



MATHEMATICS FOR ARTIFICIAL REASONING IN SCIENCE (MARS)

(B)= O, YAGE OS

Belen

Security by the Analytic: A Framework for Automatic Mapping of Vulnerabilities to Attack Patterns using Artificial Intelligence

Mahantesh Halappanavar[†], Siddhartha Das^{‡†}, Edoardo Serra^{*†}, Ashutosh Dutta^{†ε}, Antonino Tumeo [†], Maxwell Levin[†], Alex Pothen[‡], Ehab Al-Shaer^{&†} [Antonino Tumeo, Sumit Purohit, Kathy Panchal, Luis de la Torre, John Miller]

[†]Pacific Northwest National Lab; [‡]Purdue University;
 *Boise State University; [&]Carnegie Mellon University;
 ^ɛ Amazon



PNNL is operated by Battelle for the U.S. Department of Energy



Programming must be...

"If debugging is the process of removing software bugs, then programming must be the process of putting them in."

#1 Rule in cybersecurity: "Treat Everything Like It's Vulnerable"





1972 ACM A.M. Turing Award winner Edsger W. Dijkstra. **Photo Credit: The University** of Texas at Austin

Our Goal: Feed the Good Wolf

- Minimize the time between vulnerability discovery and mitigation by linking vulnerabilities to mitigation actions
- Enhance threat intelligence and exploratory research
- Eg., The "Log4Shell" flaw was widely exploited -- ~40,000 attempted attacks within two hours of it becoming public, and >830,000 attempts within the first three days.*



https://www.checkpoint.com/cyberhub/cyber-security/what-iscybersecurity/biggest-cybersecuritychallenges-in-2022/







1. Data & Problem Setting





= 50; new int[num]; new int[num];

0, 100); ke(); 102);

w() { ound(0); the values to the right i = num-1; i > 0; i--) { x[i-1]; y[i-1];

the new values to the beginning of the array nouseX; nouseY; / the circles i = 0; i < num; i++) {

ə(x[i], y[i], i/2.0, i/2.0);

5

Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE)

A blueprint for understanding software flaws and their impact through a hierarchically designed dictionary of software weaknesses (934 Weaknesses)





https://cwe.mitre.org







Common Vulnerabilities & Exposures (CVE)

- Bugs: Mistakes happen in the process of building and coding a system
- Vulnerabilities: Bugs that can be exploited to induce unintended behavior from software/protocol/hardware
- A bug is determined to be a vulnerability is registered by MITRE as a CVE
 - Publicly known information-security vulnerabilities and exposures
 - TOTAL CVE Records: 215,715. (https://cve.mitre.org/) on 10/31/2023
- Some Examples:
 - Broken Authentication
 - SQL Injection
 - Cross-Site Scripting



Example description: "CVE-2004-0366: SQL injection vulnerability in the libpam-pgsql library before 0.5.2 allows attackers to execute arbitrary SQL statements."



Mapping CVEs to CWEs

- CVE reports are uniquely identified computer security vulnerabilities, where a vulnerability is defined as a set of one or more weaknesses in a specific product or protocol that allows an attacker to exploit the behaviors or resources to compromise a system
- Example: "CVE-2004-0366: SQL injection vulnerability in the libpam-pgsql library before 0.5.2 allows attackers to execute arbitrary SQL statements."





Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') - (74) 😼 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') - (89)

CVE to CWE Mapping

- We considered 933 CWE classes from MITRE (circa 2021)
- About 124 types of CWEs are classified in National Vulnerability Dataset (NVD) \bigcirc
- CVE to CWE mapping is done manually, requires human expertise, and error prone



Partial hierarchy of CWE extracted from MITRE to demonstrate how precise and relaxed predictions are performed. We consider **124** CWEs that are distributed in three levels in the hierarchy, with 34 in the first level, 78 in the second level, and **16** in the third level.



CVE to CWE Mapping: Challenges

- Distribution of the number of CVEs per CWE in NVD, bucketed into four categories
- Data partitioned into two time periods to simulate testing for CVEs observed in the future
- 1999-2017 (used for training) and 2018-2020 (used for testing).





