

IntelEX: A LLM-driven Attack-level Threat Intelligence Extraction Framework

Ming Xu*, Hongtai Wang*, Jiahao Liu*, Yun Lin[†], Chenyang Xu*
Yingshi Liu*, Hoon Wei Lim[‡], Jin Song Dong*

*National University of Singapore, [†] Shanghai Jiao Tong University, [‡] Cyber Ops-R&D, NCS Group, Singapore

Abstract—To combat increasingly sophisticated cyberattacks, a common practice is to transform unstructured cyber threat intelligence (CTI) reports into structured intelligence, facilitating downstream security tasks such as summarizing detection rules or simulating attack scenarios for red team exercises. However, existing threat intelligence often remains at the technique-level details, lacking critical attack-level insights, such as the use of specific techniques across different attack stages, detailed implementation procedures and contextual reasons, which are crucial for rapid investigation and analysis.

To bridge this gap, we propose *IntelEX* (Intelligence Extraction), an automated tool designed to extract structural, attack-level intelligence by identifying logical attack sequences—including tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs)—and contextual insights. Specifically, *IntelEX* leverages the in-context learning capabilities of large language models (LLMs), enhanced with an external intelligence vector database, to pinpoint fine-grained attack details. Additionally, *IntelEX* introduces a novel *LLM-as-a-judgment* module to mitigate hallucination issues, reducing false positives. We systematically evaluate *IntelEX*'s performance using 1,769 newly crawled reports in the real world and 16 manually labeled and calibrated reports. Experimental results highlight *IntelEX*'s effectiveness in identifying attack-level intelligence. Specifically, *IntelEX* identifies 3,591 techniques and achieves an average F1 score of 0.792 in identifying techniques, outperforming state-of-the-art approaches of AttackKG by 1.34x. Moreover, the extracted attack-level intelligence directly benefits downstream security tasks. We demonstrate its utility in two key application scenarios: (1) automated generation of detection rules, such as Sigma, without human intervention, achieving an F1 score of up to 0.929 for detecting malicious events on the Splunk platform, and (2) generation of attack implementation procedures, with 83.48% of generated outputs containing complete <entities, relationships, actions> information, rated as highly useful by security analysts with at least two years of experience under expert supervision.

1. Introduction

Recently, enterprises have increasingly faced penalties [1]–[3] for the lax supervision of sophisticated cyberattacks. For instance, in 2024 alone, R.R. Donnelley & Sons

Company (RRD) was charged a 2.1 million penalty by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for inadequate cybersecurity controls [4]. These penalties highlight the growing sophistication of cyberattacks and the critical need for effective threat mitigation strategies. To combat the evolving threats, organizations typically transform unstructured cyber threat intelligence (CTI) reports into structured formats of intelligence, enabling streamlined security tasks [5] such as threat detection and response. Structured intelligence plays a key role in detecting emerging threats and supporting efficient security operations. Detailed attack-level intelligence usually offers a promising solution by providing fine-grained details including techniques and implementation procedures. These insights can automatic the generation of detection rules, like Sigma [6], widely used in Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) [7] platforms due to the lightweight overhead. Additionally, comprehensive implementation details can empower red teams to simulate attacks effectively, making them understand of attack flows and strengthening defenses.

However, existing studies in structured threat intelligence often remain at the technique-level [8]–[10], lacking the fine-grained attack-level intelligence details, such as the precise information of logical attack methods (i.e., techniques) ordered by their stages (i.e., tactics) and enriched with specific implementations (i.e., procedures). Structured Threat Information eXpression (STIX) [10] is a de-facto standard of structural threat intelligence, always focusing on segmented attack contexts like indicators of compromise (IoCs) including malware hashes or IP addresses based on Regex, lacking adaptability to full attack contexts [11]. AttackKG [8] attempts mapping techniques from MITRE ATT&CK and IoCs into graph representations to visualize attacks, capturing technique-level intelligence. Nevertheless, it still falls short in providing attack-level details, such as specific implementation procedures, the logical sequence of utilized techniques, and contextual explanations, which are critical elements for improving the efficiency of security tasks. As an example in real-world, MITRE ATT&CK [12] has offered a matrix of tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs), capturing the full context of an attack. Despite this, industry companies highlight that critical strategies like TTPs are not effectively disseminated in practice [13], [14].

With the rise of revolutionary capabilities in large lan-

guage models (LLMs) [15]–[17], we aim to explore whether recent advances in LLMs, such as the state-of-the-art GPT-4o-mini [18] and GPT-4o [19], can enhance the precise generation of accurate attack-level intelligence (e.g., TTPs) with contextual insights. Moreover, we explore how this enriched attack-level intelligence can be applied to downstream security tasks in real-world scenarios, particularly the critical challenge of automating rule generation. To address these challenges, we highlight three difficulties in the following aspects: 1) Overcoming the inherent limitations of LLM base capabilities, which are insufficient for generating precise attack-level intelligence with contextual and procedural details. 2) Ensuring the generated results are intuitive and interpretable to analysts remains a significant challenge, as existing methods often lack clear reasoning or logic behind their outputs. 3) Verifying the effectiveness in the wild environments is challenging due to the complexity and variability of practical scenarios. While initial works [20], [21] have made progress in automating rule generation, they have not yet achieved the ultimate goal of catching attacks using the generated rules, and instead focus primarily on IoC extraction rates.

We propose *IntelEX* (Intelligence Extraction) framework, which extracts the attack-level intelligence details (i.e., TTPs) with contextual insights. To enhance the accuracy of the technique identification, we design a chunking mechanism, the tailored prompts, and introduce an external vector database [22] to embed existing techniques in MITRE ATT&CK [12]. Moreover, we use another module of *LLM-as-a-judgment* to purify the technique candidates generated from the previous steps, reducing the false positives. As for the attack procedure generation phase, we employ GraphRAG [23] frameworks based on their excellent entity extraction abilities. Well-written procedures will precisely describe the attack entities (e.g., APT-29), relationships (e.g., install backdoor known as WEBC2-TABLE) and actions (e.g., malicious execution). We implement *IntelEX* prototype and evaluate it against 1,769 crawled reports from the Cisco Talos [24] and 16 manually calibrated reports [8], [25] due to the significant updates in 2024. Our experimental result shows that *IntelEX* can identify the techniques with up to 0.902 F1 score, substantially outperforming the state-of-the-art approach (i.e., AttackKG [8]) by 1.34x. More importantly, *IntelEX* can yield the implementation procedures and the contextual reasons. For comprehensiveness, we also conduct the ablation study to show that our retrieval augmentation based on the vector database can reduce false negatives and the module of *LLM-as-a-judgment* can reduce the false positives.

Moreover, we validate the practical utilities of the enriched attack-level intelligence by two key application scenarios: 1) *automatic rule generation*; 2) *implementation procedure generation for attack simulation*. For the automatic rule generation, we tailor the prompt structure consisting of the extracted TTPs to generate the high-fidelity Sigma [6] rules due to their universal compatibility with multiple SIEM vendors. We convert the Sigma rules into a format compatible with the Splunk SIEM [26], and during this

process, any syntax errors are passed back to the LLMs for correction until no syntax errors remain. To evaluate rules’s effectiveness, we simulate 61 atomic attack tests, collect 229,968 system logs covering nearly all possible tactics in MITRE ATT&CK, and ingest them into Splunk, allowing us to check whether the generated rules can catch the malicious attack logs in Splunk. The experimental results show that the generated rules can achieve up to 0.929 F1 score in catching the malicious events/logs, significantly outperforming that without TTPs. Furthermore, we deploy a field study to test the effectiveness of our generated rules in the wild. We collect the attack logs in real-world based on a deployed honeypot. Experimental results show that our generated rules can significantly outperform existing open-sourced rule sets either from Sigma or Splunk in detecting malicious security events in the wild. Second, we evaluate whether our generated procedures can help red teams reproduce and simulate attacks. To verify this, we hire two experienced staff with at least 2 years of experience to judge the generated procedures (e.g., *APT installs malicious executable backdoor known as WEBC2-TABLE*). We require that a complete procedure should follow the template of <entities relationships actions>. The results show that 83.48% of the generated procedures are complete and extremely useful by their feedback. We summarize our main contributions as follows.

