

# Global Information Assurance Certification Paper

# Copyright SANS Institute Author Retains Full Rights

This paper is taken from the GIAC directory of certified professionals. Reposting is not permitted without express written permission.

# Interested in learning more?

Check out the list of upcoming events offering "Network Monitoring and Threat Detection In-Depth (Security 503)" at http://www.giac.org/registration/gcia

\*\*\* Northcutt, Very interesting, Bill is making use of BlackIce while I get three to four messages a day from my students telling me why they can't detect anything. That has to be worth a few points! Good use of an analysis process. A little attention for formatting would improve clarity. 82 \*\*\*

Certification Exercise Submitted by Bill Connett 4/06/2000

Unfortunately, I dont yet have sophisticated sensors in place. As a result

of the Sans IDIC course we are now working on developing security policies,

additional protection to our networks and putting IDS in place. All of

these traces are from BlackIce Defender on my work PC (using a program

called "ethereal" to format the traces). A big problem using BlackIce is

that the Detect traces are only "incoming" and you have to look in separate

logs if you want to try to find both incoming and outgoing
packets -- not

nice at all. As you can see, other than being behind a switch, we are

pretty open to the world. We do have limited ingress and egress router

(routers not under our control) filtering in place to prevent address

spoofing but at this point that's about it. Hopefully we will be in much

better shape in the near future. I should add that I couldn't figure out

why so few people from the previous class did this assignment until I tried

to do it. For those who have been doing this as part of their jobs for

awhile it is clearly a piece of cake. For those of us who haven't and who

don't have IDS systems in place it is a pretty daunting exercise. I've

been struggling with this assignment for several days and am biting the

bullet today and will finish it before I sleep, if I sleep.
:-)

#### Detect 1:

No. Time Source Destination Protocol Info 2 22:40:34.0920 mapper xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 0 > 111 [FIN, SYN] Seg=3729129472 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0 3 23:23:35.5820 mapper xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 0 > 143 [FIN, SYN] Seq= 508624896 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0 4 00:06:03.4229 mapper xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 0 > 53 [FIN, SYN] Seq=3679911936 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0 This is a Syn, Fin port scan scanning Sun RPC, IMAP and DNS (Zone transfer because it is TCP instead of UDP) ports. The source port of 0 is not normal and is an indication of crafting and perhaps indicates the use of the program "linux portz 0.1" (Northcutt, Intrusion Analysts Handbook, p98) which sets the default source port to 0. Because this is logged on a machine behind several switches it is not possible to see the other addresses that are being scanned. The lag of several minutes between scans to this address is probably due to the sequential scanning of all of the ports of the same number in the Class C network. The sequence numbers also are not in order and may be crafted as well. Mapper was a single address but could not be located in whois. Active Targeting: Yes Intent: Mapping well known potentially vulnerable assets Technique: Syn/Fin scan of RPC, DNS, and IMAP ports for potential revisit Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Explanation- Desktop machine but with critical system access (C4),

attack not likely to succeed on this machine (L1), Running two personal firewalls and current patches (CM4), Network countermeasures weak N1) Please Note: The utility of the severity formula is limited in this set of examples due to most of the detects being on the same machine and network. If the sensor was able to detect exploits on more than one machine I would be able to see a broader range of exploits or more importantly exploits on a broader range of equipment, then the formula results would vary and demonstrate a greater degree of usefulness. Source: BlackIce Detect

\_\_\_\_

Detect 2:

No. Time

Source

Destination

Protocol Info

54 05:45:55.7050 xxx.xxx.72.120 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 23 > 23 [ACK]

Seq=1675637262 Ack=1761221395 Win=1028 Len=0

55 05:49:17.2159 xxx.xxx.72.120 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 4 > 80 [FIN,

SYN] Seq=963161181 Ack=95514272 Win=1028 Len=0

56 05:49:17.3099 xxx.xxx.72.120 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 5 > 80 [PSH]

