



HAL
open science

Survey on system-level graph-based and anomaly-based intrusion detection

Fanny Dijoud, Pierre-François Gimenez, Michel Hurfin, Frédéric Majorczyk,
Barbara Pilastre

► **To cite this version:**

Fanny Dijoud, Pierre-François Gimenez, Michel Hurfin, Frédéric Majorczyk, Barbara Pilastre. Survey on system-level graph-based and anomaly-based intrusion detection. RESSI 2024 - Rendez-Vous de la Recherche et de l'Enseignement de la Sécurité des Systèmes d'Information, May 2024, Eppe-Sauvage, France. pp.1-2. hal-04714325

HAL Id: hal-04714325

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-04714325v1>

Submitted on 30 Sep 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Survey on system-level graph-based and anomaly-based intrusion detection

Fanny Dijoud*, Pierre-François Gimenez†, Michel Hurfin*, Frédéric Majorczyk‡, Barbara Pilastre§

*Inria, Univ. Rennes, IRISA, {firstname.lastname}@inria.com

†CentraleSupélec, Univ. Rennes, IRISA, pierre-francois.gimenez@centralesupelec.fr

‡DGA-MI, Univ. Rennes, IRISA, frederic.majorczyk@intradef.gouv.fr

§DGA-MI, barbara.pilastre@intradef.gouv.fr

Abstract—Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) are tools for monitoring a system, in order to identify potential malicious activities within it. This survey presents an analysis of graph-based anomaly-based IDS at system level. We also present open issues regarding those IDS, and propose a taxonomy of suitable features to compare them.

Index Terms—intrusion detection system, anomaly detection, system security, machine learning, provenance graph

I. INTRODUCTION

Most widely used Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) are signature-based such as Snort, but these IDS are not able to detect new attacks like zero-day attacks. Nowadays, the widely use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in anomaly-based IDS makes new attacks detectable since these IDS do not rely on a characterization of attacks. Anomaly-based detection consists in profiling normal behavior from logs (i.e. recorded operations) and defining abnormal behavior by the degree of deviation from normal behavior. System-level logs involve APT-detection useful details: process identifier, file path, etc.

This survey provides system-level graph-based and anomaly-based IDS’ state of the art, a taxonomy of suitable features and open issues.

II. FOCUS ON TEN RECENT SOLUTIONS

We compare ten state-of-the-art approaches according to the following criteria: datasets, graph definition, graph embedding, detection level, machine learning processing, supervised or not, and the results of experiments (see Tables I, II and III).

A. Datasets

Several datasets are used and each has its own specification, making IDS’ comparison arduous. We focus on two very different widely-used datasets: StreamSpot and DARPA OpTC.

StreamSpot [11] contains logs of 6 scenarios (each reproduced 100 times and gathered in 100 graphs), including only 1 attack scenario. Thus this dataset is unrepresentative of the potential diversity of attacks and activities. However StreamSpot is popular because it is well labeled, gives first results for an approach, and its size is manageable (i.e. small).

DARPA Operationally Transparent Cyber (DARPA OpTC) [4] is 1.5+ TB of compressed JSON imprecise-labeled logs of the activity of 1,000 Windows 10 during 7 days. OpTC contains 3 red-activity days. Despite its scripted nature, the dataset is closer to real-world logs by its complexity.

B. Building a graph

Most approaches turn logs to graphs according to the definition used in Backtraker [8], called *Provenance graphs*. They are directed graphs where nodes are system’s objects and edges underline a source object, a sink object, and a timestamp. These graphs highlight causal/temporal links, resulting in a clearer intelligible vision of activities.

In Figure 1, *edge 1* represents process B doing an action (e.g. reading) on *file 1* at timestamp 1. Objects and edges sets may differ according to approaches: limited information into logs brings to limited objects/edges sets; non-obvious objects called abstract object (AO) can be added [2] (e.g. sensitive data object), etc.




Fig. 1. Provenance graph (from [8])

These AO stress that sets’ definition can significantly vary the intern structure of graphs: bringing in the same neighborhood, objects that would otherwise have been far apart. In Figure 1, if *file 0* and *file X* share sensitive data, they would be linked to a sensitive data AO, making them only two hops away from each other, which can be crucial when embedding.