- We propose *IntelEX*, an automated framework for perceiving Cyber Threat Intelligence (CTI) at the attack technique level with implementation procedures and contextual reasoning. We utilize the recent advancements of LLMs to identify the techniques, tactics and generate the procedures. Our empirical experiments show that *IntelEX* can substantially outperform the state-of-the-art models (e.g., AttackKG).
- We demonstrate the real-world use of *IntelEX*: 1) Automatic rule generation. We empirically validate in Splunk that our generated rules efficiently capture malicious events. Field study results further confirm that these rules detect more and accurate real-world malicious security events compared to existing rule sets from Sigma or Splunk. 2) Implementation Procedure Generation for Attack Simulation. We validate that 83.48% of the generated procedures are highly effective for reproducing attack environments, significantly aiding in simulation exercises.

2. Background and Motivation

2.1. Threat Intelligence and Security Tasks

Cyber Threat Intelligence (CTI). CTI carries critical information that details the lifecycle employed during attacks, playing a vital role in responding to evolving cyber threats [14], [27], [28]. CTI reports are often presented in unstructured natural languages, such as blog posts and attack documents, making them difficult to understand and

share across organizations. To smooth the utilization and sharing of CTI, organizations often transform it into structured threat intelligence. The de-facto standard of structured format is the Structured Threat Information eXpression (STIX) [10]. STIX defines a schema that consists of objects and relationships, where each object represents a type of threat information. STIX 2.1 defines 18 STIX Domain Objects (SDOs) including attack patterns, campaigns, and others [29]. Although STIX is claimed to include attack strategies, companies yet report that the vital attack-level intelligence is not effectively disseminated in practice [13], [14].

Attack-level Intelligence: Tactic, Technique, Procedures (TTPs). TTPs are hierarchical attack strategies to characterize attackers’ behaviors, systematizing attacks from the “tactic” (i.e., the adversary’s goals during an attack), “technique” (i.e., general methods used to achieve those goals) to specific “procedure” (i.e., a series of steps that carry out the attack methods). Figure 1 illustrates a group of TTPs, whose objective is classified as *initial access* using the technique of *phishing*. The procedure involves *spreading the “Hikit” malware through spear phishing*.

A group of TTPs

Tactic = Initial Access
Technique = Phishing
Procedure = Hikit has been spread through spear phishing

Figure 1: An example of the attack-level intelligence: TTPs.

In this study, we focus on the TTP matrix defined by MITRE ATT&CK [12], as it is well-maintained, follows an open policy, and has been proven effective by previous research [8], [30]. Specifically, we utilize the matrix covering 14 tactics and 235 techniques, where each tactic corresponds to multiple techniques. The tactics have a logical flow that mirrors the progression of an attack, e.g., from gaining access to completing the malicious goal. Specifically, we categorize the tactics by the following stages.

- **Early stage** (Reconnaissance, Resource Development, Initial Access): getting into the system;
- **Middle stage** (Execution, Persistence, Privilege Escalation, Defense Evasion, Credential Access): maintaining and extending control;
- **Moving stage** (Discovery, Lateral Movement): exploring the compromised network or moving laterally to gain access to additional systems or data;
- **End stage** (Collection, Command and Control, Exfiltration, Impact): gathering sensitive information and carrying out the attacker’s final goals.

Rule-based Detection. Due to the fast speed, rule-based detection [31] is widely used in industries, such as in Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) systems, to discover potential intruders from large security-related events. Among these detection rules, Sigma [6] is a generic

and open signature with YAML format and allows for the conversion to common SIEM vendors like Splunk [26]. We show an example of Sigma rules in Listing 1, where we can find that the attack-level intelligence is of great importance for the generation of Sigma rules, as the “tags” and “detection” fields are essentially attack-level threat intelligence like TTPs. The Sigma rule can be converted into the corresponding Splunk rule shown in Listing 2, by the open-sourced tool Sigma CLI [6].

```

title: Detect VSSAdmin Resize Shadowstorage
  Command
description: Detects the use of vssadmin.exe to
  resize shadowstorage.
author: IntelEX
logsource:
  category:process_creation
  product: windows
detection:
  selection:
    Image|endswith: '*vssadmin.exe'
    CommandLine|contains:
      - 'resize shadowstorage'
      - '/maxsize:401MB'
      - '/maxsize:unbounded'
  condition: selection
falsepositives:
  System administrators using the command for
  regular maintenance
tags:
  - attack.t1490
  - attack.defense_evasion
  - attack.impact

```

Listing 1: A Sigma rule generated by IntelEX.

```

Image="*vssadmin.exe" CommandLine IN ("*resize
shadowstorage*", "*/maxsize:401MB*", "*/
maxsize:unbounded*")

```

Listing 2: The converted Splunk SQL Rule.

2.2. A Motivating Example

We show the comparison between the standard structural formats (STIX 2.1) and our attack-level intelligence (i.e., fine-grained TTPs) for the same CTI report on an APT attack in Figure 2. STIX 2.1 is beginning to capture partial TTPs by the “attack pattern” object [32]. Therefore, we specifically show the parts in the object of “attack pattern” in STIX 2.1, focusing on TTPs. Unfortunately, based on the general workflow, we find that STIX 2.1 relies on the Regex match to record the rough and outdated technique-level intelligence, lacking adaptability to evolving attacks. For example, MITRE ATT&CK changed the tactic “Initial Compromise” to “Initial Access” in version 6 released on July 7, 2020, while STIX 2.1 remains outdated. Besides, we show the attack-level intelligence automatically generated by IntelEX, which can logically outline the attack sequence with techniques and procedures. The attack-level intelligence gives security professionals an at-a-glance view of their threat landscape with a causality relationship. Specifically, in this APT attack, the chain begins with initial access via *phishing*, followed by execution through *command and*




Figure 2: Comparison between STIX 2.1 and our attack-level intelligence automatically generated by *IntelEX*. We also provide the automatic detection rule generation as the application scenarios.

scripting interpreters and user execution, and concludes with defense evasion via impersonation. It could be easy to integrate full threat intelligence into existing STIX 2.x structural formats due to its portable and compatible nature. **Why Not Existing Approaches?** We compare with previous studies that also aim to extract threat intelligence in Table 1. Existing studies [8], [38] either focus on statistic IoCs, or a technique-level intelligence, without the tactics providing logical relationships, detailed attack implementation procedures, and the knowledgeable contextual reasons. To address these gaps, we deploy our approach on the client side, providing security analysts with an intuitive interface, as illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Our framework of generating the relevant TTPs.

