# Lab #16: Perform Incident Handling (Utilize NIST 800-61)

### Purpose:

- We'll now perform incident response. We've generated plenty of incident alerts after exposing our lab environment to malicious traffice for 24 hours.
- We'll be hardening our environment once we start the **Containment**, **Eradication**, and **Recovery** phase of Incident Response (IR).
- We'll advise the incidents in accordance with NIST SP 800-61 (Incident Management Lifecycle).

#### Tasks:

- 1. Incident Response #1 Brute Force Success (Windows)
  - Preparation
  - Detection & Analysis
  - Containment, Eradication, and Recovery
  - Document Findings (Including Root Cause)
- 2. Incident Response #2 Possible Privilege Escalation
  - Preparation
  - Detection & Analysis
  - Containment, Eradication, and Recovery
  - Document Findings (Including Root Cause)
- 3. Incident Response #3 Brute Force Success (Linux)
  - Preparation
  - Detection & Analysis
  - Containment, Eradication, and Recovery
  - Document Findings (Including Root Cause)
- 4. Incident Response #4 Possible Malware Outbreak
  - Preparation
  - Detection & Analysis
  - Containment, Eradication, and Recovery
  - Document Findings (Including Root Cause)

# Task 1: Incident Response #1 - Brute Force Success (Windows)

### Preparation:

<u>Note</u>: We already completed this IR phase. We've previously set up logs to be ingested into our Log Analytics workspace. We also configured alert rules in Sentinel.

#### Detection & Analysis:

1. Azure portal > Sentinel > Incidents > order the incidents by Severity >

#### 2. Select top incident.

Selected workspace	t Sentinel   Incide	ents				×	
Create incide	+ Create incident (Preview) 🖒 Refresh 🔇		Last 24 hours $\lor$ 😤 Actions 📋 Delete 🛃 Security efficiency workbook 🗮 C				
<b>23</b> Open incidents	New incidents	CO Active incidents	High (3)	Medium (20)	Low (0)	Informational (0)	
	title, tags, owner or product	ر] Severity :	All	∽ More (3)	CUSTOM: Brute	Force SUCCESS - Wi	
Auto-ref	fresh incidents				<mark>▲ Unass &gt; ※ N</mark> Owner Status	ew ∨ High ∨ s Severity	
🗌 Severity 斗	, Incident ID ↑↓	Title ↑↓	Alerts	Product n	P		
High	11	CUSTOM: Brute	For 16	Microsoft	If you see a SUCCESS but	t the Account is "NT	
High	8	CUSTOM: Windo	ows 6	Microsoft	AUTHORITY\ANONYMOU article:	US LOGON", check out this	
High	7	CUSTOM: Malwa	are 6	Microsoft	https://www.inversecos.com/2020/04/successful		
Medium	25	CUSTOM: Brute	For 6	Microsoft	Alart product pamag		
Medium	24	CUSTOM: Brute	For 1	Microsoft	Microsoft Sentinel		
< Previous	1 - 22 Next >				Evidence 16 ① U 16 Events Alerts	D Bookmarks	

3. Set the **Severity**, **Status**, and **Owner** for the incident.

CUSTOM: Brute Force SUCCESS - Windows Incident ID: 11								
Letter Stress Content And Cont	$\sim$	C Active	$\sim$	High Severity	~			

#### 4. Select View Full Details.

- Observe the Activity Log (view history of the incident)
   Observe Entities and Incident Timelines. We see the attacker who was performing brute force attempts.

Overview Entities			Incident action	ns 🗸
🔎 Search	Type : All	52.15.118.236		
Name	Туре	•		۵
52.15.118.236	IP	 Info	Timeline	Insights
windows-vm	👤 Host	 		
		Geolocation informat	ion 🛈	
		Organization Amazon Technologies Inc.	Organization typ Retail	e
		City Columbus	Country United States	
		State Ohio	Continent North America	
		Log activity 🛈		
		First seen 11/20/2023, 7:54:56 PM	Last seen 11/20/2023, 8:45	:59 PM

7. Select Investigate to further investigate the incident.



**Note:** "We see that this attacker entity was involved in other brute force attempts and successes."



<u>Note</u>: "We see that the windows-vm was involved in other incidents. We should inspect why so many alerts were generated (because it's purposefully over-exposed to the internet)."