C. Embedding

The goal of the embedding is to transform essential graphs’ information into an input for AI processing, while retaining the ability to scale up: classic information extraction methods such as adjacency matrix are out of scope.

Many different embeddings have been proposed, depending on the chosen detection level and AI processing. Approaches thus use graph objects or graphs/edges/nodes’ features and neighborhood original/low-level embedding such as one-hot encoding, NLP methods, etc. (see Table I). Time can be included in the embedding but it is often taken into account by using time window or snapshots when defining the graphs.

D. Anomaly detection

To compare the effectiveness of different IDS, we use common metrics: accuracy, precision, recall and F1-score [9].

In anomaly detection, the definition of normal behavior has a significant impact on the efficacy of the IDS. An attack

Title	Year	Detection level	Datasets	Graphs	Embedding	AI Processing	Supervised
UNICORN [5]	2020	Graph	DARPA TC3, StreamSpot	Provenance graph	Histogram	Cluster	No
ANUBIS [1]	2022	Event traces	DARPA OpTC	Provenance graph	Contextual/Causal and neighborhood	LSTM, BNN	Yes
PIKACHU [10]	2022	Events	DARPA OpTC, LANL	Provenance graph	Skipgram	GRU-AE	No
APT-KGL [2]	2022	Node	DARPA TC, custom	Abstract object	Meta-path, HGAT	R-GCN	Yes
SHADEWATCHER [14]	2022	Events	DARPA Trace (TC), custom	Provenance graph, Bipartite	Neighborhood	GNN	Add human
PROGRAPHER [12]	2023	Graph	DARPA 3, DARPA Engagement ATLAS, StreamSpot, EDR	Provenance graph	Graph2vec	RCNN	No
GCA-(SA) [13]	2023	Graph	StreamSpot	Provenance graph	GCN	AutoEncoders	No
EDGETORRENT [7]	2023	Graph	StreamSpot, UNSW-NB15, DARPA TCE5	Provenance graph	MPNN	GAN	No
KAIROS [3]	2023	Time window	DARPA3, DARPA5, DARPA OpTC, StreamSpot	Provenance graph	Feature hashing	AutoEncoder (TGN, MLP)	No
MAGIC [6]	2023	Node	StreamSpot, Unicorn Wget dataset, DARPA E3	Provenance graph	Lookup	AE (GAT), Outlier (KNN)	No

TABLE I

STATE-OF-ART SYSTEM-LEVEL GRAPH-BASED AND ANOMALY-BASED IDS.

Title	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score
UNICORN [5]	0.96	0.98	0.93	0.94
GCA [13]	0.988	1.0	0.925	0.961
GCA-SA [13]	0.970	0.851	0.978	0.909
PROGRAPHER [12]	0.94	0.90	1.0	0.94
EDGETORRENT [7]	0.934 (1.0*)	0.883 (1.0*)	0.972 (1.0*)	0.924 (1.0*)
KAIROS [3]	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
MAGIC [6]	0.997	0.994	1.0	0.997

TABLE II

RESULTS OF APPROACHES ON STREAMSPOT. (*AFTER OPTIMIZATION)

Title	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score
PIKACHU [10]	×	×	0.987	×
ANUBIS [1]	0.993	0.99	1.0	0.996
KAIROS [3]	0.987 (0.995*)	0.579 (0.842*)	1.0	0.733 (0.914*)

TABLE III

RESULTS OF APPROACHES ON DARPA OpTC. (×: NO INFORMATION)

falsely considered as normal behavior, will not trigger alarms (false negative). In Table II and Table III, the recall is high: the normal behavior profile has been meticulously constructed and contains only normal behavior.

The profile of the normal behavior implies that all possible normal behaviors are represented in this profile. However it is difficult to do so because normal behavior is too vast and unstable to be represented in its entirety. Thus alerts can be raised wrongly (false positive FP). In Tables II and III, the precision highlights a quite high FP rate: real activity being more complex, precision less than 0.99 for these simple/scripted datasets, makes approaches unpractical.