Downstream Application Scenarios. Attack-level intelligence has broad applications across various security tasks. Firstly, industry leaders typically rely on in-house or crowd-sourced experts to manually write detection rules, a process that is labor-intensive and prone to error [7], [39]. We aim to automate rule generation. While some studies propose automating this process, these approaches [20], [21] focus primarily on extracting IoCs and populating rule templates. However, they often lack evaluation within real-world SIEM

systems, leaving rule effectiveness uncertain. Secondly, red teams often need to dissect extensive CTI reports to replicate environmental attacks, a complex and time-consuming task. We address this by providing attack implementation procedures, easing the analysis workload.

2.3. Preliminaries on Large Language Models.

Large language models (LLMs), such as GPT-4o and GPT 4o-mini [40], have been widely used in many natural language understanding tasks. The pre-trained LLMs have exercised their potential to revolutionize the security tasks, e.g., vulnerability detection [41]. Given that LLM is naturally good at reasoning and understanding textual semantics, such as understanding the attack intention, we argue that the intention understanding can yield accurate and knowledgeable intelligence extraction. Based on pre-trained knowledge, LLMs could leverage existing knowledge to output the attack-level intelligence. We employ the in-context learning (ICL) ability for tactic and technique classification and procedure generation in this work. Yet, due to the limitations of the pre-training data and the efforts needed for training, LLMs may not be able to include the updated information and suffer from hallucination problems. Therefore, the basic prompt engineering could be insufficient for the accuracy requirement.

Technical Challenges. We briefly summarize the challenges involving LLMs in this task as CH-1 to CH-4, where CH-3 and CH-4 focus on challenges in downstream application tasks.

CH-1 Accurate Classification of Attack Techniques. LLMs' ability to classify the tactics, and techniques heavily

Table 1: Approaches on the extraction of threat intelligence. We emphasize our distinct approach that focuses on logical attack sequences based on fine-grained Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTPs). The NLP and IR represent natural language processing and information retrieval, respectively.

	Automatic	Year	Extracted Threat Intelligence	Technique
iACE [33]	✓	2016	IoCs	NLP: regular expressions based on terms (e.g., attachment, download)
TTPDrill [34]	✓	2017	Tactics and Techniques	NLP and IR
Poirot [35]	×	2019	Attack campaigns	Similarity metric
rcATT [36]	✓	2020	All tactics and techniques (individually listed, not grouped)	Supervised learning
EXTRATOR [37]	✓	2021	Provenance graph	NLP: semantic role labeling
ThreatRaptor [9]	✓	2021	Threat behavior graph	Unsupervised NL pipeline
AttackKG [8]	✓	2022	Techniques and threat graph	NLP: knowledge graph
<i>IntelEX</i>	✓	2024	Logical attack sequence of tactics, techniques and implementation procedures (TTPs) with contextual reasons	In-context learning (ICL) and Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) of LLMs

relies on the context provided in the input. To ensure high-quality contextual information, we specifically design the chunking mechanisms and feed the several chunks to prompt LLMs with multiple rounds of dialogues [42], [43]. In-context learning mechanism should be enhanced by offering LLMs with the ability to learn from external task contexts. We additionally introduce an external external database that embeds the existing techniques with their descriptions to enhance retrieval.

CH-2 Hallucination Issues. Hallucination refers to that LLM might generate false information that is not grounded in reality. To reduce this, we additionally employ the module of *LLM-as-a-judgment* as the final steps to judge the outputs from previous steps.

CH-3 Knowledgeable Generation of Attack Procedures. Generating accurate attack procedures can be challenging for LLMs, especially when faced with insufficient context or ambiguous information. In such cases, LLMs often struggle to produce meaningful behavior descriptions. To address this, we employ the GraphRAG [23] technique, which helps precisely locate IoCs and generate structured attack procedures. Additionally, we design tailored prompts to provide the necessary contextual information, ensuring the generation of high-quality and actionable procedures.

CH-4 Automated Detection Rule Generation. It is challenging to ensure that the generated rules are both grammatically correct and effective at catching relevant attacks in real-world systems, as poorly constructed rules may fail to detect threats. To address this, we employ Python code for rigorous grammar checks and leverage LLM to generate rules specifically designed to detect relevant attacks, enhancing both accuracy and reliability.

3. *IntelEX* Framework

3.1. Threat Model

When a new CTI report arrives, we focus on extracting attack-level threat intelligence by capturing logical TTPs




Figure 4: Overview of *IntelEX* in identifying the logical attack sequence with detailed TTPs. We arrange the logical sequence by the order of tactics.

(tactics, techniques, and procedures) to provide strategic insights for downstream security tasks. Among these tasks, we highlight two key applications that benefit from our approach. First, we automate the generation of detection rules. Since SIEM rule databases require constant tuning to remain effective against evolving threats, using *IntelEX* for rule generation offers a cost-effective, time-saving solution. Second, the implementation procedures we generate support environmental attack reconstruction, assisting red teams in simulating attacks more efficiently.

3.2. Extraction of Attack-level Threat Intelligence

Figure 4 presents the overall design of *IntelEX*, which leverages LLMs to classify the tactics and techniques and generate the implementation procedures. At a high level, *IntelEX* takes an unstructured CTI report such as blogs and ultimately outputs all its corresponding techniques by the order of tactics defined in Section 2.1. We mainly identify the tactics and techniques of the attack based on an external matrix in MITRE ATT&CK, as it is well-maintained and proven effective by previous research [8], [30]. We use the same methodology to classify both tactics and techniques, so the accuracy of techniques inherently reflects that of tactics.




Figure 5: Retrieval enhancement in *IntelEX*.

3.2.1. Technique Design. To classify the accurate techniques, ① *IntelEX* first specifically chunks the raw reports into several parts, which are possible to contain malicious behaviors by locating the Indicator of Compromises (IoCs). ② *IntelEX* creates the semantic search prompts to identify the tactic and technique candidates. ③ *IntelEX* then creates a vector database by embedding their official descriptions by MITRE ATT&CK [12]. *IntelEX* retrieves the techniques with similar descriptions with the input parts to augment the other techniques. ④ Eventually, we additionally introduce a separate LLM to judge the tactic and technique candidates from the previous steps, further reducing the hallucinations. It is noteworthy that the used three LLMs don’t have shared memories, and have different backgrounds (system messages) to ensure they can focus on their own subtask. Generating accurate outputs with LLMs requires careful contextual understanding. We provide prompt templates for the four key steps in Table 2. The prompt template mainly consists of four parts: Background, Task, and Guidelines with the optional Examples.

Chunking Mechanisms. A CTI report can be too long, and not all contain essential attack information, making LLMs struggle to interpret or parse the full report when presented in its entirety. Therefore, we divide the report into smaller parts and pass each part to the LLM, allowing it to focus on the specific techniques within each part. The dividing principle guarantees that the parts are more likely to contain the IoCs. We link the previous and subsequent sentence together as a **part**. Note that a part might include several techniques. Given the prompt template in Table 2, we also present the detailed guidelines and few-shot examples in Table 12 in Appendix B.

In-context Learning. *IntelEX* can achieve the mapping between each chunked part and their corresponding techniques by the rooted LLM’s capability for in-context learning. Nevertheless, it needs task-specific guidance for better capabilities. We, thus, carefully design the prompt to identify the tactic and techniques for each part and show the template in Table 2. The description of tactics and techniques are provided based on the matrix of MITRE ATT&CK. The detailed guidelines are in Table 13 in Appendix B.

