Security and Privacy in an **Everchanging System Landscape Amir Rahmati**















nenft'a	
wing	







All is lost? Stick to the fundamentals

Rigorous measurement, threat modeling, and analysis

Building practical end-to-end defenses





[TECS16], [TCAD15], [USENIX Sec12], [RFIDsec'12]



[NeurIPS22], [USENIX Sec22], [TSRML22], [DLS22], [EDSMLS'20], [WOOT'18], [CVPR18]

Embedded Systems

Machine Learning



Smart Homes

[WWW20], [SecDev18], [NDSS17], [SecDev16], [USENIX Sec16]



[NDSS24], [WWW23], [S&P21]





[NDSS18], [HotSec'17],



[MobiSys17], [HotNets16]

Recommendation Systems

Trigger-Action Platforms



[ACCESS23], [Health Tech'14], [Health Tech'13]



[WWW20]

Medical Devices

Cloud Platforms





[WAX16], [ISCA15], [WACAS14]

[WEPN],

[FOCI13],

[TR13],

[TR13]



[USENIX Sec18], [CCS SPSM'15]

Approximate Computing



Internet Censorship



Mobile Systems

[USENIX Sec23], [VizSec21], [WearSys19]

AR/VR Systems







[TECS16], [TCAD15], [USENIX Sec12], [RFIDsec'12]



[NeurIPS22], [USENIX Sec22], [TSRML22], [DLS22], [EDSMLS20], [WOOT'18], [CVPR18]

Embedded Systems

Machine Learning



Smart Homes

[WWW20], [SecDev18], [NDSS17], [SecDev16], [USENIX Sec16]



[NDSS18], [HotSec'17],

[MobiSys17], [HotNets16]

Recommendation Systems

Trigger-Action Platforms

[ACCESS23], [Health Tech14], [Health Tech13]

[WWW20]

Medical Devices

Cloud Platforms

[WAX16], [ISCA15], [WACAS14]

[WEPN],

[FOCI13],

[TR13],

[TR13]

[CCS SPSM15]

Approximate Computing

Internet Censorship

Mobile Systems

[USENIX Sec23], [VizSec21], [WearSys19]

AR/VR Systems

Programs that perform web requests and interact with Internet services, websites, or users on the Internet.

Bots are everywhere!

Bad Bots vs. Good Bots vs. Human in 2019

* Imperva. Bad bot report 2020: Bad bots strike back. <u>https://www.imperva.com/resources/resource-library/reports/2020-bad-bot-report/</u>

62.8%

Benign Bots

- Provide content discovery and indexing services
- Create content previews
- Used for Academic/Industry researc

Olivia Watkins 10:18 AM https://slack.com/features

Features

Slack is where work flows. It's where the people you need, the information you share, and the tools you use come together to get things done. (98 kB) -

h	

Malicious Bots

- Credential stuffing attacks
- Probing for vulnerabilities
 - Fingerprint application
 - Steal unprotected information
 - Exploit discovered vulnerabilities
- Denial-of-Service attacks
- Spam and misinformation

```
140 Jul 8 22:55 tbl_triggers.php*
            www-data www-data
          1 www-data www-data 5825 Jul 8 22:55 tbl_zoom_select.php*
         7 www-data www-data 4096 Jul 1 21:35 test/
          4 www-data www-data 4096 Jul 1 21:35 themes/
          1 www-data www-data 850 Jul 8 22:55 themes.php*
          1 www-data www-data 1990 Jul 8 22:55 transformation_overview.php*
         1 www-data www-data 3787 Jul 8 22:55 transformation_wrapper.php*
         1 www-data www-data 1165 Jul 8 22:55 url.php*
1 www-data www-data 1001 Jul 8 22:55 version_check.php*
          1 www-data www-data 8298 Jul 8 22:55 view_create.php*
rwxr--r-- 1 www-data www-data 3455 Jul 8 22:55 view_operations.php*
rwxr--r-- 1 www-data www-data 1065 Jul 8 22:55 webapp.php*
buntu@ip-172-26-6-165:~/debloating_phpMyAdmin/web/phpMyAdmin-4.4.15.6-all-languages$ cd ...
buntu@ip-172-26-6-165:~/debloating_phpMyAdmin/web$ cd ..
buntu@ip-172-26-6-165:~/debloating_phpMyAdmin$ vi exploit1.py
ibuntu@ip-172-26-6-165:~/debloating_phpMyAdmin$ python3 exploit1.py http://localhost:8084/phpMyAdmin-4.4.15.6-all-la
iguages -u root -p root -d mysql
/usr/lib/python3/dist-packages/requests/__init__.py:80: RequestsDependencyWarning: urllib3 (1.25.9) or chardet (3.0.
) doesn't match a supported version!
RequestsDependencyWarning)
esult: x bbe0d2dda414 4.15.0-1021-aws #21-Ubuntu SMP Tue Aug 28 10:23:07 UTC 2018 x86 64 GNU/Linux'
```