AI-based detection approaches can be either supervised or unsupervised. Supervised learning needs labeled data (i.e. spot attacks' logs). However, even in a controlled setup, labeling data needs time from experts. So in practice the labeled data are often not sufficient to obtain a consistent dataset for learning. However unsupervised methods are currently less efficient than supervised ones: they start to be efficient on simple datasets, but for more realistic datasets like DARPA OpTC, the precision is too low: KAIROS [3], with no optimization, has 16 FP, means 16 time-windows of 15 minutes, which correspond to 4 hours of FP activity out of 3 days of activity.

III. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Analysis of state-of-the-art approaches indicates that simple datasets are often used when more real-world scaled datasets should be the base of experiments. Moreover, time embedding, which is crucial to detect complex attacks, still need to be explored. Regarding experiments, the most effective approaches, on closer real-world datasets, are still supervised. However these approaches need labelled data, which is difficult to obtain in real environment. On the contrary, unsupervised

approaches do not need labeled data and can be set up in a real environment more easily. However, those IDS are not yet fully mature: the FP rate is high which makes these approaches not suitable in a real-world environment for now.

The goal of my PhD is to build an unsupervised graph-based system-level anomaly-based approach that can deal with real-world datasets and perform anomaly detection in reasonable time with few false alarms.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank the Brittany Region and the Directorate General of Armaments (DGA), in the context of CREACH LABS.

REFERENCES

- [1] MM Anjum, S Iqbal, and B Hamelin. Anubis: a provenance graph-based framework for advanced persistent threat detection. In *Proc. of the 37th ACM/SIGAPP Symp. on Applied Computing*, pages 1684–1693, 2022.
- [2] T. Chen, C. Dong, M. Lv, Q. Song, H. Liu, T. Zhu, K. Xu, L. Chen, S. Ji, and Y. Fan. Apt-kgl: An intelligent apt detection system based on threat knowledge and heterogeneous provenance graph learning. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2022.
- [3] Z. Cheng, Q. Lv, J. Liang, D. Wang, Y. and Sun, T. Pasquier, and X. Han. Kairos: Practical intrusion detection and investigation using whole-system provenance, 2023.
- [4] Darpa op-tc. <https://github.com/FiveDirections/OpTC-data>, Accessed: 2024-01-20.
- [5] X. Han, T. Pasquier, A. Bates, J. Mickens, and M. Seltzer. Unicorn: Runtime provenance-based detector for advanced persistent threats. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01525*, 2020.
- [6] Z. Jia, Y. Xiong, Y. Nan, Y. Zhang, J. Zhao, and M. Wen. Magic: Detecting advanced persistent threats via masked graph representation learning, 2023.
- [7] I. J. King, X. Shu, J. Jang, K. Eykholt, T. Lee, and H. H. Huang. Edgetorrent: Real-time temporal graph representations for intrusion detection. In *Proc. of the 26th Int. Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, RAID '23, page 77–91, 2023.
- [8] S. T. King and P. M. Chen. Backtracking intrusions. In *Proc. of the 19th ACM symp. on Operating systems principles*, pages 223–236, 2003.
- [9] Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Precision_and_recall, Accessed: 2024-01-20.
- [10] R. Paudel and H. H. Huang. Pikachu: Temporal walk based dynamic graph embedding for network anomaly detection. In *IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symp. (NOMS)*, pages 1–7, 2022.
- [11] Streamspot database. <https://github.com/sbustreamspot/sbustreamspot-data>, Accessed: 2024-01-20.
- [12] F. Yang, J. Xu, C. Xiong, Z. Li, and K. Zhang. Prographer: An anomaly detection system based on provenance graph embedding. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 4355–4372, 2023.
- [13] M. Ye, S. Men, L. Xie, and B. Chen. Detect advanced persistent threat in graph-level using competitive autoencoder. In *Proc. of the 2nd Int. Conf. on Networks, Communications and Information Technology*, pages 28–34, 2023.
- [14] J. Zengy, X. Wang, J. Liu, Y. Chen, Z. Liang, T.S. Chua, and Z.L. Chua. Shadewatcher: Recommendation-guided cyber threat analysis using system audit records. In *IEEE Symp. on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 489–506. IEEE, 2022.