



UNIVERSITY OF  
PLYMOUTH

PEARL

## Agent-based Vs Agent-less Sandbox for Dynamic Behavioral Analysis

Ali, M; Shiaeles, S; Papadaki, M; Ghita, B

DOI:

[10.48550/arxiv.1904.02100](https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1904.02100)

Publication date:

2019

Link:

[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Ali, M., Shiaeles, S., Papadaki, M., & Ghita, B. (2019). *Agent-based Vs Agent-less Sandbox for Dynamic Behavioral Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1904.02100>

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Wherever possible please cite the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

# Agent-based Vs Agent-less Sandbox for Dynamic Behavioral Analysis

Muhammad Ali

*School of Computing, Electronics and Mathematics*  
University of Plymouth  
Plymouth, UK  
muhammad.ali@plymouth.ac.uk

Stavros Shiaeles

*School of Computing, Electronics and Mathematics*  
University of Plymouth  
Plymouth, UK  
stavros.shiaeles@plymouth.ac.uk

Bogdan V Ghita

*School of Computing, Electronics and Mathematics*  
University of Plymouth  
Plymouth, UK  
bogdan.ghita@plymouth.ac.uk

Maria Papadaki

*School of Computing, Electronics and Mathematics*  
University of Plymouth  
Plymouth, UK  
maria.papadaki@plymouth.ac.uk

**Abstract**— Malicious software is detected and classified by either static analysis or dynamic analysis. In static analysis, malware samples are reverse engineered and analyzed so that signatures of malware can be constructed. These techniques can be easily thwarted through polymorphic, metamorphic malware, obfuscation and packing techniques, whereas in dynamic analysis malware samples are executed in a controlled environment using the sandboxing technique, in order to model the behavior of malware. In this paper, we have analyzed Petya, Spyeeye, VolatileCedar, PAFISH etc. through Agent-based and Agentless dynamic sandbox systems in order to investigate and benchmark their efficiency in advanced malware detection.

**Keywords**— Malware detection; Static analysis, Dynamic analysis, Cuckoo, VMRay

## I. INTRODUCTION

Malicious software also referred as a “Malware” in the cyber security domain [1] saw a significant increase in a number of variants. The Internet security report of Symantec concluded that 350 million malware variants were developed in 2016 [2], while Panda Security indicated that, on average, 160,000 new malware programs appeared every day in 2013 [3]. The significant growth in malware variants is due to the ubiquitous nature of computer systems and networks as well as the potential financial benefits of gaining access to computer systems and/or their data. Although several methods based on shallow architecture have been used in the past by AV companies to detect malware variants, which are either signature based [4], or heuristic-based [5], authors of malware often chose to implement robust, stealthy and sophisticated methods, such as obfuscation, polymorphic and metamorphic mechanism, in order to impede commercial antivirus companies. To cope with the thousands of new malware samples that are discovered every day, security companies and analysts use different techniques. Malware samples are analyzed usually through static and dynamic analysis. In the static analysis, the executable binary of malware sample is analyzed without executing it. This technique is widely used by AV companies to detect malware as this technique uses the

concept of pattern recognition and detect malware signature by using a common sequence of bytes in the binary code of a malware. This technique is fast and does not need any controlled environment to run samples, but it can be easily thwarted through obfuscation, packing, and code rearranging techniques and it fails to cover the zero-day malware attack [6]. In dynamic analysis malware, samples are executed and monitored in the controlled environment in order to understand the runtime behavior. This approach is computing intensive as it requires running the malware samples in an isolated sandbox environment in order to obtain artifacts and features, but it tends to have higher accuracy in characterizing malware samples. This technique is agnostic to the underlying code and can easily bypass code obfuscation and polymorphic coding. Security analysts widely use different techniques, tools, and mechanisms to perform behavior analysis. One of the most widely used tools for malware behavior modeling is Cuckoo, although researchers also prefer tools like VirMon, and WINAPIOverride32 to do malware analysis. All these above-mentioned tools are good at capturing malware artifacts, but sometimes due to rapid advancement in the development of malware these software, tools are unable to detect malware artifacts accurately and as a result of the distinct features of great importance usually get skipped because of inherent limitations of these tools, so indeed research is needed to find best Sandboxing tool before doing malware analysis. In this paper, we aim to compare the efficiency and efficacy of agent-based and agent-less sandboxes in terms of detecting sophisticated malware variants. We use the Cuckoo agent-based sandbox and the VMRay agent-less sandbox for behavioral modeling of malware and later on, we have measured the effectiveness of these tools in terms of detecting malicious software in general and, more specifically, sophisticated malicious software.