Example of exploiting CVE-2016-5734 through web requests (arbitrary code execution)

How do websites block bots?

- Drop requests (no response)
- Return error codes (403, 401, ...)
- Block IPs
- Perform human verification

An underlying assumption is that we can detect bots.

Select all squares with **street signs** If there are none, click skir

Why is it hard to detect bots? **Diverse browsing environments**

- Basic crawlers: wget, curl, etc.
- Selenium: almost the same as a normal web browser, except controlled by automated script
 - Can perform click, scroll, ...
 - Can take screenshots
 - Can execute Javascript
- **ZMap:** Scanning the Internet in a few minutes
- **Googlebot:** Crawler mixed with automated browsers and basic crawlers

Why is it hard to detect bots? **Evasion and spoofing techniques**

- Spoofing User-Agents
- Rate-limit queries and requests
- Simulate navigating behaviors with automated browsers
- Use proxies to evade IP-based detection

Mozilla/5.0 (Macintosh; Intel Mac OS X 10 9 3) AppleWebKit/537.75.14 (KHTML, like Gecko) Version/7.0.3 Safari/7046A194A

Mozilla/5.0 (Linux; Android 4.4.2; Nexus 4 Build/ KOT49H) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/34.0.1847.114 Mobile Safari/ 537.36

Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/84.0.4147.89 Safari/537.36

Little info on bot impact toward normal websites

No public dataset of bot-only traffic

How can we minimize the effect of malicious bots without hindering benign bots?

How can we build a bot-only dataset?

How can we understand the true impact and purpose of bots?

How can we build a bot-only dataset?

Build a measurement infrastructure!

How can we build a bot-only dataset?

Scalability? **Diversity?**

Build a measurement infrastructure!

Detection Methods?

Aristaeus*

*Minor God in Greece mythology, caring over beekeepers

Aristaeus

1. Deploy honeysites

2. Log aggregation

Aristaeus

1. Deploy honeysites

2. Log aggregation

Aristaeus

1. Deploy honeysites

2. Log aggregation

Honeysite structure Web Application

- Aristaeus currently supports 5 applications
 - 3 CMS web applications: WordPress, Joomla, Drupal
 - 2 web Admin tools:
 PHPMyAdmin, Webmin

Honeysite structure Browser fingerprinting

• Javascript API support

- Basic support test
- o document.write(), var img ...
- Ajax support
- Support for security policies
 - CSP, X-Frame-Options, Mixed Content (HTTP/HTTPS) ,etc.
 - First time security mechanisms are used for fingerprinting clients
- Browser fingerprinting
 - Modified FPJS2