Common Attack Pattern Enumeration and Classification (CAPEC)

- An "exploit" makes a "weakness" a "vulnerability"
- "Attack Patterns" are descriptions of the common attributes and approaches employed by adversaries to exploit known weaknesses in cyber-enabled capabilities
- CAPEC is a dictionary of common identifiers for attack patterns



Some Well-Known Attack Patterns:

- HTTP Response Splitting (CAPEC-34)
- Session Fixation (CAPEC-61)
- Cross Site Request Forgery (CAPEC-62)
- SQL Injection (CAPEC-66)
- Cross-Site Scripting (CAPEC-63)
- Buffer Overflow (CAPEC-100)
- Clickjacking (CAPEC-103)
- Relative Path Traversal (CAPEC-139)
- XML Attribute Blowup (CAPEC-229)



https://capec.mitre.org/





C Engage in Deceptive Interactions - (156) - I Content Spoofing - (148) - Fake the Source of Data - (194) - IS Principal Spoof - (195) - I Signature Spoof - (473) - • S Pharming - (89) -⊞ Resource Location Spoofing - (154) - Action Spoofing - (173) —⊞Manipulate Human Behavior - (416) C Abuse Existing Functionality - (210) —
Interface Manipulation - (113) —⊞ Excessive Allocation - (130) - • Resource Leak Exposure - (131) —
■
■
Functionality Misuse - (212) —⊞ Communication Channel Manipulation - (216) — I Protocol Manipulation - (272) — I Functionality Bypass - (554) C Manipulate Data Structures - (255) - C Manipulate System Resources - (262) - C Inject Unexpected Items - (152) Employ Probabilistic Techniques - (223) -• C Manipulate Timing and State - (172) Collect and Analyze Information - (118)

Mapping CVE to CWE to CAPEC

- We want to know what attack sequences can be taken taken given CVE descriptions
- CVE-CWE mapping ---- CWE-CAPEC mapping

"CVE-2004-0366: SQL injection vulnerability in the libpam-pgsql library before 0.5.2 allows attackers to execute arbitrary SQL statements."

https://cve.mitre.org





1000 - Mechanisms of Attack

C Engage in Deceptive Interactions - (156) - Content Spoofing - (148) Identity Spoofing - (151) -ES Fake the Source of Data - (194) - Principal Spoof - (195) - ES Signature Spoof - (473) S Pharming - (89) — 🗉 🖻 Phishing - (98) ⊞ Resource Location Spoofing - (154)
 -E Action Spoofing - (173) C Abuse Existing Functionality - (210) -B Interface Manipulation - (113) - E Flooding - (125) -⊞ Excessive Allocation - (130) Resource Leak Exposure - (131) -⊞I Functionality Misuse - (212) - E Communication Channel Manipulation - (216) - I Sustained Client Engagement - (227) —⊞ Protocol Manipulation - (272) -B Functionality Bypass - (554) C Manipulate Data Structures - (255) C Manipulate System Resources - (262) C Inject Unexpected Items - (152) Employ Probabilistic Techniques - (223) C Manipulate Timing and State - (172) Collect and Analyze Information - (118)

Adversarial Tactics, Techniques & Common Knowledge (ATT&CK)

