to measure the impact they have on the affected resource



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.26/28



- Alerts aggregated into clusters and correlated to measure the impact they have on the affected resource
- Confidence values for all affected resources are merged to determine overall health of the network.





- Alerts aggregated into clusters and correlated to measure the impact they have on the affected resource
- Confidence values for all affected resources are merged to determine overall health of the network.
 - Deteriorating / improving conditions are reflected by changes in the overall Policy Security Level





Project's Current Status: Component Integration for Review



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.27/28





Project's Current Status: Component Integration for Review





Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.27/28

Future Work



- Project's Current Status: Component Integration for Review
- Issues:
 - Quality of Information from sensors



Future Work



- Project's Current Status: Component Integration for Review
- Issues:
 - Quality of Information from sensors
 - Interoperability w/ framework



Future Work



- Project's Current Status: Component Integration for Review
- Issues:
 - Quality of Information from sensors
 - Interoperability w/ framework
 - Tests





Questions?



Network Incident Severity Assessment June 20, 2007 Seville, Spain © 2000-2007 PRESECURE Consulting GmbH – p.28/28