	[Honeysites
	Elements Console Sources Netwo	ork Performance
🕩 🛇 ta	op 🔻 💽 Filter	
▶ Object		
Mixed Cor es_gen/vi also be s	ntent: The page at ' <u>https://tinychef. ishtp.jpg?loc=mbdy&rndstr=NmpRVXVuNG5</u> served over HTTPS.	<u>.info/' was loade</u>
⊗ Failed to	o load resource: the server responded	d with a status c
Refused t zNDBnQlF2	<mark>to load the image '</mark> https://pf53ae.tin ZdkJ	nychef.info/fpcoc
fonts.goo 'unsafe-i	oglew Response Headers view s	source
► Array(3	S5) Cache-Control: no-store,	no-cache, must-revalidate, post-check=0, p
Refused t cXNrSiRii	to la no-store, must-revalida [.]	ate
<u>f.info</u> ti script-s	inyc Connection: Keep-Alive	
webdriver	rn Content-Security-Policy: de	efault-src 'self' fonts.googleapis.com http
Refused t hEcUdB721	to l ww.tinychef.info http://	//tinychef.info http://www.tinychef.info all
fonts.goo	ogle inline';	
8 Refused t	to fi info www var customir	mg2 = new Image(1, 1);
MUZZb2FVe	ella lf'; repa "https://tip.vc	2.SIC = chaf info/focodas_aan/vis2 ina?
	Content-T loc=scrpt&rn	ndstr=WFY2ZUpQbXZ3TGJIaTVUU1"
	Date: Thu	
	Expires: W document.bo	ody.appendChild(customImg2);
	Keep-Alive document.w	/rite(' <img src="</th"/>
	"https://tinyc	chef.info/fpcodes_gen/vis1.jpg?
	loc=scrpt&rn	ndstr=aXhtUmdnR2sxSm"')
	TLS Fin	
	·	
	Fingerprint Design	Honeysite Implementation

Honeysite structure Behavior fingerprinting

- Honoring robots.txt
- Customized error pages
 - We know bots probing for specific files that may not exist
 - Injecting fingerprinting code into 404 page
- Caching and resource sharing
 - Use "no-cache" header
 - Encode cache-breaker on certain URL

E.g. /a.jpg?r=[encoded IP+nonce]

Honeysite structure TLS fingerprinting

TLS fingerprint is performed <u>passively</u> (server side) compared to JS fingerprinting (client side)

- Cipher suites
- Signature algorithms
- E-curve
- TLS version
- Compression length

Honeysite structure **TLS fingerprinting**

Example of TLS fingerprint:

"tlsfp": {

"ciphersuite": "0xC02F 0xC030 0xC02B 0xC02C 0xCCA8 0xCCA9 0xC013 0xC009 0xC014 0xC00A 0x009C 0x009D 0x002F

0x0035 0xC012 0x000A", "<u>tls_version</u>": "0x0303", "<u>sig alg</u>": "0x0401 0x0403 0x0501 0x0503 0x0601 0x0603 0x0201 0x6203_", Go-http-client "src_port": 22260, "record_tls_version": "0x0301", "timestamp": "2020-04-25 03:55:59", "server_name": "www.historytenantfile.com", "ipv4_src": "167.71.193.105", "<u>e curves</u>": "0x001D 0x0017 0x0018 0x0019 " "<u>extensions</u>": "0x0000 0x0005 0x000A 0x000B 0x000D 0xFF01 0x0012 ", "ciphersuite_length": "0x0020",

import "net/http"

resp, err := http.Get("https://example.com/")

Overview of Aristaeus

Deployment

- Registered 100 domains
 - effects of residual trust
 - Did not publicly advertise our domains
 - Confident that the vast majority of clients were bots
- Spawn a honeysite for each domain via AWS
 - Use Let's Encrypt to obtain valid TLS certificates for each domain
 - Spawn in North America, Europe, and Asia.
- Use central server to periodically collect logs from all 100 honeysites
 - Logs are stored in Elasticsearch cluster for analysis

• Make sure they are not registered before (i.e. once registered then expired), to eliminate

Months

206GBData

How can we minimize the effect of malicious bots without hindering benign bots?

How can we build a **bot-only dataset?**

How can we understand the true impact and purpose of bots?