		Tac	tics						
NITRE AT	T&CK"			Matric	es Tactics -	Techniques 👻 Miti	igations 👻 Gro	oups Software	Resources *
Initial Access 9 techniques	Execution 10 techniques	Persistence 18 techniques	Privilege Escalation 12 techniques	Defense Evasion 34 techniques	Credential Access 14 techniques	Discovery 24 techniques	Lateral Movement 9 techniques	Collection 16 techniques	Command and Control 16 techniques
Drive-by Compromise	Command and Scripting Interpreter (7)	Account Manipulation (4)	Abuse Elevation Control	Abuse Elevation Control Mechanism (4)	Brute Force (4)	Account Discovery (4)	Exploitation of Remote Services	Archive Collected Data (3)	Application Layer Protocol (4)
Exploit Public- Facing Application	Exploitation for Client Execution	BITS Jobs	Access Token	Access Token Manipulation (5)	Password Stores (3)	Application Window Discovery	Internal Spearphishing	Audio Capture	Communication Through Removable
External Remote Services	Inter-Process Communication (2)	Boot or Logon Autostart Execution (11)	Manipulation (5) Boot or Logon	BITS Jobs	Exploitation for Credential Access	Browser Bookmark Discovery	Lateral Tool Transfer	Automated Collection	Media Data Encoding (2)
Hardware Additions	Native API	Boot or Logon Initialization	Autostart Execution (11)	Deobfuscate/Decode Files or Information	Forced Authentication	Cloud Service Dashboard	Remote Service Session	Clipboard Data	Data Obfuscation (a)
Phishing (3)	Scheduled Task/Job (5)	Scripts (5)	Boot or Logon Initialization	Direct Volume Access	Input Capture (4)	Domain Trust Discovery	Hijacking (2)	Storage Object	Dynamic
Replication Through Removable Media	Shared Modules	Browser Extensions Compromise Client	Scripts (5) Create or Modify	Execution Guardralls (1) Exploitation for Defense	Man-in-the- Middle (1)	File and Directory Discovery	Remote Services (6)	I Information Repositories (2)	Resolution (3) Encrypted
Supply Chain Compromise (3)	Tools	Create Account (3)	Event Triggered	File and Directory	Modify Authentication	Network Service Scanning	Through Removable Media	Data from Local System	Fallback Channels
Trusted Relationship	User Execution (2)	Create or Modify System Process (4)	Exploitation for	Permissions Modification (2)	Process (3) Network Sniffing	Network Share Discovery Network Sniffing	Software Deployment Tools	Data from Network Shared Drive	Ingress Tool Transfer
Valid Accounts (4)	Windows Management	Event Triggered Execution (15)	Privilege Escalation Group Policy	Group Policy Modification Hide Artifacts (6)	OS Credential Dumping (8)	Password Policy Discovery	Taint Shared Content	Data from Removable Media	Multi-Stage Channels
	Instrumentation	External Remote Services	Modification	Hijack Execution Flow (11)	Steal Application	Peripheral Device Discovery	Use Alternate Authentication	Data Staged (2)	Non-Application
		Hijack Execution	Flow (11)	Impair Defenses (6)	Steal or Forge	Permission Groups Discovery (3)	Material (4)	Email Collection (3)	Non-Standard Port
		Flow (11)	Process Injection (11)	Indicator Removal on Host (6)	Kerberos Tickets (3)	Process Discovery		Input Capture (4)	Protocol Tunneling
-		Image Office Application	Scheduled Task/Job (5)	Indirect Command Execution	Steal Web Session Cookie	Query Registry Remote System Discovery		Man-in-the- Middle (1)	Proxy (4) Remote Access
		Startup (6) Pre-OS Boot (3)	Valid Accounts (4)	Masquerading (6)	Two-Factor Authentication Interception	Software Discovery (1)		Screen Capture	Traffic Signaling or
		Scheduled Task/ Johan		Process (3) Modify Cloud Compute	Unsecured Credentials on	System Information Discovery		Video Capture	Web Service (3)

echniques

Adversarial Tactics. Techniques & Common Knowledge



- Persistence, Lateral Movement, Exfiltration)
- Details specific tactics, (TTPs) used in advanced persistent threats (APT)
- Attack patterns enumerated by CAPECs are used in





Describes operational phases in adversary's lifecycle (e.g.,

techniques, and procedures

specific ATT&CK techniques



2. Approach: V2W-BERT & VWC-MAP





= 50; new int[num]; new int[num];

up() { 0, 100); ke(); 102);

w() { ound(0); the values to the right i = num-1; i > 0; i--) { <[i-1]; /i-1:

the new values to the beginning of the array nouseX; acureX:

3



Key Ideas

"You shall know a word by the company it keeps" – Firth (1957)

- Meaning ≈ Location in semantic space
 - Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) state-of-the-art ✓ Vector Based on SVD of Word by Document Matrix









From "Attention is all you need" paper by Vaswani, et al., 2017

CVE-CWE: V2W-BERT Framework

- The Transformer component including the Reconstruction-Decoder (RD) is highlighted in pink, and the Link Prediction (LP) component is highlighted in blue
- Pre-training is done only on the Masked Language Model, and during link prediction the entire framework is considered
- Learnable function:

 $l = F_{\theta}(v, w)$

S Das, E. Serra, M. Halappanavar, A. Pothen, and E. Al-Shaer. "V2W-BERT: A Framework for Effective Hierarchical Multiclass Classification of Software Vulnerabilities." In proceedings of the 8th IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA). Porto, Portugal. October 2021. [Best Application Paper Award]



Architectural overview of V2W-BERT framework





Implementation details

- Huggingface and PyTorch Lightning :
 - Huggingface provides a wide range of transformer-based models
 - PyTorch Lightning helps organize and parallelize PyTorch implementations efficiently (DP, DDP)
- Step 1: V2W-BERT pretraining with CVE/CWE descriptions
 - Retraining BERT model with domain specific CVE descriptions
 - Take a batch of CVEs and update
- Step 2: V2W-BERT linking CVEs with CWEs
 - Take batch of CVEs, batch of CWEs, process them parallel
 - Create training links process them parallel
 - Process reconstruction loss of the batch of CVEs and CWEs parallel



Strong Scaling of V2W-BERT: GPUs vs. #parameters



Pre-training time for BERT-Large across different generations of Nvidia accelerators with different number of GPUs

Scaling of different language models on A100 system with a batch size of 16

Das S., M. Halappanavar, A. Tumeo, E. Serra, A. Pothen, and E. Al-Shaer. "VWC-BERT: Scaling Vulnerability–Weakness–Exploit Mapping 59 60 3 on Modern AI Accelerators." In IEEE International Conference on Big Data (IEEE BigData 2022) December 17-20, 2022. Osaka, Japan.



A Summary of Key Results





Relative Performance (temporal partition)

Table 5: Performance comparison of V2W-BERT

	Model	Tes	t 1 (k_1, k_2)	Test 2 (
	Model	(1,1,1)	(3,2,1)	(5,2,2)	(1,1,1)	(3,
	Class, TF-IDF NN	0.2631	0.5656	0.6537	0.2519	0.4
1 100	Link, TF-IDF NN	0.3626	0.5998	0.6791	0.3395	0.5
1-100	Class, BERT _{CVE}	0.4138	0.6602	0.7466	0.2914	0.6
	Link, V2W-BERT	0.4765	0.6933	0.7564	0.4072	0.6
	Class, TF-IDF NN	0.8524	0.9425	0.9616	0.7815	0.8
► 100	Link, TF-IDF NN	0.8463	0.9227	0.9485	0.7604	0.8
>100	Class, BERT _{CVE}	0.8852	0.9479	0.9649	0.8067	0.9
	Link, V2W-BERT	0.8905	0.947	0.9763	0.8113	0.9
	Class, TF-IDF NN	0.775	0.893	0.9298	0.6886	0.8
Λ 11	Link, TF-IDF NN	0.7828	0.8803	0.9132	0.6863	0.8
AII	Class, BERT _{CVE}	0.8232	0.9101	0.9363	0.7163	0.8
	Link, V2W-BERT	0.8362	0.914	0.9442	0.7345	0.8



k_1, k_2, k_3) 2,1) (5,2,2)838 0.5739 64 0.659 0.6902 105 293 0.7179 953 0.9404 738 0.9153 0.9414 064 123 0.9492 231 0.8761 0.8706 196 578 0.9038 0.9151 594

Randomly Partitioned (across years)

Table 4: Performance with randomly partitioned dataset

Model	Test Set (k_1, k_2, k_3)						
IVIOUCI	(1,1,1)	(3,2,1)	(5,2,				
Class, TF-IDF NN	0.8606	0.9464	0.966				
Link, TF-IDF NN	0.8642	0.9502	0.969				
Class, BERT _{CVE}	0.8812	0.9503	0.968				
Link, V2W-BERT	0.8916	0.9523	0.97				



Quality Across Models

- Best performance from RoBERTa
- Hierarchical Mapping



CWE-CAPEC: VWC-MAP Framework: Approach1: Link prediction

Architectural overview of the Link Prediction network. The Feature Transformer components have shared weights. The model takes CWE-CAPEC feature information and transforms and combines them for prediction



S. Das, A. Dutta, S. Purohit, E. Serra, M. Halappanavar and A. Pothen, "Towards Automatic Mapping of Vulnerabilities to Attack Patterns using Large Language Models," 2022 *IEEE International Symposium on Technologies for Homeland Security* (HST), Boston, MA, USA, 2022, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/HST56032.2022.10025459. [Best Paper Award in Cyber Security Track]



CWE-CAPEC: VWC-MAP Framework Approach2: Using LLMs (Google T5)



Text-2-Text Mapping: Training process for VWC-MAP framework



Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables. This attack pattern involves causing a buffer overflow through manipulation of environment variables

Server Side Include (SSI) Injection. An attacker can use Server Side Include (SSI) Injection to send code to a web application that then gets executed by the web server

ensures that structured messages or data are well-formed and that certain security properties are met before being read from an upstream component or sent to a downstream component.