The rest of the paper is as follows: The related work and the background of researchers are discussed in Section II. In Section III proposed research work is presented, Experimental results are given in Section IV, In Section V we

have described the future work, Section VI Conclude this paper. Finally, Section VII is Acknowledgment.

## II. RELATED WORK

Malware detection, clustering, and classification represent also a hot topic for academic researchers and industry professionals; here we are presenting different approaches, which have used so far for detecting malware. First, some methods, which use static features, are described and then dynamic features are explained. Authors of [7] used static analysis to detect malware and benign samples by extracting 4-gram features from portal executable and later on these features were used to distinguish a benign sample from the malicious sample. In a more recent study, Opcode was used to detect malicious files [8]. Malware samples were reverse engineered to get an opcode, which is part of machine language instruction and depict the operations to be performed. It plays important role in distinguishing the legitimate software from malicious software. In [9] the authors presented a model to detect malware variants on the base of the byte frequency. In this model, suspicious malware is detected if its byte frequency is similar to some known malware class. In [10], the focus is on API sequence, which appears to be more frequently in most of the malware files and then applied a similarity measure for the sequence. In [11], researchers proposed a model to detect suspicious samples by calculating frequencies of features for e.g. Dynamic link libraries, APIs and PE header, then use the information to gain feature selection to mark samples as malware or benign. In [12], the authors proposed a malware classification system based on an n-gram feature vector. A dynamic analysis was done to get network level artifacts and then from these artifacts, n-gram feature vector was constructed and later on used for classification of malware. Authors in this paper claim to achieve 80% accuracy in classification by using a number of machine learning algorithms. Researchers in [13], analyzed the system states changes, such as the number of new processes created, file written etc. The proposed method was evaluated on unseen malware variants whose signature was not available at the time and used a tree structure based on single linkage clustering to measure similarity among the various groups of malware. In [14], the authors tried to address a problem related to the packing of malware, a technique based on obfuscation method to hide malware code in software. To address this problem, the authors propose a technique that generates the signature of every packed malware. The dataset for analysis was divided into two parts. The first part is used for constructing between different systems entities, which include processes, system register etc. and another part for testing and evaluation. Authors in [15] propose a detection system based on a quantitative data flow model and then use graphs to depict the communication between different

systems entities, which include processes, system register etc. Researchers in [16] concluded that there are repetitive actions on data sequence that malware mostly does, such as loops performing decryption or encryption, and this can be addressed through iterative system calls pattern mining. In [17], it was assumed that behavior of each executable can be represented by the values of register contents in its run-time. Researcher in [18] used 4-grams to model API call sequences. By comparison of the average confidence of all 4-grams, samples are classified as malware or benign class. [19] introduced a model sample behavior based on 2-gram features through system calls and their arguments by using prioritizing arguments. It successfully identified novel classes of malware with similar behavior and assigning unknown malware to these discovered classes. Researchers in [20] removed the function libraries constructed by benign files from those, which appeared in malware as segment threat, calculated segment entropy and extracted 3-grams Opcode for each segment. In [21], in contrast to traditional techniques, the authors used iterative pattern mining to detect malware based on the assumption that malware do repetitive action on data sequence ranging from running infections to running loops, which perform a decryption/encryption process. The overall process consists of five steps. The process of gathering the malware samples and capturing PE interaction with operating system APIs (VMWARE and Qemu are used for this purpose). In next step API, call logs are used to construct the dataset and furthermore, in this, they see iterative API patterns that occur more than a minimum threshold. In the last step, they use pattern features as a dataset to classify malware.

## III. PROPOSED RESEARCH WORK

As summarized in section II, prior research led to capable platforms for dynamic analysis of malware. These are two types: Basic dynamic analysis and advance dynamic analysis platform. Dynamic analysis tools such as Capture-Bat, Regshot, APATE DNS, PEID, were used to carry out the analysis, whereas advanced dynamic analysis tools like Virmon, Cuckoo, WINAPIOverride32 were used to model the behavior of malware.