Seq=963161181 Ack=95514272 Win=1028 Len=0

57 05:49:17.3489 xxx.xxx.72.120 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 5578 > 139

[SYN] Seq=1534610384 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0

58 05:49:20.0249 xxx.xxx.72.120 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 5578 > 139

[SYN] Seq=1534610384 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0

This is an interesting set of port probes to one dest address ports 23

(telnet), 80 (http), and 139 (Netbios). The interesting thing is the variety  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

of source ports and the variety of flags used. The sequence numbers in

pairs indicate crafting as do the ack numbers. The attempt to probe port 80

and 139 twice each indicates a less than stealth approach and may be some

indication of the talent of the prober. It isn't clear to me what the 3

minute gap is between the first and second probe. This could be waiting for

a response before running a script as the subsequent probes are pretty fast.

Active Targeting: Yes

Intent: Probing selected well known ports

Technique: Random anomalous flag sets

Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Low. Probably a script

kiddie with limited

skills. No evidence of system compromise.

Source: BlackIce Detect

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### Detect 3:

6044 15:09:34.5640 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33120 > 61 [FIN, PSH, URG] Seq=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6045 15:09:34.5789 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33120 > 101 [FIN, PSH, URG] Seq=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6046 15:09:34.5989 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33120 > 873 [FIN, PSH, URG] Seq=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6047 15:09:34.6139 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33120 > 370 [FIN, PSH, URG] Seg=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6048 15:09:34.6339 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33120 > 42 [FIN, PSH, URG1 Seg=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6049 15:09:34.6490 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33120 > 465 [FIN, PSH, URG] Seg=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6050 15:09:34.6649 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 33121 > 405 [FIN, PSH, URG] Seq=0 Ack=0 Win=3072 Urg=0 Len=0 6051 15:09:34.6840 xxx.xxx.146.253 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 33121 > 816 [FIN,

This is a contrived Detect. One of my co-workers scanned my PC with nmap because we wanted to see what BlackIce would do and what the Detect would look like. BlackIce identified this scan as the TCP xmas scan although not all the flags are turned on.

Active Targeting: Yes for sure Intent: Testing, non malicious hopefully Technique: nmap with random dst port numbers and three anomalous flags set. Seq numbers crafted and ttl also set arbitrarily to 62 (not shown) Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Low Source: BlackIce Detect

We also did a Syn Scan and a Null Scan. Nothing interesting to report as far as differences between them except for flags. BlackIce did correctly detect and identify them.

### Detect 4:

```
Seq=3402534135 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
18 11:03:08.6829 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2873 > 23 [SYN]
Seg=3409999887 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
19 11:03:08.6829 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2883 > 515 [SYN]
Seq=3408648014 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
20 11:04:44.7130 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2882 > 1 [SYN]
Seq=3403969300 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
21 11:06:44.7230 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2879 > 21 [SYN]
Seq=3408068459 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
22 11:08:44.7430 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2876 > 111 [SYN]
Seg=3402534135 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
23 11:10:44.7779 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2873 > 23 [SYN]
Seg=3409999887 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
24 11:10:44.7779 xxx.xxx.72.167 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
2883 > 515 [SYN]
Seg=3408648014 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0
Date: 2/22/2000
Active Targeting: Yes
Intent: A combination of OS fingerprint (port 1 - SGI) and
scan for open
ports -- particular concern
     is the RPC port (111). Not sure what the importance
of 515 (printer
spooler port) is?
Technique: Standard Syn scan with crafted src ports and Seq
# (note matches
between them) and Ack=0 on all.
    Timing is erratic and may have something to do with
the stealthing
on the attacked machine on some
    ports causing the attacker to wait for a timeout on
that port before
moving on to the next one? Or
     interleaved scanning?
    Repeated scanning of same ports is low stealth - this
repeated
additional times
Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Low
Source: BlackIce Detect
```

