

BOTWATCHER

Transparent and Generic Botnet Tracking

Complementary Material

Thomas Barabosch¹, Adrian Dombeck¹, Khaled Yakdan^{1,2}, Elmar Gerhards-Padilla¹

¹ Fraunhofer FKIE, Germany

{firstname.lastname}@fkie.fraunhofer.de

² University of Bonn, Germany

yakdan@cs.uni-bonn.de

This *zip* file contains complementary material of the paper BOTWATCHER: *Transparent and Generic Botnet Tracking*. On the one hand side, we included the data of the evaluation as *csv* files. On the other hand side, we included further inference rules of BOTWATCHER (cf. next section).

1 Inference Rules

At the core of BOTWATCHER's correlation logic are inference rules represented by the form:

$$\frac{P_1 P_2 \dots P_n}{C}$$

The top of the inference rule bar contains the premises P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n . If all premises are satisfied, then we can conclude the statement below the bar C . Inference rules provide a formal and compact notation for single step inference and implicitly specify an inference algorithm by recursively applying rules on premises until a fixed point is reached. BOTWATCHER uses an extensible set of rules that cover a wide spectrum of malware-related actions. We show current inference rules in Figure 1. See the paper for a detail description of the symbols. Note that we will enhance this table with new inference rules from time to time (current state: September 8, 2015).

$$\begin{array}{l}
(1) \frac{\mathcal{M}[a_s, a_e, p_{id}, ts_1] \quad \mathcal{T}[t_{id}, p_{id}, a_t, \tau_{create}, ts_2] \quad ts_2 \geq ts_1 \quad a_t \in [a_s, a_e]}{\text{CODEINJECTION}[p_{id}, ts_2]} \\
(2) \frac{\mathcal{N}[s, p_{id}, \tau_{start}, -, ts_1] \quad \mathcal{N}[s, p_{id}, \tau_{stop}, -, ts_2] \quad ts_2 \geq ts_1}{\text{DOWNLOAD}[p_{id}, ts_2]} \\
(3) \frac{\text{DOWNLOAD}[pp_{id}, ts_1] \quad \mathcal{P}[p_{id}, pp_{id}, \tau_{create}, ts_2] \quad ts_2 \geq ts_1}{\text{MALWAREDOWNLOAD}[p_{id}, ts_2]} \\
(4) \frac{\text{DOWNLOAD}[p_{id}, ts_1] \quad \mathcal{M}[-, -, p_{id}, rwx, ts_2] \quad ts_2 \geq ts_1}{\text{MALWAREDOWNLOAD}[p_{id}, ts_2]} \\
(5) \frac{\text{DOWNLOAD}[p_1, ts_1] \quad \text{CODEINJECTION}[p_2, p_1, ts_2] \quad ts_2 \geq ts_1}{\text{MALWAREDOWNLOAD}[p_2, ts_2]} \\
(6) \frac{\mathcal{N}[s, p_{id}, \tau_{start}, -, ts_1] \quad s.\text{dest} \in PM}{\text{SPAMMING}[p_{id}, ts_2]} \quad (7) \frac{\mathcal{C}[ts, k, v] \quad k \in K}{\text{PERSISTENCE}[p_{id}, ts_2]} \\
(8) \frac{\mathcal{N}[s, p_{id}, \tau_{start}, -, ts_1] \quad s.\text{status} = \text{listening}}{\text{CCINFRASTRUCTURE}[ts]} \\
(9) \frac{\mathcal{N}[s, p_{id}, \tau_{start}, -, ts_1] \quad \Delta[s] \geq T_{min}}{\text{CCINFRASTRUCTURE}[ts]} \\
(10) \frac{\mathcal{N}[s_i, p_{id}, \tau_{start}, -, ts_i]^{i \in 1..k} \quad \Omega[s] \leq \omega_{max}}{\text{CCINFRASTRUCTURE}[ts]} \\
(11) \frac{\mathcal{K}[-, ts]}{\text{ROOTKIT}[ts]}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1: Exemplary inference rules. Premises are execution events and as conclusion malicious behavior is inferred.