# Cyber Threat Intelligence and Incident Response Report

This template leverages several models in the cyber threat intelligence domain (such as the Intrusion Kill Chain, Campaign Correlation, the Courses of Action Matrix and the Diamond Model) to structure data, guide threat intel gathering efforts and inform incident response actions. If you’re not familiar with this approach, read the following papers: [Intelligence-Driven Computer Network Defense Informed by Analysis of Adversary Campaigns and Intrusion Kill Chains](http://www.lockheedmartin.com/content/dam/lockheed/data/corporate/documents/LM-White-Paper-Intel-Driven-Defense.pdf) and [The Diamond Model of Intrusion Analysis](http://www.activeresponse.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/diamond.pdf). This framework is discussed in depth in the SANS Institute course [FOR578: Cyber Threat Forensics](https://www.sans.org/course/cyber-threat-intelligence).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Incident Name |  |
| Report Author |  |
| Report Date |  |
| Revision Dates and Notes |  |

## Executive Summary

Describe in up to three paragraphs your key observations and takeaways related to the intrusion. Explain the adversary’s tactics, techniques and procedures. Outline the most significant courses of action taken to defend against the adversary when responding to the intrusion. The remainder of the report should substantiate this summary.

## The Adversary’s Actions and Tactics

Summarize in one paragraph the adversary’s actions and tactics, as well as the effects that the intrusion had on the victims. This section of the report overlays the intrusion kill chain’s phases over the diamond model vertices to capture the core characteristics of the malicious activities.

### Description of the Adversary

Describe observations and indicators that may be related to the perpetrators of the intrusion. If possible, highlight the attributes of the adversary operator and the adversary’s potential customer. Outline potential motivations and identifying elements. Categorize your insights according to the corresponding phase of the intrusion kill chain, as structured in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### The Adversary’s Capabilities

Describe the adversary’s capabilities in terms of tactics, techniques and procedures (TTPs). Address the tools and tradecraft employed by the intrusion perpetrators, such as exploits backdoors, staging methods and situational awareness. Categorize your insights according to the corresponding phase of the intrusion kill chain, as structured in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### The Adversary’s Infrastructure

Describe the infrastructure, such as IP addresses, domain names, program names, etc. used by the adversary. Categorize your insights according to the corresponding phase of the intrusion kill chain, as structured in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### The Victims and Affected Assets

Describe the victims affected by the adversary’s actions. Address applicable victim identifiers such as people and organization names. Also outline the affected victim assets, such as networks, systems and applications. Categorize your insights according to the corresponding phase of the intrusion kill chain, as structured in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

## Course of Action During Incident Response

Summarize in one paragraph the steps you’ve taken when responding to the various phases of the intrusion chain. The section below should describe your actions in greater detail.

### Discover

Describe in the following table the steps you’ve taken to determine what the adversary has done so far as part of the intrusion, as determined based on the analysis of logs, network packer captures, forensic data and other sources.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### Detect

Describe in the following table the measures you’ve put in place to identify the adversary’s future activities related to the applicable intrusion phase. Explain how you defined and deployed indicators and signatures, additional sensors or instrumentation, security event data monitors, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### Deny

Describe in the following table the measures you’ve implemented to block the adversary from taking the malicious actions, staying within the context of the intrusion phase described in this report. For instance, did you block specific IPs at the perimeter firewall, patch targeted vulnerabilities, block emails that matched specific patterns, etc.?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### Disrupt

Describe in the following table the measures you’ve established to interfere with the adversary’s attack in progress to cause it to fail. For instance, did you use an intrusion prevention system or firewall to terminate the adversary’s active network connections, quarantined suspicious files, distributed updated antivirus signatures, etc.?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### Degrade

Describe in the following table the actions you’ve taken to slow down or otherwise degrade the attack in progress. One example of such measures might be to configure the network equipment to rate-limit the connections attributed to the adversary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### Deceive

Describe in the following table the steps you’ve taken to misinform the adversary in the context of the applicable intrusion phase. Deception might involve planting fake assets that might interest the intruder, redirecting the adversary’s network connections, fooling malware into believing the targeted system is already infected, employing honey tokens, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

### Destroy

Describe in the following table the offensive actions you’ve taken against the adversary to reduce their ability to carry out the intrusion. Such steps are generally unavailable to private individuals or firms outside of specific law enforcement or military organizations, although coordination and intelligence sharing with these organizations is within scope of this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reconnaissance |  |
| Weaponization |  |
| Delivery |  |
| Exploitation |  |
| Installation |  |
| Command and Control |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |

## Intrusion Campaign Analysis

If applicable, summarize in one paragraph the relationship between the intrusion discussed earlier in the report and other related intrusions that, when taken together, form a campaign. Mention the indicators and behaviors shared across the intrusions within the campaign. Outline the commercial, geopolitical or other factors that might have motivated the adversary’s activities.

### Other Intrusions in the Campaign

Describe other incidents or intrusions that share commonalities with the intrusion discussed earlier in the report. Explain whether the shared attributes indicate a low/medium/high likelihood that the intrusions form a larger campaign. Provide internal and external intrusion names or other relevant identifiers. Include references to related internal and external documents. Clarify when the intrusions occurred.

### Shared Intrusion Attributes

Specify the key indicators and behavioral characteristics that are consistent across intrusions within the campaign. Categorize the attributes according to the kill chain phase when they were exhibited and their relevance to the adversary description, attack infrastructure, capabilities (tactics, techniques and procedures) and the affected victims. Wherever possible, account for Adversary, Infrastructure, Capabilities and Victim in each applicable phase of the kill chain.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Adversary | Infrastructure | Capabilities | Victim |
| Reconnaissance |  |  |  |  |
| Weaponization |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery |  |  |  |  |
| Exploitation |  |  |  |  |
| Installation |  |  |  |  |
| Command and Control |  |  |  |  |
| Actions on Objectives |  |  |  |  |

### Campaign Motivations

Outline the likely motivation for the adversary’s activities across the intrusion campaign, including the relevant commercial, geopolitical or other factors. If practical, offer substantiated theories regarding the attribution of the campaign to specific individuals, groups or nation states.

### Third-Party References

Provide references to third-party data about the intrusion discussed in this report, the campaign that it is a part of or the associated adversaries.

This report is based on the [template created by Lenny Zeltser](https://zeltser.com/cyber-threat-intel-and-ir-report-template). The template is distributed according to the [Creative Commons Attribution license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) (CC BY 4.0), which basically allows you to use this material in any way, as long as you credit the author for the original creation. The contents build upon the concepts and terminology defined by Eric M. Hutchins, Michael J. Cloppert and Rohan M. Amin’s paper [Intelligence-Driven Computer Network Defense Informed by Analysis of Adversary Campaigns and Intrusion Kill Chains](http://www.lockheedmartin.com/content/dam/lockheed/data/corporate/documents/LM-White-Paper-Intel-Driven-Defense.pdf) and Sergio Caltagirone, Andrew Pendergast, and Christopher Betz’s paper [The Diamond Model of Intrusion Analysis](http://www.activeresponse.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/diamond.pdf). It also incorporates the insights from SANS Institute’s course [FOR578: Cyber Threat Forensics](https://www.sans.org/course/cyber-threat-intelligence) as taught by Michael J. Cloppert and Robert M. Lee.