Overflow Buffers. Buffer Overflow attacks target improper or missing bounds checking on buffer operations, typically triggered by input injected by an adversary

CWE-CAPEC Mapping Result: CWE-131

CWF	Link Prediction	T5-model			
CWE	CAPEC		CAPEC	Rating	
	CAPEC-100: Overflow Buffers*	10	CAPEC-100: Overflow Buffers*	10	
	CAPEC-47: Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion*	10	CAPEC-47: Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion*	10	
CWE 121. Incorrect	CAPEC-14: Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow	8	CAPEC-14: Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow	8	
CwE-151. Inconect	CAPEC-24: Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow	10	CAPEC-24: Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow	10	
of Buffer Size	CAPEC-256: SOAP Array Overflow	10	CAPEC-67: String Format Overflow in syslog()	3	
	CAPEC-45: Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links	5	CAPEC-45: Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links	5	
	CAPEC-46: Overflow Variables and Tags	10	CAPEC-46: Overflow Variables and Tags	10	
	CAPEC-8: Buffer Overflow in an API Call	3	CAPEC-8: Buffer Overflow in an API Call	3	
* - Ground truth					

Predictions from our Link Prediction model for CWE-131. Both models predict the ground truth of two CAPECs perfectly. The additional predictions were evaluated manually and we have found them to be highly relatable. It's also interesting to see both of these give almost same predictions with one difference.



CWE-CAPEC Mapping Result: CWE-22

CWF	Link Prediction		T5-model			
CWE	CAPEC		CAPEC	Rating		
CWE 22: Improper	 CAPEC-126: Path Traversal* CAPEC-64: Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic*† CAPEC-76 Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls* CAPEC-78: Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding*† CAPEC-79: Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding*† CAPEC-597: Absolute Path Traversal CAPEC-139: Relative Path Traversal 		CAPEC-126: Path Traversal*†	Х		
CWE-22. Improper			CAPEC-64: Using Slashes and URL Encoding	10		
cf a Dathnama			Combined to Bypass Validation Logic	10		
of a Paulifallie			CAPEC-76: Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls*			
Directory ('Deth			CAPEC-78: Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding			
Troversel')			CAPEC-79: Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding*†	×		
Havelsal)			CAPEC-80: Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic	10		
			CAPEC-139: Relative Path Traversal	10		
			CAPEC-3:Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences	5		
			to Bypass Input Filters	5		
* - Ground truth	† - not predicted					

Predictions from our Link Prediction model for CWE-22. We kept the original CWE-CAPEC mapping hidden during training time. We can see Link prediction model predicted two out of five CAPECs successfully, and the suggested two CAPECs match the context. The T5-model predicted three CAPECs successfully, and among the suggestions, two of the three CAPECs match contexts.



3. Insights and Next Steps











SOM Cluster



K. Panchal, S. S. Das, L. De La Torre, J. Miller, R. Rallo and M. Halappanavar, "Efficient Clustering of Software Vulnerabilities using Self Organizing Map (SOM)," 2022 IEEE International Symposium on Technologies for Homeland Security (HST), Boston, MA, USA, 2022, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/HST56032.2022.10025443.