Fig.1. Conceptual model

TABLE I: COMPARISON OF PROPOSED MALWARE CLASSIFICATION METHODS WITH CURRENT STUDY.

Author Name	Year	Technique used	Features	Representation
L. Bilge and T. Dumitras	2014	Dynamic analysis	Communication between different system entities (processes, sockets, files or system registries)	Data Flow Graph
Mohaisen et al.	2014	Dynamic analysis	N-gram feature of the network artifacts	N-gram
Ahmadi et al.	2013	Dynamic analysis	executables' API call	Graph
Ghiasi et al.	2013	Dynamic analysis	register values	The binary vector of Features
Ravi and Manoharan	2012	Dynamic analysis	API call sequences	N-gram
Rieck et al.	2011	Dynamic analysis	system calls and their arguments	N-gram, Binary vector of Features
Tahan et al.	2012	Dynamic analysis	API calls and their parameters	The binary vector of Features
Mansour Ahmadi et al.	2013	Iterative pattern mining	API, call logs	API,call logs

Most of the advanced dynamic analysis platforms are agent-based, and they usually drop their agent on the analysis machine to capture the features of the malicious software, but current malware is intelligent enough to circumvent analysis when they find themselves being analyzed by the agent-based sandbox. In this research, we have taken both agent-based and agent-less sandbox and executed the malware sets in these environments in order to find which one is the best for capturing sophisticated malware features as shown in Fig.1. For conducting this research, we have used two different testbeds one with Cuckoo Sandbox and another with VMRay analyzer Sandbox. Cuckoo Sandbox is an open source widely used platform to model the behavior of malware in a controlled environment. It was developed as a summer project in 2010 in Google sponsored summer Code project. The propose of this malware analysis system is to provide automatic analysis of malware for e.g. files created, deleted, API calls, argument and there return values etc. Cuckoo mainly focus on DLL, PDF, office documents, and different executables for windows and further consider Java files. VMRay Analyzer is agentless dynamic behavior analysis tool for malware. Unlike other established sandbox solutions in the market, it is embedded in the hypervisor in order to monitor the behavior of malware and overcome the problem in tradition sandboxes, thus malware could not able to detect that it is being detonated in control environment One reason for choosing VMRay analyzer is that it overcome the advance evasion techniques and another reason for choosing is its significant features for e.g. Evasion Resistance, Customizable Yet Automated, Easy Deployment, VMRay's Reputation Engine, and Seamless Integration as shown in Table II. In the first one, we used VMware workstation version (12.5.9) virtual environment, where we set up a virtual machine of Ubuntu (16.04 LTS) with Cuckoo sandbox installed on it to carry out the dynamic analysis of malware in order to get the artifacts of malicious software for understanding the behavior of malware. To execute malware in control environment in Ubuntu we have set up VBox with a Windows XP-SP3 machine, furthermore, the cuckoo agent

was installed on the XP virtual machine along with some other software so that it can effectively capture the behavior of malicious variants when they are executed. In the second testbed, we have used VMRay analyzer, which was hosted on the VMRay cloud environment and we were been given special access by VMRay analyzer company for 30 days to perform our experiments. The testbed environment in the cloud was configured with almost all versions of Windows ranging from Windows XP (SP1, SP2, and SP3), Windows 7, Windows 8 and Windows 10 (with all service packs), Moreover, in order to understand the behavior more clearly these machines were configured with all necessary software for e.g. MS Office 2007,2010,2013, Acrobat Reader version 9,10,12 etc. In our proposed conceptual model, we have used Cuckoo and VMRay analyzer as shown in the fig. 2 and fig.3 to do a comparison of artifacts extracted by both the Sandboxes as shown in Table II.