- Honeysites keep observing traffic from new IP addresses \bullet
- Average: 1,235 requests/day

Bot Traffic Analysis Use Host header to determine how bots discovered us

- 44% bots visit us through IP (Host:1.2.3.4)
 - IP space scanning
 - Network monitoring
- 26% bots visit us through domain (Host: example.com)
 - DNS zone files
 - Certificate transparency logs
- 30% bots do not present Host header

```
hastorensic": true,
flog": {
 "headersText": [
   "Host:52.3.222.202",
   "User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.
   "Accept:*/*\n"
 "headersKV": {
   "Nonce": "ap",
   "Host": "52.3.222.202",
   "Accept": "*/*\n",
   "User-Agent": "Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT
 },
 "request": "GET / HTTP/1.1",
 "fid": "XqOyiz0QYdqDT09GefocHgAAAAI"
```

```
"headersKV": {
  "Nonce": "ap",
  "Accept-Encoding": "gzip",
  "Connection": "close\n",
  "User-Agent": "Mozilla/5.0 (X11;
  "Host": "www.objectivecurtainbook
  "Cookie": "csessid=5ea3edf88e02d;
  "Referer": "https%3a//www.objecti
  "Content-Type": "application/x-ww
},
"request": "GET /wp-admin/ HTTP/1.1
"fid": "XqPt-yv0Qhj0lfbRhAU6sQAAAAL
```


\checkmark =exists, \checkmark =does not exist, \heartsuit =not accessible

\checkmark =exists, X=does not exist, \heartsuit =not accessible

- Bots first discover that a website is running \bullet WordPress, then target the login page of wp-login.php, wp-admin, and xmlrpc.php.
- Bots are highly specific, targeting easy-toexploit endpoints.
- Login endpoints of our applications that received the most attention

Bot Intentions

• Benign

- Asking for valid resources similar to a normal browser
- No manifested intentions of attacking
- Malicious
 - Send unsolicited POST requests toward authentication endpoints
 - Send invalid requests trying to exploit vulnerabilities
- Other/Gray
 - None of the above traits

Bot Intentions Benign

- Search Engine bots
 - Googlebot, Bingbot, etc.

Academic and industry scanners

- Builtwith, Netcraft
- Internet Archive
- Academic research bot

Туре	Total SEBot Requests	Verified Requests
Googlebot	233,024	210,917 (90.5%)
Bingbot	77,618	77,574 (99.9%)
Baidubot	2,284	61 (0.026%)
Yandexbot	4,894	4,785 (97.8%)
Total	317,820	293,337 (92.3%)

Use reverse-DNS verification to make sure they did not spoof their identity

Bot Intentions Malicious

- Credential bruteforce attempts
- Reconnaissance attempts
 - Application fingerprinting
 - Exploitation attempts
 - Scanning for publicly-reachable backdoors
 - Scanning for unprotected sensitive files

Path	# requests	Unique IPs	Target applications
/CHANGELOG.txt	116,513	97	Drupal, Joomla, Moodle and spip
/(thinkphp TP)/ (public index)	55,144	3,608	ThinkPHP
/wp-content/plugins	32,917	2,416	WordPress
/solr/	23,307	919	Apache Solr
/manager/html	10,615	1,557	Tomcat Manager

e backdoors itive files

Bot Intentions Gray

- Single-shot scanners (50.04% of IP address)
 - Visit the website only once, mostly asking "/"
 - No obvious activities.
 - Require future explorations

of Malicious bots appeared in online blocklists

Online Blocklist Coverage

	1.0
 Where are these bots? 	0.8
 Commercial (<5%) 	_ 0.6
 Datacenter (~30%) 	Eractio
 Residential (~65%) 	0.2 -
 Other (<1%) 	

Javascript Support

Bots executed JavaScript

TLS Fingerprinting

(even though it's optional)

Fingerprints

TLS Fingerprinting

- TLS fingerprints can be used to identify spoofing bots.
- Search for mismatch between the stated UAs and the observed TLS fingerprints.
- E.g. Claim to be Firefox, but match TLS fingerprint of python-requests