Case Studies

- Microsoft Office Memory Corruption (CVE 2017-11882):
 - This Microsoft Office software bug allows attackers to execute arbitrary code on the user's system by convincing the user to open a malicious file. It was patched in a later version of Office
 - CWE-119 (from V2W-BERT): Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer --- The software performs operations on a memory buffer, but it can read from or write to a memory location that is outside of the intended boundary of the buffer.
- Citrix Netscaler Directory Traversal (CVE-2019-19781):
 - An issue was discovered in Citrix Application Delivery Controller (ADC) and Gateway 10.5, 11.1, 12.0, 12.1, and 13.0. They allow Directory Traversal.
 - CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') The software uses external input to construct a pathname that is intended to identify a file or directory that is located underneath a restricted parent directory, but the software does not properly neutralize special elements within the pathname that can cause the pathname to resolve to a location that is outside of the restricted directory

CISA CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY: Top Routinely Exploited Vulnerabilities August 20, 2021 -- Alert CodeAA21-209A



CVE-2017-11882

CVE-2017-11882

2017-11-15 03:29:00 UTC

Score: 7.8

Microsoft Office 2007 Service Pack 3, Microsoft Office 2010 Service Pack 2, Microsoft Office 2013 Service Pack 1, and Microsoft Office 2016 allow an attacker to run arbitrary code in the context of the current user by failing to properly handle objects in memory, aka "Microsoft Office Memory Corruption Vulnerability". This CVE ID is unique from CVE-2017-11884.

Vector: 'CVSS:3.1/AV:L/AC:L/PR:N/UI:R/S:U/C:H/I:H

More information: https://www.cvedetails.com/cve/CVE-2017-11882

CWEs

 \sim

['CWE-119']

The CVE to CWE mappings are provided by employing the V2W-BERT tool using the DistilBERT model. These mappings have not been validated by subject matter experts and should be used only as a suggestion.

CWE Lookup

CWE-119

CWE-119

Description

Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer The software performs operations on a memory buffer, but it can read from or write to a memory location that is outside of the intended boundary of the buffer. Certain languages allow direct addressing of memory locations and do not automatically ensure that these locations are valid for the memory buffer that is being referenced. This can cause read or write operations to be performed on memory locations that may be associated with other variables, data structures, or internal program data. As a result, an attacker may be able to execute arbitrary code, alter the intended control flow, read sensitive information, or cause the system to crash.

::SCOPE:Integrity:SCOPE:Confidentiality:SCOPE:Availabi lity:IMPACT

Unauthorized Code or Commands: IMPACT Memory:NOTE

the memory accessible by the attacker can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code, as with a standard buffer overflow. If the attacker can overwrite a pointer's worth of memory (usually 32 or 64 bits), they can redirect a function pointer to their own malicious code. Even when the attacker can only modify

CWE-119

CWE-119

Description

CVEs

View linked clusters

 \sim

 \sim



Linked Clusters: 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63, 64, 66, 70, 71, 72, 77, 80, 81, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 120, 122, 125, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136



Linked Clusters: 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63, 64, 66, 70, 71, 72, 77, 80, 81, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 120, 122, 125, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136





CVE Severity Score



CVE Count by Cluster

CWEs for Cluster 2



View linked clusters



Overall Cluster 2 Cluster 4 Cluster 5 Cluster 8 Cluster 10

Average Severity by Cluster





Cluster 13	Cluster 14	4 Cluster 15	Clus	
۵	@, ⊕			[™] ⊻
-	-			-

CAPEC Explorer

CWE Count and Severity CAPEC Total Severity vs Average Severity

Overall Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables MIME Conversion



ID	CWEs	CVSS Total	CVSS Mean	N_CWEs	Name
1	CWE-8 CWE-110 CWE-166 CWE-276 CWE-277 CWE-278 CWE-280	11,708.6	7.6327	55	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained b
2	CWE-447 CWE-645	0	None	2	Inducing Account Lockout
3	CWE-8 CWE-24 CWE-26 CWE-28 CWE-29 CWE-30 CWE-32 CWE-33	10,270.4	8.1317	131	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypa
4	CWE-173 CWE-291 CWE-925	0	None	3	Using Alternative IP Address Encodings
5	CWE-111 CWE-178 CWE-221 CWE-241 CWE-248 CWE-253 CWE-273	5,897.6	6.914	36	Blue Boxing
6	CWE-78 CWE-141 CWE-142 CWE-143 CWE-145 CWE-146 CWE-153	8,028.7	8.5777	23	Argument Injection

n Buffer Overfle	ow via Paramete	er Expar
		2
o Q 🕂	⊞ ⊟ (≥) 4	1
\geq		
>		
	Abstraction	Statu
y ACLs	Standard	Draft
	Standard	Draft
ss Input Filters	Detailed	Draft
	Detailed	Draft
	Detailed	Draft
	Standard	Draft

