IETF 55, 21 November 2002 Jan Meijer <{}jan.meijer@surfnet.nl>{} INCH datamodel issues

- Linkage between attacker/victim
- Degree of IDMEF compatibility
- General unclarity of the datamodel
- Readability of the document
- Sanitization techniques
- Purpose and Restriction attribute definition
- Items on enumerated lists
- readability of the document

Linkage Attacker/Victim and Source/Target (1)

• Attacker/Victim:

"The Attacker class augments information found in the Source class with further details related to the entity(ies)/person(s) identified as the source(s) of the incident activity."

• Source/Target:

```
"The Source class contains information about the possible source(s) of the incident event(s). An
event may have more than one source (e.g., in a distributed denial of service attack). For the
purpose of compatibility, the Source class has been reused from the IDMEF."
+-----+ || Incident || >{| >{| >{| >| Attack || >{| >| Source || >{| >| Node || +-----+
-|} Target |}<{}>{} -|} Node |} |} |} |} |} |> -+ ----++|} |} |} |} |> -+ +----++|} |} |} |} |> -+ +----++|} |} |} |> -+ +----++|} |} |> |} |> -+ +----++|} |} |> |} |> -+ +----++|} |> |} |> |+-----++|
Linkage Attacker/Victimand Source/Target <{}IODEF-Description>{} <{}Incident>{}
<{}\Attack>{} <{}\Source>{} <{}\Node>{} ... <{}\Node>{} ... <{}\Node>{} ... <{}\Node>{} ... <{}\Node>{} ...
<{}\Source>{} <{}\Source>{} <{}\Node>{} ... <{}\Node>{} ... <{}\Source>{} <{}\Target>{}
<{}Node>{} ... <{}/Node>{} ... <{}Attack>{} ... <{}Attacker>{} <{} Contact>{} ...
<{}/Contact>{} <{}/Attacker>{} <{}Attacker>{} <{}Contact>{} ... <{}/Contact>{}
<{}/Attacker>{} <{}Victim>{} <{}Contact>{} ... <{}/Contact>{} <{}/Victim>{} ...
<{}/Incident>{} <{}/IODEF-Description>{} IDMEF compatibility
```

• "One of the design principles in the IODEF is compatibility with the Intrusion Detection Message Exchange Format (IDMEF) [3] developed for intrusion detection systems. For this reason, IODEF is heavily based on the IDMEF and provides upward compatibility with it."

- IODEF != IDMEF
- IDMEF classes have been adopted both semantically and syntactically where sometimes only adoption of syntax would be appropriate (impact)
- Strict compatibility maintenance created complex and unclear constructions
- And problems that can not easily be solved

Other issues

• Datamodel unclear and too complex

General feeling of overcomplexity, unclarity and basically not fulfilling the needs for exchanging incident coordination data between CSIRTs (and other entities!)

- Readability of the document
- Sanitization techniques

Need to express that a particular item is available but can not be shared

- Purpose and Restriction attribute semantics
- Items on enumerated lists
- readability of the document

Reordered datamodel (1)

- "One of the design principles in the IODEF is compatibility with the Intrusion Detection Message Exchange Format (IDMEF) [3] developed for intrusion detection systems. For this reason, IODEF is heavily based on the IDMEF and provides upward compatibility with it."
- IODEF != IDMEF

•

•

Reordered datamodel (2)

- Looking at the datamodel: two main areas
- Incident meta-data ('fuzzy', human interpretation)
- Data that can be 'measured', objective data
- Example: incident-impact vs. attack impact

First result of restructuring:

Incident Report

Incident meta-data Incident data Event —-0..*- Attacker/Victim —0..*- Source/Target Authority Record IncidentImpact Impact History AdditionalData

- Folded Source/Target into one class
- Folded Attacker/Victim into one class