Retrieval Augmented Searching. Given that LLMs may not include the domain-specific information, for example, the updated description specific to the technique, we further leverage the vector database [22] to to augment and search the other tactics and techniques. As shown in Figure 5, the critical step is to build an external knowledge base, typically

a vector database [22], [23]. We embed the technique’s description from MITRE ATT&CK [12] to construct the vector database, which contains the key of tactics and techniques, and the value of their detailed description (formally: $\langle tactic - techniques : description \rangle$). Our vector database consists of 14 tactics with 253 techniques in total.

With the vector database, we can retrieve the similarity score between the report’s parts (e.g., the report’s sentences) and the technique descriptions in the vector database. To translate texts into vectors, we use the model of text-embedding-ada-002 realized by OpenAI ¹. Formally, the sentence in the CTI report is embedded E_{part} and the dot product is calculated with all the vectors $E_{description}$ in the vector database. The cosine similarity distance between two vectors E_{part} and $E_{description}$ is calculated as:

$$\text{cosine} - \text{dis}(E_{part}, E_{description}) = \frac{E_{part} \cdot E_{description}}{\|E_{part}\| \|E_{description}\|}$$

where:

- $E_{part} \cdot E_{description}$ is the dot product of vectors, given by:

$$E_{part} \cdot E_{description} = \sum_{i=1}^n E_{part_i} E_{description_i}$$

- $\|E_{part}\|$ and $\|E_{description}\|$ is the Euclidean norm (or length) of vector $E_{description}$, defined as:

$$\|E_{part}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n E_{part_i}^2}, \|E_{description}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n E_{description_i}^2}$$

The top similar descriptions are then retrieved, and their top-K similar techniques are returned as a result. Here, we settle down with the K=3 based on our empirical observations.

LLM-as-a-judgment. Finally, we employ an additional LLM, isolated from the prior context, to judge the output techniques generated in previous steps. This LLM, equipped with the external knowledge of technique descriptions, is intended to filter out irrelevant techniques with grounded reasoning, effectively reducing hallucination issues. Previous literature [44] claimed that “LLM-as-a-judge” is a salable and explainable way to approximate human preferences. Note that the input is the whole report rather than the chunked parts. We use the detailed guidelines in Table 14 in Appendix B.

3.2.2. Procedure Generation. To leverage strong entity extraction capabilities (e.g., for IoCs), we adapt the GraphRAG framework [23] to generate attack implementation procedures. All MITRE ATT&CK procedures [12], totaling 677, are embedded in a vector database in the format $\langle technique : procedures \rangle$. GraphRAG builds an internal knowledge graph connecting entities and relationships (e.g., verbs like “launches”). We empirically demonstrate linked entity distribution and separate community patterns in Figure 9 (Appendix A). Specifically, the generated knowledge graph comprises 6,002 entities and 10,900 relationships across 36 categories. To retrieve and generate relevant procedures, we apply a global search [23]

1. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/embeddings/what-are-embeddings>

Table 2: Prompt template for classifying the tactics and techniques. Detailed guidelines and examples are listed in Appendix B, respectively. The red and green components are mutable regarding the report or identified techniques.

<p>Background: You are a helpful assistant for a cybersecurity analyst.</p> <hr/> <p><IoC Recognition for Chunking Mechanisms>: Task: Your task is to extract the indicators of compromise (IoCs) from the following CTI report. Final prompt: Background + Task + Guidelines + Examples + Report_parts</p> <hr/> <p><In-context Learning>: Task: You are good at extracting and generating techniques in a cyber threat intelligence (CTI) report. You will be given a CTI report. You need to analyze the techniques used in the attack. The tactic and technique are defined by MITRE ATT&CK. Below are the Tactics names and descriptions: {TACTIC_DESCRIPTION} Below are all the tactics and the techniques they contain: {TACTIC_TECHNIQUES_MAPPING} Final prompt: Background + Task + Guidelines + Report_parts The output format is as follows: {"technique": ["TACTIC, TECHNIQUE", "TACTIC, TECHNIQUE", ...]}</p> <hr/> <p><Retrieval Augmented Searching>: Task: According to the report, find the techniques most relevant to the description Final prompt: Background + Task + Report_parts</p> <hr/> <p><LLM as a Judgement>: Task: The user will provide another possible technique and description. Your task is to determine whether the technique exists in the report. Description: {TECHNIQUE_DESCRIPTION} Final prompt: Background + Task + Guidelines + {Identified techniques from previous steps} + Report</p>
--

across the entire graph and design prompts requiring procedures to include entities, relationships, and actions, detailed in Table 15 (Appendix B). For example, we guide LLMs to generate procedures following the template: <entity><relationship><action>.

4. Evaluation

We implement the prototype of *IntelEX* in Python. We also integrate our approach into the client-side interface

using the Streamlit library to make it more reliable and practical. We respectively employ the GPT-4o-mini and GPT-4o in our experiments, given the popularity in real-world [19]. Particularly, GPT-4o-mini is released by 18, July, 2024 [18] with a lightweight model and economic cost. It is expected to be extremely useful for companies and developers as they typically make a large number of API calls. We set the temperature to 0 to improve the stability of each output. In this evaluation, we are keen to investigate the following research questions.

- **RQ1 Effectiveness:** How accurately does *IntelEX* identify techniques, specifically regarding false negatives and false positives, compared to the state-of-the-art AttackKG [8]? We mainly evaluate the accuracy of the technique recognition here, and leave the evaluation of generated attack procedures in RQ3.
- **RQ2 Efficiency and Ablation Study:** What is the latency and economic costs when identifying the techniques? How does each component like *retrieval augmented searching based on vector database* or *LLM-as-a-judgment* contribute to the overall performance in identifying techniques?
- **RQ3 Real-world Application Scenarios:** Whether *IntelEX* can facilitate the downstream security tasks? We evaluate two scenarios: 1) can fine-grained TTPs support the generation of high-fidelity detection rules? how effective are they in terms of accuracy, end-to-end latency, and economic cost? 2) can the generated attack procedures help to reconstruct the environmental attack simulations?
- **RQ4 Field Study:** How does the performance of our generated rules in detecting security events in the wild compare to existing rule sets from Sigma [6] and Splunk [45]?

4.1. RQ1: Effectiveness and Efficiency

Evaluation Setup. To answer RQ1, we download and analyze the public 16 reports including 5 attack reports from DRAPA TC and another 11 reports regarding widely-occurred attack campaigns from the open-sourced repository². We also crawl 1,769 reports from Cisco Talos [46], one of the largest commercial threat intelligence teams.

Due to the large-scale updates on MITRE ATT&CK [12] (e.g., 81.5% of techniques are modified later than 2022), several descriptions now differ significantly from earlier versions and have their updated extensions. We find many such instances and show two of them here: ① the technique of “T1059-Command and Scripting Interpreter” has added various scripting languages (e.g., PowerShell, Bash, Python) and the contexts that are commonly used in attacks. ② The technique of “T1071-Application Layer Protocol” has explicitly listed several web protocols (e.g., HTTP, HTTPS) and provided examples of how these protocols

2. <https://github.com/li-zhenyuan/Knowledge-enhanced-Attack-Graph/tree/main/Results>. We find that the first 8 reports are labeled, and the last 8 reports lack the labeled techniques. We have carefully checked the attack reports analysis (1-8) and compared them with MITRE ATT&CK, and then we summarize that the gray and green parts together serve as the ground truth. In the result of attack reports analysis (1-8), the yellow parts are the false negatives, and the blue parts serve as false positives.