TABLE II  
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CUCKOO AND VMRAY ANALYZER

Features	Cuckoo	VMRay Analyzer
Zero Data Detection	×	√
Visualization of the parent-child relationship	×	√
Evasion of Anti-analysis technique possible or not?	×	√
Files related activities	√	√
Registry related activities	√	√
API calls	√	√
HTTP requests	√	√
DNS requests	√	√
Process tree	√	√
IRC commands	√	√
Service activities	√	√
IDS signatures	×	√

#### IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We have taken malicious samples from different sources such as contagion dump and Zoo and executed these samples in both environments. Here we are mentioning the results of few of them, including The Ransomware Petya, Spyeeye, Volatile Cedear, Dyre, and PAFISH. These samples were executed in both Agent-based and Agentless environment on a different version of Windows for e.g. Windows 7 (SP-1 32






Fig. 2. Agent-based sandbox




Fig. 3. Agent-less sandbox

bit and 64 bit), Windows 8(64bit) and Windows 10(64 bit) respectively as shown in the fig. 4. The behavior and actions of malicious samples were analyzed through dynamic analysis mechanisms using two different types of sandboxes: i) Agent-based sandbox and ii) Agentless sandbox tools. We have performed empirical analysis by executing different samples of malware in both Agent-based and Agentless sandbox environments and find that agentless sandbox is more efficient in detecting sophisticated malware, which bypasses or crash themselves on finding themselves being detected by sandbox agent. The motivation behind this research is to model the behavior of those malware variants, which are able to thwart the agent base sandboxes and as a result, they are not detected. During the analysis, we closely monitored the changes occurring in the operating resource for e.g. DNS requests, HTTP requests, file related activities, registry related activities, API calls and their return values, service activities, IRC commands, and process tree we have seen during our experiment that whenever we try to execute some produce features which are helpful in understanding the behavior of malware. In our view, the reason behind this is that environment when they are executed and on finding the analysis of the advance malware for e.g. Wanna Cry, Petya Spyeye, VolatileCedar etc in Cuckoo platform as shown in Table III.

Table III Malicious Dataset used in experiments

Malicious Samples Datasets	Category/Type
Petya	Encrypting Ransomware
Spyeye	Spyware
VolatileCedar	APT malware
PAFISH	Anti debugger/vm/sandbox Malware
Dyre	Financial Trojan
WannaCry	Ransomware worm
Finfisher	Spyware

It has been observed that the above mentioned malware variants usually stop their execution or in some case give only insignificant features, whereas in contrast when these advance malware were executed in Agentless Sandbox the results were totally opposite and we were able to capture some of Moreover the features of significant importance for e.g. Zero-day detection, of malware etc. as shown in Table II, moreover we find that these features will play an important role in designing advance threat detection and mitigation platform and we will prove the significance of these features in our future work, so from our analysis we came to this conclusion that agentless sandboxes are more effective and robust in terms of capturing intelligent malware and in extracting their features. so from our analysis, we came to this conclusion that agentless sandboxes are more effective and robust in terms of capturing intelligent malware and in extracting their features.



Fig. 4 Ransomware Wannacry

## V. FUTURE WORK

This session discusses our future work and framework comprising three stages: the monitoring phase, feature-engineering phase, and learning stage.

### A. Monitoring stage

In the monitoring stage, we will take malware samples from different classes and then will execute them to control the environment in order to model the behavior of malicious software. For behavior analysis, we will use our indigenous in-house made agentless sandbox or some open-source Agentless sandbox and the reason behind using this tool is that we have found from experiments that Agentless Sandboxes are evasion resistance and nowadays sophisticated malware and APTs can detect it is being observed, therefore, as a result, they stop their executions

Also features used in [23] will be taken into consideration so we can collect as much information as possible from the execution of the malware.

### B. Feature Engineering stage

In this phase, feature sets will be created based on API calls and their argument as this is done by extracting string information from the text files generated by our indigenous tool or open source tool. Once we get the features, we will apply feature selection techniques to get significant feature sets and. In the last stage of this phase different NLP techniques for e.g. n-grams will be used to convert features into binary vectors, which are, later on, feed to deep learning algorithm for training purpose as shown in the fig. 5

### C. Learning and verification stage

In this stage, the binary vector will be given to Learning algorithm as shown in fig. 5. In our case, we will use generative algorithms and our focus will be on deep belief network DBN and the reason behind using this is that they are very good at creating invariant representations of objects even if the specific object changes its size, contrast, angle etc. and they had produced very promising results in a number of image classification projects, moreover possess high accuracy. Moreover, the use of game theoretic models and trust will be explored [24].