Tools	Unique FPs	IP Count	Total Requests
Go-http-client	28	15,862	8,708,876
Libwww-perl or wget	17	6,102	120,423
PycURL/curl	26	3,942	80,374
Python-urllib 3	8	2,858	22,885
NetcraftSurveyAgent	2	2,381	14,464
msnbot/bingbot	4	1,995	44,437
Chrome-1(Googlebot)	1	1,836	28,082
Python-requests 2.x	11	1,063	754,711
commix/v2.9-stable	3	1,029	5,738
Java/1.8.0	8	308	1,710
MJ12Bot	2	289	28,065
Chrome-2(Chrome, Opera)	1	490	66,631
Chrome-3(Headless Chrome)	1	80	2,829
Chrome-4(coc_coc_browser)	1	4	101
Total	113	38,239	9,879,320


```
"tlsfpinfo":
  "tlsfp": {
    "ciphersuite": "0xC02F 0xC030 0xC02B 0xC02C 0xCCA8 0xCCA9 0xC013 0xC009 0xC014 0xC00A 0x009C 0x009D
    "tls_version": "0x0303",
    "matchcount": "1",
    "sig alg": "0x0401 0x0403 0x0501 0x0503 0x0601 0x0603 0x0201 0x0203 ",
    "src port": 43482,
    "ipv4 dst": "172.26.13.77",
    "record_tls_version": "0x0301",
    "timestamp": "2020-04-25 03:59:59",
    "server_name": "www.objectivecurtainbook.com",
    "ipv4_src": "134.209.53.244",
    "ec_point_fmt": "0x00",
    "e curves": "0x001D 0x0017 0x0018 0x0019 ",
    "compression": "0x00",
    "extensions": "0x0000 0x0005 0x000A 0x000B 0x000D 0xFF01 0x0012 ",
    "dst port": 443,
    "compression_length": "1",
    "ciphersuite_length": "0x0020",
    "id": 0,
    "desc": "Dynamic ip-172-26-13-77.ec2.internal 12947 201"
  "hastlsfp": true
},
"SSL_PROTOCOL": "TLSv1.2",
"forensic": {
  "hasforensic": true,
  "flog": {
    "headersText": [
    "Host:www.objectivecurtainbook.com
      "User-Agent:Mozilla/5.0 (X11; Ubuntu; Linux x86_64; rv%3a62.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/62.0",
      "Content-Type:application/x-www-form-urlencoded",
      "Cookie:csessid=5ea3edf88e02d; wordpress test cookie=WP+Cookie+check"
      "Referer:https%3a//www.objectivecurtainbook.com/wp-login.php",
      "Accept-Encoding:gzip",
      "Connection:close\n"
    ],
```

"Golang HTTP request"

"Firefox on Ubuntu"

Bots are pretending to be browsers

Fake Chrome (82.6%)

- Mostly curl/wget Ο
- Ο

Fake Firefox (98.5%)

- 68.7% are go-http-client Ο
- 21% are libwww-perl Ο
- Ο

86.2% of bots claiming to be Firefox/Chrome, were lying about their identities

Shown no GREASE in TLS fingerprint

Remaining requests are still not firefox

Bots scanning for vulnerabilities present distinct behavior

- Send a large number of requests.
- Distinct exploration and attack phases.
- May only use a subset of their attack vectors during each execution.
- Produce a large number of invalid requests. **Vulnerabilities are being quickly abused**
- Netgear GPON router (EDB-48225), 0 days
- F5 TMUI shell (CVE-2020-5902), 0 days
- DrayTech modems (CVE-2020-8585), 3 days

•	

	Aristaeus (
° • ° •	Website Templates Domain Registration M Name Servers

1. Deploy honeysites

- By putting an unpopular website online, the website will receive at least 1200 requests/day, <2% are benign
- Bots are highly selective, targeting easy-to-exploit endpoints.
- 97% bots are rudimentary HTTP libraries, but pretending to be browsers
- Only 13% of bot IPs appeared in IP blocklists

Takeaways

- TLS fingerprinting are effective against cloaking and evasion
- Exploits that go public are quickly abused Just in a few hours

How can we minimize the effect of malicious bots without hindering benign bots?