- 8. Determine the legitimacy of the incident (True Positive, False Positive, etc.).
  - a. Go to Log Analytics workspace > Run this query to analyze the attacker IP:

Secu	intyEvent   where Eventic	) == 4624   where ipAddre	ess == "52.15.118.236"	
15 16	SecurityEvent   where EventID == 4624			
17	where IpAddress == "52.15	5.118.236"		
P	loculto Chart			
	chart			
Tin	neGenerated [UTC] $\uparrow \downarrow$	Account	AccountType	Computer
>	11/21/2023, 12:49:52.872 AM	NT AUTHORITY\ANONYMOU	User	windows-vm
>	11/21/2023, 12:49:52.669 AM	NT AUTHORITY\ANONYMOU	User	windows-vm
>	11/21/2023, 12:49:15.092 AM	NT AUTHORITY\ANONYMOU	User	windows-vm
>	11/21/2023, 12:48:04.157 AM	NT AUTHORITY\ANONYMOU	User	windows-vm

<u>Note</u>: "It initially seemed like an attacker successfully brute-forced via utilizing SMB. But upon further investigation it was found that the alerts were **false positives** created by a service account (see explanation: <u>https://inversecos.com/2020/04/successful-4624-anonymous-logons-to.html</u>). Though the alert was a false positive, this type of traffic shouldn't be reaching the VM."

### Containment, Eradication, and Recovery:

- 1. Per the "Incident Response PlayBook", we'll lock down the NSGs:
  - a. Edit the "DANGER\_AllowAnyCustomAnyInbound" inbound rule to only allow one IP (our IP).
  - b. Delete the rule that allows inbound RDP.

#### **Document Findings (Including Root Cause):**

1. Documented the findings of the incident and labeled it as a "False Positive". Closed the incident.



# Task 2: Incident Response #2 - Possible Privilege Escalation

#### Preparation:

<u>Note</u>: We already completed this IR phase. We've previously set up logs to be ingested into our Log Analytics workspace. We also configured alert rules in Sentinel.

#### **Detection & Analysis:**

- 1. Azure portal > Sentinel > Incidents > order the incidents by Severity >
- 2. Select the **Possible Privilege Escalation** alert.

	🔎 Sear	rch by ID, title, tags, c	wner or p	product	) ର   (	Severity : A	JI	Status : 2 se	elected			∨ More (2)	1	CUST Incide	OM: Pos nt ID: 26	ssible P	rivilege E	scalat	tion (Azure Key
		Auto-refresh incide	nts										20	<b>Unassig</b> r wner	ned $\vee$	Statu	ew s	$\sim$	High Severity
	Ser	werity ↑↓ High	Inciden 26	it ID ↑↓	CUSTO	↑↓ DM: Possible	Privileg	ge Escalation (/	Azure Key	/ Vault Criti	ical Credential F	letrieval or Upo	c Al	ert product	: names ft Sentine	I			
		Medium	72		CUST	DM: Brute Fo	orce ATT	EMPT - Linux	Syslog				E١	vidence		-			
		Medium	71		CUSTO	OM: Brute Fo	orce ATT	EMPT - Windo	ows				4	66 🛈		22		rke	
		Medium	70		CUSTO	OM: Brute Fo	orce ATT	EMPT - Windo	ows					vents	Alerts		BOOKINA	IKS	
	•	Erich Mair	$\sim$	0 4-	i	~		Llink		~									
		Erich Mair	$\sim$		ivo	~		High		$\sim$									
	Owr	ner		Status			Se	everity											
4. 3	Selec	t View Full	Deta	ails.															
5. \	We se	ee many al	erts ti	riggere	d for t	his inc	ider	nt. Let's	start	: writir	ng our n	otes.							
	0	CUSTOM:	Possi	ible Pri.															
	ΎΙ	Hi Dete	cted	Та	<b>P</b>														
	0	CUSTOM:	Possi	ible Pri.															
	Ý	Hi Dete	cted	Та	P														
	0	CUSTOM:	Possi	ible Pri.															
	Ý	Hi Dete	cted	Та	թ														

<u>Note</u>: "Several alerts were triggered by a user (NAME, EMAIL) who viewed a secret (critical credentials) many times. It seems like possible suspicious behavior. Need to investigate further..."

CUSTOM: Possible Pri...