\_\_\_\_\_

```
Detect 5:
38 17:29:10.1380 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1762 [SYN]
Seq=4001384687 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0
39 17:29:56.2680 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1769 [SYN]
Seg=936374699 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0
40 17:29:56.2730 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1769 [SYN]
Seq=936374699 Ack=0 Win=16060 Len=0
41 17:29:56.2779 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1772 [SYN]
Seq=2517046452 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0
42 17:29:56.2829 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1772 [SYN]
Seq=2517046452 Ack=0 Win=16060 Len=0
43 17:29:56.2829 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1772 [SYN]
Seg=2517046452 Ack=0 Win=16060 Len=0
44 17:29:56.2879 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1769 [SYN]
Seq=936374699 Ack=0 Win=16060 Len=0
45 17:30:29.3839 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1774 [SYN]
Seq=8415158 Ack=0 Win=512 Len=0
46 17:30:29.3880 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1774 [SYN]
Seq=8415158 Ack=0 Win=16060 Len=0
47 17:30:29.3930 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1774 [SYN]
Seq=8415158 Ack=0 Win=16060 Len=0
48 17:30:29.3980 xxx.xxx.218.150 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP
20 > 1776 [SYN]
Seg=1907674164 Ack=0 Win=512
Date: 4/01/2000
Active Targeting: Yes, port mapping by web server
```

(www.trinux.org)

Intent: Not clear what the intent of this is. It is not

targeted at a netbios port

or, as far as I know, a known trojan port. This occurs when you

attempt to see the list of

downloadable files.

Technique: Very fast scan of ephemeral ports in three with some variation.

Interesting that the window size

changes. Do sequence numbers indicate a very busy

server?

Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Low

Source: BlackIce Detect

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### Detect 6:

43 18:59:14.5049 xxx.xxx.126.41 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 4560 > 139 [SYN] Seg=248663655 Ack=0 Win=8192 Len=0 44 19:00:21.1349 xxx.xxx.126.41 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 4560 > 139 [SYN] Seq=248663655 Ack=0 Win=8192 Len=0 45 19:00:21.1390 xxx.xxx.126.41 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 4560 > 139 [SYN]Seq=248663655 Ack=0 Win=8192 Len=0 46 19:00:21.1490 xxx.xxx.126.41 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 4560 > 139 [SYN] Seg=248663655 Ack=0 Win=8192 Len=0 47 19:00:58.7100 xxx.xxx.126.41 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 4576 > 139 [SYN] Seq=248663916 Ack=0 Win=8192 Len=0 48 23:57:58.6799 xxx.xxx.216.42 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 1986 > 139 [SYN] Seg=1791183030 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0 49 23:58:01.6890 xxx.xxx.216.42 xxx.xxx.146.169 TCP 1986 > 139 [SYN] Seg=1791183030 Ack=0 Win=32120 Len=0

Date: 3/08/2000

Active Targeting: Yes Netbios port probe from a residence hall

Intent: Two bored students putting off studying or one with
two machines?

Technique: This looks like they were browsing the network neighborhood for

open shares. No packet crafting,

just poking around. Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Low Source: BlackIce Detect Detect 7: 264 06:37:38.8760 xxx.xxx.10.102 xxx.xxx.146.169 UDP Source port: 60000 Destination port: 2140 Date: April 1, 2000 (happy April fools day present) Active Targeting: Yes Intent: A trojan (Deep Throat) Scan. Note from San website writeup on Deep Throat: "Using outbound source port 60000, the DT client sends UDP to port 2140. If successful in finding the DT server (compromised box) the DT client initiates a back door, BO-like remote session using ports 2140 and 3150" Technique: A single packet to the dst address. Address is traceable to a UK AOL address with 17 hops from the victim. This is reasonably consistent with a ttl of 113 found on the incoming Detect. Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 Low -- no indication of client/server connection or outgoing packets to http which is characteristic of an infected machine. BlackIce would not detect this but the second personal firewall (AtGuard) running on this host would detect outgoing attempts. Source: Human Scanning a BlackIce Trace -- BlackIce did not detect this probe. I noticed it as I looked through a trace that BlackIce had triggered for a false positive UDP Scan