How can we build a **bot-only dataset?**

How can we understand the true impact and purpose of bots?

Web Vulnerability Scanners

Stop malicious bots from scanning websites for vulnerabilities

Web vulnerability scanner (WVS)

- Automated, "point-and-click" tools that scan web applications for vulnerabilities.
- Perfect tool for penetration testers
 - Identify and fix low-hanging vulnerabilities
- **Full-auto weapon for malicious actors**
 - Identify and exploit low-hanging vulnerabilities

root@kali:~# commix --url="http://192.168.0.23/commix-testbed/scenarios/refer@

+--Automated All-in-One OS Command Injection and Exploitation Tool Copyright (c) 2014-2017 Anastasios Stasinopoulos (@ancst) +--[*] Checking connection to the target URL... [SUCCEED] [*] Setting the HTTP header User-Agent for tests. [*] Testing the (results-based) classic command injection technique... [FAILE [*] Testing the (results-based) dynamic code evaluation technique... [FAILED [*] Testing the (blind) time-based command injection technique... [FAILED] [*] Trying to create a file in '/var/www/html/commix-testbed/scenarios/referen [!] Warning: It seems that you don't have permissions to read and/or write fil

[?] Do you want to try the temporary directory (/tmp/) [Y/n] > Y

Commix Scanner Example

ScannerScope Design Clients Web <u>(@)</u> Fingerprinting Vulnerability Scanners <u>(@)</u> Resources $\overline{\mathfrak{G}}$ Benign Bots **~** Regular × Users Access Control

Fingerprinting Techniques from Aristaeus

Training the ML Model

- 159 Users are from Amazon Mechanical Turk
 - Users are asked to perform series of inweb application
 - Reading articles, Posting comments
 - Actions are randomized so that no ty behave the same.
- 12 Web Vulnerability Scanners
 - Top 10 open-source WVS of top OWASF
 - OWASP Zap, Arachni, Commix, etc.
 - 2 academic scanners
 - Black Widow, Enemy of the State

Eriksson et al., Black widow: Blackbox data-driven web scanning. IEEE S&P 2021 Doupé et al., Enemy of the state: A state-aware black-box web vulnerability scanner, Usenix Security 2012

	Scanner Name	Version
teractions to the	WPScan(kali)	3.8.13
	Arachni	1.5.1
oto	OWASP Zap	D-2020-12-21
	WMap	1.5.1
wo users will	Wapiti	3.0.3
	Nikto	2.1.6
	W3af	1.6.45
	Skipfish (kali)	$2.10\mathrm{b}$
Pentesting tools	Commix	2.9-stable
	Google Tsunami	0.0.5
	Black Widow	N/A
	Enemy of the State	N/A

ScannerScope Performance

 \mathbf{Model}

WordPress-WordPress

Joomla-Joomla

WordPress-Joomla

 $1 \ {\rm Unseen} \ {\rm Scanner}$

 $4 \ {\rm Unseen \ Scanners}$

 $6 \ {\rm Unseen \ Scanners}$

Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score
99.30%	97.79%	99.58%	98.66%
99.22%	99.17%	99.14%	99.15%
91.44%	92.52%	91.44%	91.39%
98.27%	96.71%	98.53%	97.43%
96.20%	93.65%	97.13%	95.19%
91.26%	85.50%	94.38%	87.66%

ScannerScope Performance

 \mathbf{Model}

WordPress-WordPress

Joomla-Joomla

WordPress-Joomla

 $1 \ {\rm Unseen} \ {\rm Scanner}$

 $4 \ {\rm Unseen \ Scanners}$

6 Unseen Scanners

Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score	
99.30%	97.79%	99.58%	98.66%	
99.22%	99.17%	99.14%	99.15%	
91.44%	92.52%	91.44%	91.39%	
98.27%	96.71%	98.53%	97.43%	
96.20%	93.65%	97.13%	95.19%	
91.26%	85.50%	94.38%	87.66%	