can be leveraged for stealthy C2 communications, while earlier descriptions only focused on standard web protocols for C2 communications. Also, as the attacks evolve, they also employ more updated techniques than previously. The labeled ground truth, thus, becomes age and gradually loses its effectiveness over time. To make it more accurate, we must carefully calibrate the open-sourced 16 reports to align with the updated framework. To ensure a strict result, we hired two staff with at least two years of experience in security operation centers (SOCs) for labeling. Finally, our senior expert with ten years of experience should make a final decision when the results from the two junior staff are different. Specifically, we calibrate by the two steps: ① *Revise existing labels (1-8 reports)*: First, we let our hired two experienced staff revisit the labeled technique with their latest description in the first 8 reports. When they find that the original labels are not ground by the latest description, they should remove the labeled techniques and write their reasons for experts’ verification. ② *Search the other relevant techniques (1-8 and 8-16 reports)*: Second, we supplement the newly updated labels to these reports. We let the staff carefully search and understand the keywords appearing in the reports for accurate techniques. For example, the technique “T1197-BITS Jobs”, which appeared on 21 April 2023, should be relevant with the sentence of *We used the exploited Firefox backdoor to initiate download of ctfhost2.exe via the Background Intelligent Transfer Service (BITS)* in the report of Firefox BITS Micro APT. We have open-sourced the calibrated datasets with 171 labeled techniques for public use in our open-sourced dataset repository. It takes around 1 month for our hired staff under expert supervision to finish the dataset calibration.

Evaluation Metrics. We use precision, recall, and F1-score, as well as the detailed false negatives and false positives to measure the effectiveness of the technique extraction. We primarily evaluate the accuracy of “technique” extraction due to its popularity. Accurate technique identification also aligns with the corresponding tactics. The detailed metrics are below.

- **True Positives (TP), False Negatives (FN) and False Positives (FP):** True positives refer to the number of the recognized techniques that are correct. False negatives refer to the number of correct techniques that are not identified. False positives refer to the number of identified techniques that are not correct.

- **Precision:** the percentage of correct techniques out of all the identified techniques, represented as $= \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$.

- **Recall:** the percentage of all correctly identified techniques out of all the correct techniques, represented as recall $= \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$.

- **F1-Score:** the harmonic mean of precision and recall, represented as $F_1 = 2 \cdot \frac{\text{Precision} \cdot \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$.

Accuracy Results. Table 3 shows the accuracy of technique identification. We can find that *IntelEX* can generally perform better in identifying techniques than AttackKG [8] in terms of the lower false positives and false negatives, and higher precision, recall and F1 scores. The core idea of

Table 3: Accuracy of technique identification. We report the results based on GPT-4o-mini and (GPT-4o), respectively.

CTI (Techniques in ground truth)	False negatives (↓)		False positives (↓)	
	AttackKG	<i>IntelEX</i>	AttackKG	<i>IntelEX</i>
TC_Firefox DNS Drakon APT (9)	2	2 (3)	14	2 (4)
TC_Firefox Drakon Copykatz (4)	3	1 (2)	4	2 (4)
TC_Firefox BITS Micro APT (8)	5	2 (3)	7	3 (2)
TC_SSH BinFmt-Elevate (6)	5	2 (2)	3	1 (3)
TC_Nginx Drakon APT (9)	5	4 (5)	10	1 (2)
Frankenstein Campaign (16)	9	3 (3)	5	2 (4)
OceanLotus Campaign-APT32 (7)	5	3 (1)	2	0 (1)
Cobalt Campaign (16)	10	3 (2)	3	2 (2)
DeputyDog Campaign (13)	10	2 (4)	6	1 (9)
HawkEye Campaign (25)	19	2 (4)	8	3 (1)
DustySky Campaign (8)	5	2 (1)	7	3 (5)
TrickLoad Spyware (7)	7	2 (1)	3	1 (3)
Emotet Campaign (8)	5	3 (1)	4	2 (5)
Uroburos Campaign (8)	7	3 (4)	5	3 (5)
APT41 Campaign (13)	9	4 (3)	11	3 (6)
Espionage Campaign (14)	10	3 (4)	3	1 (2)
Metrics	AttackKG	<i>IntelEX</i>		
Overall Precision (↑)	0.313	0.818:[0.625, 1] (0.696)		
Overall Recall (↑)	0.366	0.767:[0.571,0.920] (0.756)		
Overall F1 score (↑)	0.338	0.792:[0.625,0.902] (0.724)		

AttackKG is to extract attack behavior graphs and identify techniques by aligning these graphs with predefined templates. It uses a graph alignment algorithm to match entities and dependencies, creating technique knowledge graphs (TKGs). However, AttackKG relies on training with limited datasets, which may restrict its robustness to more diverse reports. Therefore, AttackKG might struggle with semantic understanding and extraction, making it less effective at handling complex or nuanced CTI data. To gain further insight, we place an example in Figure 6 of false negatives and positives in AttackKG, while *IntelEX* can correctly identify the false negatives. Figure 6 also shows relevant contextual reasons by *IntelEX*.

Looking deeply into the example, we find that *IntelEX* can be more capable of understanding attack intentions. For example, the **blue parts** can exactly point out the difference between the technique intentions and the described attacks, and confidently reject the irrelevant techniques. Also, the **orange parts** can show the reasons regarding the identified techniques. We classify the principles as the nuanced semantic understanding capabilities of LLMs, which enable *IntelEX* to comprehend complex natural language expressions, including ambiguous descriptions and context-dependent information. This stands in stark contrast to AttackKG, whose semantic understanding is constrained by its limited training data and reliance on specific keywords and fixed patterns,




Figure 6: The false negatives and false positives in AttackKG, which can be correctly identified/reduced by *IntelEX*.

making it less effective at parsing nuanced or complex language. Furthermore, *IntelEX* excels through In-Context Learning, requiring no additional training data to achieve strong performance. This allows it to dynamically adapt to the latest attack techniques and seamlessly incorporate updates, such as new versions of MITRE ATT&CK, into its analysis. In contrast, AttackKG’s dependence on retraining to accommodate new data is both costly and time-consuming, hindering its ability to respond swiftly to emerging threats.

Effectiveness on Comprehensive Threat Intelligence Dataset (CTID). To ensure a thorough evaluation, we crawl and conduct the Comprehensive Threat Intelligence Dataset (CTID), consisting of 1,769 reports [24] from Cisco, specifically curated for this study. The dataset is divided into medium reports (1,398) and severe reports (371) based on their CVSS scores, with medium reports ranging from [4.0-8.9] and severe reports from [9.0-10.0]. This classification emphasizes the varying threat levels and ensures a balanced representation of real-world scenarios. Note that most reports do not provide unified and formatted intelligence to validate our extracted results, which is also our motivation behind this work. Therefore, we randomly select several techniques with intelligence aggregated from reports for manual investigation. Table 4 lists the five most common techniques and their frequency, which mostly overlap with manually generated top TTP lists like [47]–[49]. For example, among these top-used techniques, the “Command and Scripting Interpreter”, emphasizing that malicious scripts are heavily relied upon for executing payloads, is widely used in [48], [49]. Besides, the top three techniques are largely overlapped between medium and severe reports.

4.2. RQ2 Efficiency and Ablation Study

Efficiency. Table 5 lists the time and economic cost between different LLMs in identifying techniques, where we can find that *IntelEX* is training-less and lightweight to be deployed.

Table 4: Top-10 techniques across recent and massive CTI Reports in real word.

