

CYBER SECURITY: WHO IS WORRYING ABOUT T&E?

Test & Evaluation to Meet the Advanced Persistent Threat International Test and Evaluation Association

John B. Foulkes, Ph.D.

(Teacher/Consultant/Grandfather/(Very Recent) Great Grandfather)

November 29, 2012

Cyber Security: The Problem

- *This country's critical infrastructure (power plants, bridges, hospitals, financial institutions) are at risk to exploitation, disruption and even destruction by our adversaries through cyber-attacks.*
- *Our systems are easily penetrated; once penetrated, cleanup is expensive and time consuming; and if one system can be penetrated, all can be.*
- *Stuxnet, Flame, Duqu, etc., etc., etc.*
- *Etc.*
- *Etc.*

OK, we get the message

The Prevailing Philosophy

- “Defense in Depth”: A common approach to deterrence
 - Pile on layers and layers of defenses (sometimes making things worse), in the hope that any and all types of penetration can be prevented.
 - This is more like “Failure in Depth”.
 - ***As one DARPA program manager put it recently: “Our current mentality is P⁴I: “Perimeter Protection, Patch, and Pray”***
 - *The “I” stands for the intrusion that always follows”!*
- Any solution short of complete denial of intrusion is not acceptable.

The testing of any “solution”, whatever it may be, has not been given adequate attention.

Message

- **We need to seriously start thinking about testing in the Cyber Domain**
 - **Policy**
 - We have a lot of policy already.....
 - *Kratznicki's Law: Compliance with policy is inversely proportional to the amount of policy to be complied with.*
 - **Methodology**
 - Adapt/translate from the traditional domains into the Cyber Domain, but.....
 - Operations in Cyber Space do not translate well from conventional operations.
 - The avenues of approach for an adversary are wide.
 - In conventional operations, we can study the terrain and know where the enemy can and can't go.
 - Not so in Cyber Space: if the terrain exists, it is passable.
 - **Infrastructure**

Zero Day: “A virtual battleground for Pentagon’s cyber warriors”
Washington Post, November 27, 2012 (Robert O’Harrow Jr.)

- Researchers use virtual cities to develop cyber defenses
 - CyberCity
 - “One of **hundreds** of virtual environments – often known as cyber ranges” or test beds – launched in recent years by military, corporate , and academic researchers to confront the mind-bending security challenges posed by cyberspace.....”
 - DARPA’s “National Cyber Range”
 - DoD’s “Information Assurance Range”
 - Cyber range at Eastern Michigan University – Merit Network, Inc.
 - Cyber ranges run by Northrup Grumman
 - Defense Technology Experimental Research (DETER) project

***Efforts are primarily research-focused, using
Constructive and Virtual environments***

Navigating a Way Forward.....

- Academia and industry provide the inertia
- Feasible products emerge
- Understanding the operational environment
- Characterizing and replicating the threat(s)
- Building the right “sand box”
 - The proliferation of “cyber ranges” is astounding
 - The term cyber range is misapplied
 - Rather, range (or ranges) that can test system capabilities within the cyber domain....
 - Research, development, testing, training, and operations should be interwoven
 - Distributed L-V-C capabilities: reconfigurable; persistent
- Use cases
- Goal: Conducting no-kidding test/training events in a realistic than support acquisition decisions

The Academic Contribution: Understanding the “physics” of system/network intrusion

- Behavior of systems (hardware software, people) in networks has a rich mathematical foundation.
 - Modeling the human
 - Statistical techniques applied to stochastic processes
 - Current University-level research using:
 - Variable Length Markov Models (VLMMs)
 - Hidden Markov Models (HMM)s
 - Partially Observable Markov Decision Processes (POMDPs)
 - Bayesian Networks
 - All help provide better insight into pattern recognition; in predicting attacks and their outcomes, assessing the probability of penetration and determining the risk of disruption or destruction of the system.

Recently Published Research

- *“Projecting Cyber-attacks Through Variable-Length Markov Models”*; Daniel S. Fava, Stephen R. Byers, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Shanchieh Jay Yang, *Member, IEEE*
 - Presents a VLMM that captures the sequential properties of attack tracks, allowing for the prediction of likely future actions on ongoing attacks; it is able to adapt to newly observed attack sequences without requiring specific network information.
- *“Robustness of the Markov-Chain Model for Cyber-Attack Detection”*; Nong Ye, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Yebin Zhang, and Connie M. Borrer
 - Presents a cyber-attack detection technique through anomaly-detection, and discusses the robustness of the modeling technique employed. In this technique, a Markov-chain model represents a profile of computer-event transitions in a normal/usual operating condition of a computer and network system (a norm profile).

Recently Published Research

- “*Methods to Window Data to Differentiate Between Markov Models*”; Jason M. Schwier, Richard R. Brooks, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Christopher Griffin, *Member, IEE*
 - Uses statistical pattern matching calculations performed on a sliding window of data samples to detect changes between behaviors.
- “*Behavior Detection Using Confidence Intervals of Hidden Markov Models*”; Richard R. Brooks, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Jason M. Schwier, and Christopher Griffin, *Member, IEEE*
 - Uses confidence intervals for HMM analysis; enables consideration of the number of data samples available when comparing an HMM model with a sensor data stream; uses a novel approach in applying receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves to find detection thresholds when confidence intervals are used.

Summary

Bottom Line:

- Efforts to completely deny adversarial intrusion are resource prohibitive.
- Attention must be given to testing cyber products in a realistic, operational environments.

Next Steps:

- Identify the key, critical components of infrastructure (starting with DoD networks and architectures)
- Use Markov model theory (HMMs, VMMs) to develop algorithms for understanding and bounding the probabilities of adversarial intrusion.
- Soliciting product developers.
- Adapting the existing L-V-C capabilities to serve as operational research and testing “sand boxes”.