0

6. Select Investigate to inspect it further > select the Entity and view the Related Alerts



7. We see that this entity has triggered a Possible Lateral Movement alert as well.



a. Add more notes to our documentation:

<u>Note</u>: "…It's an internal user that viewed critical credentials many times, and they were also involved in other incidents including **Excessive Password Resets** and **Global Admin Role Assignment**…"

8. Determine the legitimacy of the incident by reaching out to the user and their supervisor.

<u>Note</u>: "...After contacting the user's supervisor directly, and discussing with the user, it's confirmed that their actions were legitimate and non-malicious. Closing out this incident as a **False Positive**. "

#### Containment, Eradication, and Recovery:

1. N/A

### Document Findings (Including Root Cause):

1. Document the findings of the incident and labeled it as a "False Positive". Close the incident.

New			
C Active			
Closed			
False Positive -	Inaccura	ite data	`
involved in seve	eral othe	r incidents	
including exces	sive pas	sword reset	ts and

# Task 3: Incident Response #3 - Brute Force Success (Linux)

### Preparation:

<u>**Note</u>**: We already completed this IR phase. We've previously set up logs to be ingested into our Log Analytics workspace. We also configured alert rules in Sentinel.</u>

### **Detection & Analysis:**

- 1. Azure portal > Sentinel > Incidents > order the incidents by Severity >
- 2. Select the Linux Brute Force Success alert.

Auto-refresh incidents					La Unassigned	$\sim$	🔅 New	$\sim$
Severity ↑↓ Incident ID ↑↓	L Title ↑J	Alerts	Product names	Cre	Owner		Status	
High 31	CUSTOM: Brute Force SUCCESS - Linux Syslog	1	Microsoft SAntinel	03/	Alert product n	ames		
High 21	CUSTOM: Brute Force SUCCESS - Windows	1	A Microsoft Sentinel	03/	• MICTOSOIL	senunei		
High 19	CUSTOM: Possible Privilege Escalation (Global Admir	n Role 6	Microsoft Sentinel	03/	Evidence	01	0	
High 17	CUSTOM: Malware Detected	12	Microsoft Sentinel	03/	Events	Alerts	Bookmarks	
High 15	CLISTOM: Possible Privilege Escalation (Global Admir	Role 6	Microsoft Sentinel	03/				
et the <b>Severity</b> , <b>St</b>	atus, and Owner for the incid	lent.						
🔒 Erich Mair 🛛 🗸	C Active V High	$\sim$						
Owner	Status Severity							
elect View Full De	tails.							
e see the entity the	at triggered this alert (our atta	ck-vm, locate	ed in a differen	t cou	untry).			
Overview Entities								
C	Torres All							
D Search	Type : All							
D Search	Type : All						Time	
Name	Type : All						Туре	
Name	Type : All						Туре	l
Name	Type : All						Type	
Name 20.	Type : All						Type	
Name 20. linux-vm	Type : All						Type IP Host	
Name 20. linux-vm	Type : All						Type IP Host	
Name 20. linux-vm 20. 20. 20. 20. 20. 20. 20. 20. 20. 20.	Type : All						Type IP Host	
Name 20. Iinux-vm 20. IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Type : All						Type IP Host	
Name 20. Iinux-vm 20. Iinux-lp	Type : All						Type IP Host	
Name 20. linux-vm 20.	Type : All	•					Type IP Host	
Name 20. linux-vm 20. linux-vm	Type : All	© Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20. linux-vm 20. linux-vm	Type : All	<b>₽</b> Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20	Type : All	<b>₽</b> Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20	Type : All	Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20	Type : All	Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20	Type : All	Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20	Type : All Timeline Timeline Organization Type Publishing	<b>₽</b> Insights					Type IP Host	
Name 20. Iinux-vm 20. Iinux-vm 20. Info Ceolocation info Organization microsoft corporation City	Type : All Timeline Timeline Organization Type n Organization Type Publishing	<b>₽</b> Insights					Type	

6. Select Investigate to see other events that originated from this attacker/entity.



a. Let's start writing our notes.

<u>Note</u>: "Attacker at [IP Address] was involved with several other incidents that triggered alerts. Need to investigate further..."

7. Went to Logs Analytics workspace to investigate the malicious IP further. We confirmed that the IP did make a successful connection to our linux-vm.

<pre>21 Syslog 22   where Facility == "auth" and 23   where SyslogMessage contains 24</pre>	SyslogMessage startswith "Ad "20.	ccepted password for"		
Results Chart				
HostName	SeverityLevel	SyslogMessage		
linux-vm	info	Accepted password for	from 20.	port 56488 ssh2

<u>Note</u>: (I'm pretending that this was a malicious IP that connected to our linux-vm) "The malicous IP (IP Address) did successfully connect to linux-vm. This is a **True Positive**. Need to perform containment and remediation steps..."

#### Containment, Eradication, and Recovery:

- 1. Per the "Incident Response PlayBook", we'll perform these steps:
  - a. Stopped the affected PC
  - b. Reset the account's password
  - c. Hardened the NSG (we already performed this though)

<u>Note</u>: "...Remediated by resetting account password for the compromised user, locked down NSGs, and stopped the affected PC. The impact  $\rightarrow$  the account was local to the linux machine (non-admin), so essentially low-impact. The attacker was involved with other incidents but these will be remediated through hardening of NSGs."