Rank	Medium Reports (1,398)	Frequency
1	Exploitation for Client Execution	940
2	Exploitation for Privilege Escalation	561
3	Command and Scripting Interpreter	474
4	Exploit Public-Facing Application	371
5	Process Injection	299
Severe Reports (371)		
1	Exploitation for Client Execution	318
2	Exploitation for Privilege Escalation	200
3	Command and Scripting Interpreter	186
4	Exploit Public-Facing Application	164
5	Abuse Elevation Control Mechanism	78
	Total	3,591

LLM’s Comparison. As shown in Table 3, we can find that either GPT 4o or GPT 4o-mini can outperform the AttackKG. Additionally, we compare that the GPT 4o is 20x more expensive than the GPT-4o-mini while yielding fewer gains. Therefore, we recommend that the GPT-4o-mini in *IntelEX*, and use the GPT-4o-mini in the down-stream tasks. Furthermore, we observe that both models show similar rates of false negatives, but GPT-4o generates significantly more false positives. We speculate that this is due to GPT-4o’s tendency to produce more divergent responses, which can sometimes lead to hallucinations and incorrect answers.

Table 5: Efficiency comparison. The results represent the average efficiency per CTI report.

Model	Prompt Tokens	Output Tokens	Money Cost	Query Time	Training Time
GPT-4o-mini	96,481	2,533	\$0.020	56s	0
GPT-4o	91,642	2,068	\$0.488	58s	0
AttackKG	–	–	–	26s	12h

Ablation Study. We conduct an ablation study to evaluate the individual contributions of retrieval augmented search based on the vector database (vectorDB) and the *LLM-as-a-judgment* module in reducing false negatives and false positives, respectively. The results, presented in Figure 7, show that with vectorDB, false negatives are significantly reduced, as indicated by the red points falling lower. This outcome is intuitive, as the well-structured descriptions in the vector database enhance the accuracy of identified techniques. Additionally, the *LLM-as-a-judgment* module can significantly reduce false positives, evident in the green points being largely at the bottom. This is also reasonable because the re-checking module can minimize hallucinations of LLMs.




Figure 7: The experiments of ablation study: The modular of retrieval augmented search based on vectorDB can reduce the false negatives; The modular of *LLM-as-a-judgment* can significantly reduce the false positives.

4.3. RQ3 Application Scenarios

We present two application scenarios to show *IntelEX*'s ability to facilitate downstream security tasks: (1) automatic generation of detection rules and (2) attack generation of procedures to support environmental attack reproduction.

4.3.1. Scenario-1: Automatic Generation of Detection Rules. To address the challenge of manual rule-writing in the industry, we leverage the generated TTPs and the LLM's ICL abilities to generate Sigma rules, benefiting the SIEM systems due to Sigma's SIEM-vendor-agnostic feature. We convert Sigma rules into Splunk's rules to test whether they can catch malicious logs in Splunk [26]. To this end, we should also specifically design a generation prompt to convert into the Splunk rules. As shown in Figure 8, we first prompt LLMs to generate Sigma rules with the detailed TTPs. Then, we use the Sigma-CLI libraries [6] to convert the Sigma rules into Splunk rules, during which process we go through a grammar check (i.e., execution feedback) in Splunk. Once the rule incurs execution error feedback, we pass the errors to LLM again to let LLM correct the generated rules until no errors remain. We limit the attempt threshold to 30, and discard the rule when the attempts reach the threshold. Finally, we go through the *LLM-as-a-judgment* in the generation prompts to reject the generic rules that might cause too many false positives. We show the prompt template in Table 6, detail the guidelines that avoid the possible errors in Table 16, and present the detailed judgment prompts in Table 17 in Appendix B.

System Log Collection. To evaluate the rules, we simulate the atomic attacks [50] provided by red teams spanning 13 tactics in MITRE ATT&CK. The provided atomic tests [50] are expected to cover all possible attacks in this tactic. We simulate all listed atomic tests with a max threshold of 10 for those with too many atomic tests. We summarize our used system logs in Table 7, in which we only do not simulate one tactic of "resource development", because the type is a preparation for attacks including acquiring infrastructure




Figure 8: Overview of our rule generation and conversion: we convert the Sigma rule to Splunk rules.

Table 6: The prompt template for the detection rule generation with the TTP as the chain of thought. The red and green parts are mutable regarding the reports and TTPs. The Guidelines are detailed in Appendix B.

<Candidate Rule Generation>:

Background

You are an expert in writing Sigma rules.

Task

For each attack description, write several Sigma rules to detect the relevant attacks.

The CTI report is as follows: {report}

TTPs: {TTPs}

Final prompt:

Background + Task + Guidelines

<LLM-as-a-judgment>:

Background:

You are a cyber security analyst.

Task:

Your task is to filter out irrelevant rules from the generated rules.

You will be given a CTI report and a rule. You need to determine whether the rule is relevant to the CTI report.

The cyber threat intelligence report is as follows: {report}

The rule you need to judge: {Sigma_rule}

Final prompt:

Background + Task + Guidelines

to register domain names for malware, rather than directly executing malicious acts. We use EventViewer to collect the system logs including system, sysmon, and PowerShell logs in a virtual machine with the OS of Windows 10 (64-bit). Our evaluation focuses primarily on Windows events due to their widespread use in both enterprises and consumer markets. Besides, the sophisticated attacks are mostly designed for Windows platforms [51]. It is important to note that our results are suitable for other systems like Linux or FreeBSD. Note that the open-sourced logs of DRAPA TC [52] are not suitable for rule-based detection, because the DRAPA TC records mostly the structural information of audit logs belonging to multi-step attacks. The detection rules are effective for single attack logs, while the multi-step attacks can be effectively detected by provenance graph. To

evaluate, we manually label the malicious logs by locating the malicious executing commands. All simulated logs and the labeled ground truths can be found [53].

Experiment Setup. We ingest the collected logs into Splunk, and evaluate whether the detection rules fire as expected. The version is Splunk 9.3.1. We use the trial license for experiments. We compare the performance with and without the fine-grained TTPs. Besides, we also collect the attacks' corresponding reports [53].

Metrics. We use precision, recall, F1 score, and calculate the attempts to pass the grammar check for every tactic.

Experimental Results. Table 8 shows the results for the generated rules across every tactic. We can find that, with comprehensive TTPs from *IntelEX*, the effectiveness of the generated rules can be largely improved, in terms of the precision, recall, and attempts to pass the rules' grammar check. We speculate that the reasons could be that the detailed TTPs can give a full and organized understanding of the attacks, which can greatly facilitate LLM's digest to generate better rules. Furthermore, we empirically investigate the separate gains of the module of *LLM-as-a-judgment* in our end-to-end rule generation approach. Given that this module is only to reject the rules that are generated from previous steps, we check the false positives and empirically find the filtered rules are more general and attack-irrelevant, e.g., *Image IN* (“*CalculatorApp.exe”, “*hollow_process_name.exe”). However, such a rule is too general as it only captures image names and does not specifically relate to the process injection. We find that the corresponding caught logs are benign activities in loading the CalculatorApp.exe.

End-to-end Efficiency. Finally, we test the end-to-end efficiency that streamlines generating the detection rules from an unstructured CTI report, and show the efficiency in Table 9. We can conclude that the economic investment and the time cost are both accessible and generally better than the manual efforts. In the traditional sense, the time and money for analyzing a report and generating Sigma rules depend heavily on the analyst's expertise, and the complexity of the report. Based on the previous documents [54], [55], we investigate that the total time is 15-40 hours with the total cost ranging from 750 to 3, 200 on junior analysts, compared to 1, 500 to 6, 000 on senior analysts.

