# **Chatter: Order-based Features for Malware Classification**

Aziz Mohaisen<sup>1</sup>, Omar Alrawi<sup>2</sup>, Andrew West<sup>1</sup>, Allison Mankin<sup>1</sup>, and Trevor Tonn<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Verisign Labs, VA, USA <sup>2</sup>Qatar Foundation

First IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security. Oct. 14-16, 2013, Washington, DC, USA.



- Artifacts are collected and used to fingerprint various malware families: memory, file system, registry, and network.
- Using those artifacts, researchers created features vectors and used machine learning algorithms for classification and clustering of malware samples.
- Often times, expensive algorithms: require co-residence and variety of features.



## Design Goals and Objectives

- Protocol type (TCP, UDP, RAW)
- port (53, 80, 443, 8080, 10, 8000, other)
- Request and response size (in and out; quartiles; total of 8 features).
- Dense representation
- Fixed length of alphabets (26)
- Variable length of behavior profiles (200 ~ 1000 characters)

#### Example

T1: Outgoing traffic, UDP connection, Port 53, DNS A record, 25KB, ... T2: Incoming traffic, UDP connection, Port 53, DNS AAAA record, 57KB, ... t1: A0, A3, A6, A8, A10, ...  $n=1 \rightarrow (A0, A3, A6, A8, A10), n=2 \rightarrow (A0A3, A3A6, A6A8, A8A10, ..)$ t2: A1, A3, A6, A9, A12, ...  $n=1 \rightarrow (A1, A3, A6, A9, A10), n=2 \rightarrow (A1A3, A3A6, A6A9, A8A10, ..)$ 

#### Results

K Nearest Neighbor (KNN)

• *Datasets:* Zeus (1025 samples, 50.74 avg chars), Darkness (544 samples, 61.47 avg chars), and SRAT (1130 samples, 52.74 avg chars). • Parameters and settings: n used for the n-• Evaluation metric: we use the accuracy, precigram is in the range of 1 to 8. A random set sion, recall, and F1-score. with equal size is used against the given family. Only network features are used (26 of them • Precision =  $\frac{T_p}{T_p + F_p}$ across multiple families). The table below is for augmented experiment with file-system arti-• Recall =  $\frac{T_p}{T_p + F_n}$ facts. (below: chatter; above: +fs, order: dark-• Accuracy =  $\frac{T_p + T_n}{T_p + T_n + F_p + F_n}$ ness, zeus, SRAT). Re K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) Support Vector Machine (SVM) Support Vector Machine (SVM) Vector Machine (SVM) Support Vector Machine (SVM) n values n values n values ---- K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) K Nearest Neighbor (KNN) Support Vector Machine (SVM) Support Vector Machine (SVM) Support Vector Machine (SVM) Support Vector Machine (SVM) n values n values n values n values Re

• F1 score =  $2 \times \frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}$ 

K Nearest Neighbor (KNN)

- Cost effective: no deep features
- Less invasive: ideally can be implemented as an outside observer unit.
- Generalizable and multiple purpose: can be used for malware as well as other malicious activities characterization.
- Evolvable to address behavior changes: easy to tune to address malware circumvention mechanisms.
- Accurate: to meet operational standards.

## Expansion of Features

- Not all combination of features are used
- Ideally, for k characters and n length of a feature, there exist  $k^n$  possible features. The number explodes quickly as both parameters grow
- We use a condensed representation: we use non-zero features across the multiple
  - samples. The number of features is reduced to 0.0005% when n = 6.
- Reduced features not only support efficient representation but fast of operation when using machine learning algorithms

n value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Zeus Darkness	$\begin{array}{ c c } 24 \\ 24 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 102 \\ 103 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 250 \\ 243 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 481\\ 461 \end{array}$	$943 \\ 875$	$\begin{array}{c} 1690 \\ 1503 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2638\\ 2266\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 3794\\ 3149 \end{array}$
SRAT	25	105	247	460	877	1536	2337	3300

### References

[1] Aziz Mohaisen et al., Chatter: Behavior and Order-based Features for Malware Classification In *Technical Report*, VeriSign Labs, October 2013

다. 	<ul> <li>Support Vector Machine (SVM)</li> <li>Decision Trees Classifier</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Support Vector Machine (SVM)</li> <li>→ Decision Trees Classifier</li> </ul>			9	$\begin{array}{c c} & & & \\ \hline \\ \hline$				$ \begin{array}{c c} & & & \\ \hline \\ \hline$			
N L	1 2 3 4 5 6	7 8	1 2	2 3 4	5 6 7	· 8	1 2	3 4 5	6 7		2 3	4 5 6	7 8	
	n values			n values			n values			n values				
	n-grams						4			8				
	Algorithms	Р	R	А	F1	P	R	A	F1	P	R	A	F1	
Zeus	k-NN	80.79	79.68	81.48	79.97	79.07	83.90	82.25	81.35	78.29	78.17	79.64	78.09	
	SVM	67.41	82.67	72.69	73.92	75.96	80.47	78.67	77.84	80.41	82.87	82.45	81.50	
	Decision Trees	80.14	80.90	81.74	80.42	81.13	81.82	82.67	81.35	80.82	82.82	83.02	81.77	
Dark.	k-NN	76.22	73.13	76.08	74.56	80.40	71.52	77.70	75.57	71.38	69.58	71.65	70.20	
	SVM	76.82	32.38	62.24	45.05	78.18	71.32	76.45	74.35	76.62	76.36	77.22	76.27	
	Decision Trees	80.45	72.56	78.20	76.07	81.75	72.89	79.04	76.93	80.50	68.37	76.39	73.59	
SRAT	k-NN	81.38	76.78	82.78	78.45	83.87	81.83	85.51	81.95	83.99	74.28	82.93	78.16	
	SVM	76.88	65.43	75.88	69.55	83.70	82.94	86.23	83.03	85.68	80.86	86.33	82.71	
	Decision Trees	85.16	81.11	86.44	82.60	88.28	81.65	88.01	84.45	86.13	78.92	85.54	81.85	

K Nearest Neighbor (KNN

K Nearest Neighbor (KNN)