## **Document Findings (Including Root Cause):**

1. Document the findings of the incident and labeled it as a "True Positive". Close the incident.

Owner	Status	High Severity	`
🔆 New			
🔁 Active			
✓ Closed			
True Positive - Suspicio	us activity 🔍 🗸		
locked down NSGs, and affected PC. The impact was local to the linux m admin), so essentially lo attacker was involved w	d stopped the t → the account achine (non- ow-impact. The vith other	me )9:24 AM	

## Task 4: Incident Response #4 - Possible Malware Outbreak

#### Preparation:

<u>Note</u>: We already completed this IR phase. We've previously set up logs to be ingested into our Log Analytics workspace. We also configured alert rules in Sentinel.

#### **Detection & Analysis:**

- 1. Azure portal > Sentinel > Incidents > order the incidents by Severity >
- 2. Select the Linux Brute Force Success alert.

₽ Se	earch by ID, title, tags, o	wner or product	Severity : All	∽ Мо	re (3)	CUSTOM: Malware Detected
•	Auto-refresh inciden	its				Lunassigned → X New → High Owner Status Severity
	Severity ↑↓	Incident ID $\uparrow \downarrow$	Title ↑↓	Alerts		
	High	7	CUSTOM: Malware	6	$\supset$	Alert product names     Microsoft Sentinel
	Medium	27	CUSTOM: Brute For	1		Evidence
	Medium	26	CUSTOM: Brute For	20		
	Medium	25	CUSTOM: Brute For	6		Events Alerts Bookmarks

3. Set the Severity, Status, and Owner for the incident.

CUSTON Incident I	<b>1: Ma</b> D: 7	lware Detecte	d		
A Erich Mair Owner	$\sim$	C Active Status	$\sim$	High Severity	$\sim$

#### 4. Select View Full Details.

5. We see that the entity triggered several alerts (generated by our 'test' malware script).



6. Select Investigate to see other events that originated from this attacker/entity.



a. Let's start writing our notes.

<u>Note</u>: Windows-vm was involved with several activities that raised alerts.

7. Let's examine the query that generated this alert.

#### a. Copy the rule's query > Log Analytics workspace >

Se   	curityAlert where AlertType == "Antima where CompromisedEntity ==	wareActionTaken" "windows-vm"	
Resu	Ilts Chart		
imeG	enerated [UTC] Di	olayName AlertName AlertSeverity Description	
	AlertType	AntimalwareActionTaken	
	IsIncident	false	
	StartTime [UTC]	2023-11-20T19:22:48Z	
	EndTime [UTC]	2023-11-20T19:22:48Z	
	ProcessingEndTime [UTC]	2023-11-20T20:21:12.6981974Z	
>	RemediationSteps	["No user action is necessary"]	
>	ExtendedProperties	{"ActionTaken":"Blocked","Threat Status":"Quarantined","Protection Type":"Windows Defer	nder","Thre
~	Entities	[{"\$id":"5","HostName":"windows-vm","AzureID":"/subscriptions/2b31cc00-64b6-484	58-9a4a-a
	> 0 {"\$id":"5","Hosti	ame":"windows-vm","AzureID":"/subscriptions/2b31cc00-64b6-4868-9a4a-a217af0b3c91/res	ourceGrou
	> 1 {"\$id":"6","Direc	ory":"c:\\users\\labuser","Name"("eicar-0.txt")"Asset":false,"Type":"file"}	

SecurityAlert | where AlertType == "AntimalwareActionTaken" | where CompromisedEntity == "windows-vm" it seems like the user was testing with EICAR files. I corroborated with the user and the user's supervisor."

## Containment, Eradication, and Recovery:

1. N/A

#### **Document Findings (Including Root Cause):**

1. Documented the findings of the incident and labeled it as a "Benign Positive". Close the incident.

(3)	CUSTOM: Malware Detected Incident ID: 7				
	<mark>≧ Erich Mair</mark> ∨ Owner	C Active Status	~	High Severity	$\sim$
1 - See	New				
	Closed				
Se	lect classification	$\sim$			
query I used: SecurityAlert   where AlertType == "AntimalwareActionTaken"   where CompromisedEntity == "windows-vm" it seems like the user was testing with EICAR files. I corroborated with the user and user's supervisor.			יז 2	e ::34 PM	



- We've performed incident response on our lab environment and hardened our lab environment.
- We'll soon expose our lab environment again for 24 hours We'll then compare results of 'Before' and 'After' securing/hardening our environment.