We would like to emphasize that generally, *IntelEX* comes as no real surprise that outperforms the manual efforts in terms of the time latency and economic investment. We encourage organizations to integrate it into their production workflow and mitigate emerging threats in a timely manner. Additionally, given that the attack evasions are an intrinsic problem in human-created rules due to the impracticality of covering every possible mutation, *IntelEX* is promising to reduce this problem to some extent by the diversified procedures generated.

4.3.2. Scenario-2: Environmental Attack Reproduction.

Red teams are usually expected to quickly, portably, and reproducibly reproduce the well-documented attacks. Therefore, we investigate whether our generated procedures can facilitate the environmental reproduction process. We sam-

Below is an example of the generated procedures and our scoring principles by IntelEX.

Reports: CISO-TALOS-2021-1337.txt

Tactic: Execution

Technique: Command and Scripting Interpreter

Procedures:

1. Attacker targets /itrx_user/ directory to assess sensitive files.
2. Attacker crafts HTTP Post parameters to interact with the system.
3. Attacker exploits incomplete sanitization of HTTP Post parameters to bypass security.
4. Attacker executes commands using the Command and Scripting Interpreter.
5. Attacker manipulates system behavior to gain unauthorized access to files outside of the /itrx_user/ directory.

Scoring Principles: The procedure 3,5 are extremely useful, the procedure 1,2 are useful, while the procedure 4 is useless due to generality.

Figure 9: The generated procedures and our scoring principles. The red parts have the complete <entities relationships actions> and are rated as highly used by security engineers.

ple 10% of the severe reports (37 reports out of 371 reports) in Cisco Talos [24], and generate the relevant procedures for manual verification due to the time requirement. We show a typical example of the generated procedures and the scoring principles in Figure 9, which shows that procedures 3 and 5 provide much necessary information including <entities relationships actions> for an attack simulation. Following this criteria, we let our two hired staff score the generated procedures with three levels: **Useless:** These procedures are too general to be useful in the attack reproduction. **Useful:** The procedures provide useful information for the attack reproduction. **Extremely Useful:** The procedures contain much necessary information of <entities relationships actions> for an attack reproduction. We have empirically counted that 83.48% of the generated procedures are extremely useful in the engineer's workflow, as detailed in Table 10. Additionally, *IntelEX* can potentially generate the attack variants, which are valuable sources for attack mitigation because the rule-based or machine-learning-based detection approaches could be bypassed by attack variants [1], [56], [57]. With the attack variant well found, we can better respond to them.

4.4. RQ4 Field Study

To demonstrate the effectiveness of the rules generated by our workflow in the wild, we deploy a honeypot to safely attract and capture security event logs from real-world attacks [58]–[61]. We mainly collect the web application security logs to demonstrate the generalization effectiveness of diverse types of security logs/events. Specifically, we follow the DShield [62], which uses a Cowrie honeypot on an Amazon Web Service (AWS) server with the 3-month free plan, to attract the general web attacks in the wild. For example, Cowrie honeypot can record the web attacks including brute-force attacks (e.g., brute force to login via SSH or Telnet to try different username and password combinations. Cowrie logs all the malicious login attempts.), command injection

Table 7: Summary of our simulated attack logs, comprising 61 atomic tests and 229,968 system logs. We simulate all tactics in MITRE ATT&CK, except for resource development due to its largely attack-irrelevant features.

TTP attacks	Reconnaissance T1592.001- Gather Victim Host Information	Resource Development	Initial Access T1195- Supply Chain Compromise	Execution T1053.005- Scheduled Task/Job	Persistence T1197- BITS Jobs	Privilege Escalation T1055.012- Process Injection Process Hollowing	Defense Evasion T1112- Modify Registry
Atomic Tests	1	0	1	11	4	4	10
Number of Logs	1,438	0	10,091	47,269	5,761	46,375	31,560
TTP attacks	Credential Access T1555- Credential from Password Stores	Discovery T1615- Group Policy Discovery	Lateral Movement T1021.002- Remote Services	Collection T1557.001- Adversary-in-the-Middle: LLMNR/NBT-NS Poisoning and SMB Relay	Command and Control T1071.001- Application Layer Protocol Web Protocols	Exfiltration T1041- Exfiltration Over C2 Channel	Impact T1490- Inhibit System Recovery
Atomic Tests	6	5	4	1	3	2	10
Number of Logs	15,798	16,189	8,752	1,910	5,530	5,954	33,341

Table 8: End-to-end results of rule generation with and without TTPs generated by *IntelEX*. We test whether the generated rules can catch attacks in Splunk. The precision, recall and F1 score should be higher, the better; The attempts should be smaller, the better.

TTPs	Precision (\uparrow)		Recall (\uparrow)		F1 score (\uparrow)		Attempts to pass grammar check (\downarrow)	
	No TTP	TTP	No TTP	TTP	No TTP	TTP	No TTP	TTP
Reconnaissance	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0	0
Initial Access	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5	1
Execution	0.909	1.00	0.416	0.655	0.571	0.792	2	0
Persistence	1.00	1.00	0.714	0.867	0.833	0.929	2	1
Privilege Escalation	0.00	0.105	0.00	0.200	0.00	0.138	5	4
Defense Evasion	0.600	0.518	0.656	0.538	0.627	0.528	12	3
Credential Access	1.00	1.00	0.273	0.545	0.429	0.706	8	2
Discovery	0.167	0.167	0.100	0.167	0.125	0.167	2	3
Lateral Movement	1.00	1.00	0.667	0.800	0.800	0.889	5	0
Collection	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0	0
Command and Control	0.500	0.667	1.00	1.00	0.667	0.800	3	1
Exfiltration	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.077	0.00	0.143	12	4
Impact	0.594	0.775	0.731	0.816	0.655	0.795	24	5

Table 9: Efficiency of the end-to-end performance in generating rules per CTI report. The short reports are with an average of 59 words. The long reports are with an average of 408 words.

CTI Reports	Average Generated Rules	Average Money Costs	Average Time
Short	5	0.009\$	16.6s
Long	18	0.038\$	212.8s

Table 10: Usefulness of the generated procedures.

Scores	Frequency	Percentage
Useless	79	6.98%
Useful	109	9.63%
Extremely useful	945	83.48%

(e.g., Cowrie logs the vulnerable commands), file operation (e.g., modify critical files such as `/etc/passwd` to create or alter users, maintaining persistent access to the system) or even ransomware (e.g., upload and execute ransomware or encrypt files on the system). In summary, our honeypot collects web application logs with a total of 64,185 events for three months from 22nd Jul-22nd Oct 2024.

To generate the relevant rules, we analyze the application logs from the first month of 22nd Jul-20th Aug 2024 and create relevant reports from the web corpus to generate rules, which are used to test the effectiveness of the logs from the next two months of 20th, Aug.-22nd Oct. 2024. We use *IntelEX* to generate TTPs, and follow the same workflow in Table 6 to generate the final rules. To accommodate the web application logs, we slightly modify the guidelines used in the rule generation prompt, which are detailed in Table 18 in Appendix A. In this field study, we generate a total of 135

rules based on the attack reports happened in the first month. We compare our generated rules to existing rule sets from Sigma [6] and Splunk [45], with details shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Basic information of the rules-set used in the field study. The Sigma rules are converted into Splunk rules, which are also open-sourced in the repository [53].

Rules-set	Folders	Size
Sigma [6]	emerging threat rules	366
Splunk [45]	application and web	121
Ours [53]	–	135




Figure 10: Results of Field Study: The rules’ effectiveness on real-world logs in the wild collected from the honeypot.