## Detect 8: 84 13:46:33.4550 xxx.xxx.64.137 xxx.xxx.146.169 UDP Source port: 19220 Destination port: 51200 85 13:46:33.4550 xxx.xxx.64.137 xxx.xxx.146.169 UDP Source port: 19220 Destination port: 51200 86 13:46:33.4550 xxx.xxx.64.137 xxx.xxx.146.169 UDP Source port: 19220 Destination port: 51200 87 13:46:33.4550 xxx.xxx.64.137 xxx.xxx.146.169 UDP Source port: 19220 Destination port: 51200 88 13:46:33.4600 xxx.xxx.64.137 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 19221 Destination port: 51201 89 13:46:36.4149 xxx.xxx.64.137 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 19221 Destination port: 51201 90 13:47:26.7309 xxx.xxx.64.139 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 18068 Destination port: 51200 91 13:47:26.7309 xxx.xxx.64.139 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 18068 Destination port: 51200 92 13:47:26.8049 xxx.xxx.64.139 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 18068 Destination port: 51200 93 13:47:26.8300 xxx.xxx.64.139 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 18068 Destination port: 51200 94 13:47:26.8550 xxx.xxx.64.139 xxx.xxx.146.169 Source port: 18068 Destination port: 51200 Date:2/24/2000 Active Targeting: No Intent: At first blush this looked really interesting. Two high UDP ports getting pounded by lots of incoming packets. After looking at the trojan lists and not finding any identified with these ports, I did a net search and found a reference to the internet telephony

program DialPad using

destination port 51200 and realized this was around the time I was experimenting with DialPad! My assumption at this point is that this was one of the dialpad hosts trying to respond to a request from my machine for a connection. When I have a little time I will try to recreate this.

Technique: Normal function
Severity: (C4+L1)-(CM4+N1)=0 to None
Source: BlackIce UDP scan trace

deleted about 60

Detect 9: taken from Sans -- I realized at the last minute that I had duplicated two detects, uggg

Brian Friday from .edu has a close encounter with Brazil, I

of the attempts )
Mar 31 05:08:28 myhost portsentry[172]: attackalert:
Connect from host: 150.183.91.134/150.183.91.134
to TCP port: 111
Mar 31 10:36:38 myhost portsentry[173]: attackalert:
Connect from host: dgt048.cpunet.com.br/200.254.53.48
to UDP port: 111
Mar 31 10:38:36 myhost portsentry[173]: attackalert:
Connect from host: dgt048.cpunet.com.br/200.254.53.48
to UDP port: 111

Mar 31 12:34:44 myhost portsentry[173]: attackalert: Connect from host: user-33qs1hs.dialup.mindspring.com/199.174.6.60 to UDP port: 31337 Mar 31 12:35:10 myhost2 portsentry[8311]: attackalert: Connect from host: user-33qs1hs.dialup.mindspring.com/199.174.6.60 to UDP port: 31337

Date: 3/09/2000
Active Targeting: Yes
Intent: 3 RPC probes (port 111), two from Brazil and one self inflicted?
Weird (sometimes when I feel

completely inadequate a sense of humor is all I have to fall back

probes.

Technique: Low stealth scan -- fast and twice on same port.

30 second

interval on the BO so might be

manual.

Severity: Don't have all the info but I would judge low on

both

Source: Sans Web site

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Detect 10:

59 18:06:15.9110 xxx.xxx.235.11 xxx.xxx.146.169 UDP

Source port: 1512

Destination port: 31337

Date: 3/27/2000

Active Targeting: Likely a broad scan

Intent: Scanning for Back Orifice (port 31337) trojan Technique: Insufficient information. UDP TTL was 53 and

backtrace to IP

address was to an existing dns.

Could have been (likely?) a spoofed address.

Severity: Low

Source: BlackIce Scan