CVE Home

SOM Cluster

CAPEC Cluster



CAPEC Explorer



CWEs	CVSS Total	CVSS Mean	N_CWEs	Name
CWE-276 CWE-285 CWE-434 CWE-693 CWE-732 CWE-1191 CWE-1	11,325	7.6572	29	Accessing Functionality Not P
CWE-645	0	None	1	Inducing Account Lockout
CWE-20 CWE-41 CWE-74 CWE-172 CWE-173 CWE-179 CWE-180	42,672.4	7.3472	12	Using Leading 'Ghost' Charact

Summary & Conclusions



Summary of Contributions

- First work to provide complete mapping of CVEs to CWEs to CAPECs
- Showed how Siamese link predictions and large language models can be used for high quality mappings
- Scaled V2W-BERT on several generations of Nvidia systems and a GraphCore system
- Classified both frequent and rarely occurring CVEs better than all existing approaches
- Classified CVEs while maintaining the hierarchical relationships



Future Work

- Work with subject matter experts to perform validation and verification of mappings and clusters
- Enhance transfer learning techniques to classify CVEs/CWEs/CAPECs with few/zero training examples
- Build ability to predict if/when new CWE definitions are necessary
- Enhance mechanism to incorporate novel definitions over time
- Enhance the demonstration website



The coming tsunami from AI disruptions



Sponsors:

- PNNL Lab Directed Research & Development
 - The Mathematics for Artificial Reasoning in Science (MARS) initiative
 - The Data Model Convergence (DMC) initiative
- Department of Energy's Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research
- Department of Defense

Thank you





References

- S Das, E. Serra, M. Halappanavar, A. Pothen, and E. Al-Shaer. "V2W-BERT: A Framework for Effective Hierarchical Multiclass Classification of Software Vulnerabilities." In proceedings of the 8th IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA). Porto, Portugal. October 2021. [Best Application Paper Award]
- S. Das, A. Dutta, S. Purohit, E. Serra, M. Halappanavar and A. Pothen, "Towards Automatic Mapping of Vulnerabilities to Attack Patterns using Large Language Models," 2022 IEEE International Symposium on Technologies for Homeland Security (HST), Boston, MA, USA, 2022, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/HST56032.2022.10025459. [Best Paper Award in Cyber Security Track]
- K. Panchal, S. S. Das, L. De La Torre, J. Miller, R. Rallo and M. Halappanavar, "Efficient Clustering of Software Vulnerabilities using Self Organizing Map (SOM)," 2022 IEEE International Symposium on Technologies for Homeland Security (HST), Boston, MA, USA, 2022, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/HST56032.2022.10025443.
- Das S., M. Halappanavar, A. Tumeo, E. Serra, A. Pothen, and E. Al-Shaer. "VWC-BERT: Scaling Vulnerability–Weakness–Exploit Mapping 59 60 3 on Modern AI Accelerators." In IEEE International Conference on Big Data (IEEE BigData 2022) December 17-20, 2022. Osaka, Japan.



Self Organizing Maps (Kohonen Maps)



Image Adapted From: arxiv.org/pdf/1312.5753.pdf



Source: <u>https://ei</u>organizing map



Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-

SOM Training: Output from V2W-BERT (~100k CVEs)

- sD = som read data('V2W-LINK-distilbert-base-uncased-dp rep.txt');
- sD is a struct with 99950×768 elements.
- sM=som make(sD,'shape','toroid','mapsize','big','training','long','tracking',0);
- To Create, initialize and train Self-Organizing Map
- sM struct with fields:

type: 'som_map' codebook: [<mark>6417×768 double</mark>] topol: [1×1 struct] labels: {6417×1 cell} neigh: 'gaussian' mask: [768×1 double] trainhist: [1×3 struct] name: 'SOM 01-Dec-2021' comp_names: {768×1 cell} comp_norm: {768×1 cell}





K-means clustering with K=138







K-means clustering with Davies-Bouldin optimization for selecting best k





Clusters: CWE label Representation Bar chart representation (first 10 clusters)