ScannerScope Performance

 \mathbf{Model}

WordPress-WordPress

Joomla-Joomla

WordPress-Joomla

1 Unseen Scanner

4 Unseen Scanners

6 Unseen Scanners

of requests to detect: 15 99.27% Accuracy on Benign Bots

Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score	
99.30%	97.79%	99.58%	98.66%	
99.22%	99.17%	99.14%	99.15%	
91.44%	92.52%	91.44%	91.39%	
98.27%	96.71%	98.53%	97.43%	
96.20%	93.65%	97.13%	95.19%	
91.26%	85.50%	94.38%	87.66%	

ScannerScope Overhead

How can we minimize the effect of malicious bots without hindering benign bots?

Web Server

💿 🐹

MySQL

Clients

Wulnerability Scanners

 \bigotimes

Web

Benign

Bots

Regular Users

How can we understand the true impact and purpose of bots?

2. Log aggregation

Beyond Attacking Web Servers Targeting users instead of servers

Jennifer Alberto You invest with Mrs Luciana cruz too? Wow that woman has be and my family. Scripted conversation Norbert Stephan Within a few seconds I'm new at this, please how can I reach her? albert john You can reach her on her TELEGAM with the user name below

albert john .investwithLucruz.

Data Collection

- Measurement range: 10/1/2022 to 03/31/2023
- Monitored Channels: 20
- Videos: 8,226
- Captured comments: 8.8 Million

Comment Scam Features

- Textual Scammers use Visually Similar
 Symbols (VSS) to evade automated detection systems
- **Graphical** Scammers apply similar profile images to impersonate channel owners
- Temporal Scammers split the conversation and even contact phone numbers, and use multiple accounts to post them together to form a fabricated short story

Comment Scam Features

Comment Scam Features

- **Textual** Scammers use Visually Similar Symbols (VSS) to evade automated detection systems
- **Graphical** Scammers apply similar profile images to impersonate channel owners
- **Temporal** Scammers split the conversation and even contact phone numbers, and use multiple accounts to post them together to form a fabricated short story

Flagged 206K (2.34%) of comments as scam

Scam Campaigns

Campaign ID	Accounts	Comments Posted	Affected Videos	Targeted Channels	Affected Categories
1	112	4045	92	1	Finance
2	59	703	324	4	News/Politics, Finance
3	46	5405	66	2	Finance
4	45	692	321	4	News/Politics, Finance
5	44	5662	76	2	Finance

Only 31.42% scam accounts were deactivated during study

Interacting with Scammers

- Cryptocurrency Investment (76%)
 - Promise unrealistic high-yield investments (15% to 1300% weekly return)
 - Impersonation as channel owner or broker
 - Entice user to transfer cryptocurrency to scammer's wallet
- Fake Prize (22%)
 - Promise a prize (usually related to channel content)
 - Request shipping charges (\$50 to \$500)
- Others (2%)

6) vestments (15% to 1300% weekly

Interacting with Scammers

Crypto- currency	# of Wallets	Total Amount of Cryptocurrency	USD Valu (Min Ma
Bitcoin (BTC)	31	67.64	\$1.07M - \$1.
Ethereum (ETH)	16	36.49	\$0.04M - \$0.
(Total)	47	-	\$1.11M - \$1.

Millions of dollars (equivalent) were stolen by only 31 scammers

Security and Privacy in an **Everchanging System Landscape**

Amir Rahmati Stony Brook University https://amir.rahmati.com

transfer model medical accelerating cells embedded malware comprehensive deep robust clocks physical application feasibility approximate securing voltage information sram data bot framework study power devices iot trigger-action research adversarial learning training frameworks integrity platforms dram towards visual robustness security attention state attacks attacks certified state attacks permission retention **smart** compressing certified

1. Deploy honeysites

2. Log aggregation

