

Bibliography details

Name of the Serial/Publication: Veritas

Volume No.: 1

Issue No.: 1

Month & Year of publication: August 2021

Page numbers: Case studies (49-55)

Title of Article: 64 Million cryptocurrency hack

Contributor (s)

1. Mr. Varun Gupta

64 MILLION CRYPTOCURRENCY HACK

Mr. Varun Gupta

Introduction:

67 million USD worth of bitcoin was stolen from a Cryptocurrency-mining marketplace that connected people in need of computer processing power to point those who have the power to spare to mine for Cryptocurrency. In return, payment was made in bitcoins. “Through tactics, techniques, and procedures, the theft was ultimately linked to Hidden Cobra, a threat actor with ties to North Korea. While not too technically advanced, this attack was executed with military precision, taking advantage of common security weaknesses found in many start-ups, resulting in an unprecedented financial theft.”

Before going further, we should now understand some terms like Cryptocurrency and Social Engineering.

Cryptocurrency: “A cryptocurrency is a digital or virtual currency that is secured by cryptography, which makes it nearly impossible to counterfeit or double-spend. Many cryptocurrencies are decentralized networks based on blockchain technology—a distributed ledger enforced by a disparate network of computers. A defining feature of cryptocurrencies is that they are generally not issued by any central authority, rendering them theoretically immune to government interference or manipulation”. Some of the examples of cryptocurrency are Bitcoin, Basic Attention Token (BAT), Ethereum, etc.

Social Engineering: “Social engineering is the act of tricking someone into divulging information or acting, usually through technology. The idea behind social engineering is to take advantage of a potential victim’s natural tendencies and emotional reactions. To access a computer network, the typical hacker might look for a software vulnerability. A social engineer, though, could pose as a technical support person to trick an employee into divulging their login credentials. The fraudster is hoping to appeal to the

employee's desire to help a colleague and, perhaps, act first and think later.”

Attack Methodology:

The first line of attack was through social engineering. The threat actor pretended to be a company employee, specifically one of the system engineers. The e-mail exactly mimicked an invitation from cloud service and was pretending to appear as sort of a weekly report. Given the impersonated sender's actual role within the company, this wasn't only expected, but the specified document.

They used servers that allow them to send an e-mail anonymously, which is how they managed to defeat the Security Protection Factor (SPF) within the place to stop the victim's domain from being spoofed.

Several links inside the email body, including the one to just accept the invitation, had been replaced with bit.ly shortened URLs. But all the servers were down at the time of the investigation.

When the target clicked the primary link, the link triggered a download of a .zip file, and inside that zip file were two more files named “Password.txt.lnk”: the “weekly_report.doc” file was password protected which made the target more convinced that files are genuine.

The string is executed as a script (see Appendix 2) which connects to a different server that requests to send the “main.cs” file, which got decoded from Base64 so it got passed as a script block. This script or the initial download file wasn't retrieved on the filesystem; however, at the same time, the Event Log started showing messages containing parts of PowerShell code (channel Microsoft-Windows-PowerShell/Operational, event ID 4104). Pieced together, this code was found to perform several tasks:

- Writes a long string, which decodes to a script, to the user's APPDATA followed by “\Microsoft\Windows\Start Menu\Programs\Startup\appView.js”;

- Gets some “base information” (computer name, network configuration, the OS details, the list of open ports, and the Internet settings) and transmits these to the attacker using the C2 server; and connects to a C2 server and retrieve actions to perform, including
- “Kill”/”Stop”(same command);
- “Execute” which downloads a payload and inserts it into a PE file using PEInjection() function; and “DownExec”, this last one downloads a file, decodes it, and executes it directly.

The Heist (Plan Execution):

The last act started, but 48 hours after, the target was successfully compromised. Most of the logs used to reconstruct the activity were retrieved from servers. The company that hosted the data centre and operated the VPN failed to retain all the logs for the VPN concentrator. Using stolen credentials, the attacker connected to the data center VPN and using the stolen SSH key, to one of the servers hosting the API server and also the BitGo proxy server for the company. The attacker went straight for this server, indicating that he/she had an extremely good understanding of the company’s infrastructure, possibly due to the documents retrieved from the target’s computer. A search within the swap file revealed several instances of the “curl” tool used with an authorization key was stolen from the target’s computer to initiate the bitcoin transfers to different addresses (See appendix D), for a total slightly below 4,450BC or, as of the end of December 2017, a bit more than \$67 million

Moving The Money:

Several professionals banded together to trace the movement of the bitcoins from address to deal with because the attacker was splitting the “loot” into smaller amounts. A partial view established shortly after the heist is presented below.

Continuing the efforts, the money movement was summarized as shown in the figure below.

The Loot:

One address was found to have received most of the stolen funds.

The Security Weaknesses:

- Missing formalized Incident Response Plan and Security Policies
- Limited endpoint security monitoring, detection, and response
- The Virtual Private Network (VPN) only required an id and password to connect to the servers hosted in a cloud provider's data centre.
- The private key for Secure Shell, a network protocol that provides administrators with a secure way to access a remote computer, was not password protected.
- The logs, specifically of the firewall and the VPN servers, were not available for part of the attack period.

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

Appendix 3

Attacker Bitcoin Address

References:

- Frankenfield, J., & Sonnenshein, M. (2019). Cryptocurrency. Accessed from Investopedia Website: <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/cryptocurrency.asp> [accessed 16th November 2020].
- Symanovich, Steve. "What is social engineering? Tips to help avoid becoming a victim." 2018.

Myth - Evidence containing blood or other fluids should be packed in a plastic bag.

Fact - Evidences which contain moisture are supposed to be air dried in shade and packed in a paper bag. Packing wet evidence in plastic will not let air circulation and will lead to the evidence being contaminated by bacteria and fungi.