Fig. 5. Cyber Intelligent System for Malware detection

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we reviewed past approaches for detecting malware through either static or through dynamic analysis, furthermore, we found that dynamic analysis is an effective approach for the behavioral analysis of malware. Dynamic analysis is usually carried out in sandbox environment, in our research we find that traditional sandboxes are not evasive resistance because they hook data by dropping their agent in control environment which can be detected by intelligent malware and as a result they don't unpack or execute themselves on finding agent, so in our research we

find that Agentless Sandbox is the best solution for dynamic analysis.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 786698. This work reflects authors' view and Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. H. Mathur and S., *A Survey on Techniques in Detection and Analyzing Malware Executables*, 2013, vol. 3.
- [2] "Internet security threat report, 0. [Online]. Available: <https://www.symantec.com/content/dam/symantec/docs/reports/istr-22-2017-en.pdf>
- [3] [Online]. Available: <https://www.pandasecurity.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/malware-still-generated-rate-160000-new-samples-day-q22014/>
- [4] L. B. T. Dumitras, *Before we knew it: an empirical study of zero-day attacks in the real world*, 2012.
- [5] S. Wen et al., "Modeling and analysis on the propagation dynamics of modern email malware," *IEEE transactions on dependable and secure computing*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 361-374, 2014.
- [6] L. B. T. Dumitras, *Before we knew it*, Raleigh, NC, USA: ed, 2012.
- [7] A. Walenstein, D. J. Hefner, and J. Wichers, "Header information in malware families and impact on automated classifiers,," ed, pp. 15-22, 2010.
- [8] D. Bilal, "OpCodes as predictor for malware," *International Journal of Electronic Security and Digital Forensics*, pp. 156-168, 2007.
- [9] S. Yu, S. Zhou, L. Liu, R. Yang, and J. Luo, Malware variants identification based on byte frequency, 2010, vol. 2.
- [10] M. K. Shankarapani, S. Ramamoorthy, R. S. Movva, and S. Mukkamala, "Malware detection using assembly and API call sequences," *Journal in computer virology*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 107-119, 2011.
- [11] U. Baldangombo, N. Jambaljav, and S. J. Horng, "A static malware detection system using data mining methods. arXiv Prepr. arXiv 1308.2831," 2013.
- [12] "Mohaisen A, West AG, Mankin A, Alrawi O. Chatter: classifying malware families using system event ordering," 2014, pp. 283-91.
- [13] B. M, O. J, A. J, M. MZ, J. F, and N. J, Automated classification and analysis of internet malware.
- [14] S. Naval, SPADE: Signature Based Packer Detection, 2012.
- [15] V. Walenstein, D. J. Hefner, and J. Wichers, "Header information in malware families and impact on automated classifiers," Nancy, France, 2010, pp. 15-22.
- [16] "Malware detection by behavioural sequential patterns," *Comput. Fraud and Secur*, vol. 8, pp. 11-19, 2013.
- [17] L. J and W. MP, "Malware detection with different voting schemes, COMPUSOFT," *Int J Adv Comput Technol*, vol. 2014, no. 3.
- [18] "Malware detection using windows API sequence and machine learning," *Int. J. Comput. Appl*, vol. 43, no. 17, pp. 12-16, 2012.
- [19] K. Rieck, P. Trinius, C. Willems, and T. Holz, "Automatic analysis of malware behavior using machine learning," *Journal of Computer Security*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 639-668, 2011.
- [20] R. Tian, R. Islam, L. Batten, and S. Versteeg, "Differentiating malware from clean ware using behavioral analysis," Nancy, 2010.
- [21] M. Ahmadi, "Malware detection by behavioural sequential patterns." *Computer Fraud & Security*, vol. 2013, no. 8, pp. 11-19, 20
- [22] K.-P. Grammatikakis, A. Ioannou, S. Shiales, and N. Kolokotronis, "Are cracked applications really free? an empirical analysis on Android devices," 16th IEEE International Conference on Dependable, Autonomic and Secure Computing — DASC, August 2018
- [24] K. Ntemos, N. Kolokotronis, and N. Kaloutsidis, "Using trust to mitigate malicious and selfish behavior of autonomous agents in CRNs," in 27th IEEE Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor, and Mobile Radio Communications — PIMRC, September 2016, pp. 1-7