Similarly, we ingest the test logs (from 20th, Aug.–22nd Oct. 2024) into Splunk, and use three rule sets (shown in Table 11) to test whether they can fire to catch the test malicious logs. To evaluate the rule sets’ performance, we let our two hired staff carefully label the malicious events in the logs collected by Honeypot. We summarize the labeling principles as that containing sensitive paths like “/etc/passwd”, malicious IP address [63], mass repeat requests like brute-force attacks or scans, or access the sensitive files like “/phpmyadmin/, /server-status”, etc. We open-source all the collected logs and the labeled ground truth from honeypots in [53]. In experiments, we define malicious security events as those originating from the same labeled malicious IP sources, as IPs often indicate coordinated or repeated attacks. Once a suspicious IP is identified in a network attack, all its behaviors are monitored, reflecting real-world practices in tracking and mitigating threats.

We report the percentage of precision and recall in the wild across three rule sets in Figure 10, where we can find that the rules generated by *IntelEX* significantly outperform existing Sigma or Splunk rules in detecting malicious events in the wild. This improvement stems from *IntelEX*’s ability to enhance static knowledge in existing rule databases by incorporating attack information from the first month, filling gaps in detection logic. Existing rule sets lack this early attack data, as no other tools currently automate rule generation, leaving the task to security experts—a costly process. This is one of our key motivations for developing this tool for automatic rule generation.

Additionally, we also check the security events that can only be captured by *IntelEX*, and find that such ex-

ploits mostly align with the trend of targeting API endpoints and web application with injection attacks (e.g., the *phpunit/src/Util/PHP/eval-stdin.php* for remote code execution). Specifically, *IntelEX* captures more targeted file paths (such as *.env*, */phpMyAdmin/index.php*, and *.git/config*), while the Sigma report focuses more on generic malicious scripts or files (such as *Build.bat*). We note that the Sigma and Splunk rules may sometimes be effective such as on September 14, 2024, this is perhaps because the indicators like */.env* and */login.jsp* (i.e., Files like *.env* often contain sensitive configuration data, including secrets and credentials) were present. However, existing open-source rules will mostly fail to capture more sophisticated, obfuscated, or evasive attack variants. We highlight that **our generated rules would be practical given the prevalence of attack variants in the wild.**

5. Discussion

Security Takeaways. (1) We demonstrate the potential of LLMs in CTI parsing tasks, where *IntelEX* excels at capturing nuanced semantics to improve the accuracy and interpretability of tactic and technique identification beyond traditional natural-language techniques; (2) *IntelEX* significantly supports two real-world applications, particularly by making substantial progress toward automating rule-based detection—a known pain point in industry.

Future Works. First, further work can focus on fine-tuning LLMs to better extract attack-level threat intelligence with detailed TTPs. It is worth emphasizing that high-quality data is essential for this process, which can not only improve the accuracy but also enable deeper mapping capabilities. Second, we generate Sigma rules, instead of more customized and complex rules [64]. We believe *IntelEX* has shown that LLMs show great potential in generating such complex rules satisfying the specific SIEM vendors, which we leave as the future works.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a feasible solution called *IntelEX* for automatically extracting the attack-level threat intelligence with fine-grained TTPs from an unstructured CTI report. We use the revolutionary ICL capabilities of LLMs with the *LLM-as-a-judgment* modular to identify the relevant tactics, techniques, and generate the procedure implementations, which serve as attack re-construction or attack variants potentially. Our evaluation results show that *IntelEX* can extract techniques with a higher F1 score up to 0.902. We provide two application scenarios to show that the extracted TTP can significantly improve rule generation, reducing the boring and error-prone workflow for security analysts. We empirically show that the generated rules by *IntelEX* can outperform existing rules-set in detecting malicious events in the wild.

References

- [1] K. Mukherjee, J. Wiedemeier, T. Wang, J. Wei, F. Chen, M. Kim, M. Kantarcioglu, and K. Jee, "Evading provenance-based ML detectors with adversarial system actions," in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 9-11, 2023*, J. A. Calandrino and C. Troncoso, Eds. USENIX Association, 2023, pp. 1199–1216. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/mukherjee>
- [2] Z. Cheng, Q. Lv, J. Liang, Y. Wang, D. Sun, T. Pasquier, and X. Han, "Kairos: Practical intrusion detection and investigation using whole-system provenance," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2308.05034, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.05034>
- [3] A. Goyal, X. Han, G. Wang, and A. Bates, "Sometimes, you aren't what you do: Mimicry attacks against provenance graph host intrusion detection systems," in *30th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2023, San Diego, California, USA, February 27 - March 3, 2023*. The Internet Society, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/sometimes-you-arent-what-you-do-mimicry-attacks-against-provenance-graph-host-intrusion-detection-systems/>
- [4] "Sec settles charges against rr donnelley related to cybersecurity incident disclosure and internal access controls." 2024, <https://www.cooley.com/news/insight/2024/2024-07-17-sec-settles-charges-against-rr-donnelley-related-to-cybersecurity-incident-disclosure-and-internal-access-controls>.
- [5] <https://digitalguardian.com/blog/cyber-security-investments-Experts-discuss-detection-vs-prevention-2020>.
- [6] <https://github.com/SigmaHQ/sigma/>, sigma – Generic Signature Format for SIEM Systems – GitHub, 2023.
- [7] S. N. Bhatt, P. K. Manadhata, and L. Zomlot, "The operational role of security information and event management systems," *IEEE Secur. Priv.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 35–41, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2014.103>
- [8] Z. Li, J. Zeng, Y. Chen, and Z. Liang, "Attackkg: Constructing technique knowledge graph from cyber threat intelligence reports," in *Computer Security - ESORICS 2022 - 27th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 26-30, 2022, Proceedings, Part I*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, V. Atluri, R. D. Pietro, C. D. Jensen, and W. Meng, Eds., vol. 13554. Springer, 2022, pp. 589–609. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17140-6_29
- [9] P. Gao, F. Shao, X. Liu, X. Xiao, Z. Qin, F. Xu, P. Mittal, S. R. Kulkarni, and D. Song, "Enabling efficient cyber threat hunting with cyber threat intelligence," in *37th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2021, Chania, Greece, April 19-22, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 193–204. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00024>
- [10] B. Sean, "Standardizing cyber threat intelligence information with the structured threat information expression (stix)," *Mitre Corporation*, vol. 11, pp. 1–22, 2012.
- [11] D. Bazeul and F. Grelot, "The use of iocs to detect and respond to cyber threats."
- [12] T. M. Corporation, "The att&ck knowledge base is used as a foundation for the development of specific threat models and methodologies in the private sector, in government, and in the cybersecurity product and service community." 2024, <https://attack.mitre.org/>.
- [13] Y. Ghazi, Z. Anwar, R. Mumtaz, S. Saleem, and A. Tahir, "A supervised machine learning based approach for automatically extracting high-level threat intelligence from unstructured sources," in *2018 International Conference on Frontiers of Information Technology, FIT 2018, Islamabad, Pakistan, December 17-19, 2018*. IEEE Computer Society, 2018, pp. 129–134. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIT.2018.00030>
- [14] B. Jin, E. Kim, H. Lee, E. Bertino, D. Kim, and H. Kim, "Sharing cyber threat intelligence: Does it really help?" in *Proceedings of 19th Annual Network & Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 2024)*, 2024.
- [15] Z. Li, Z. Yang, and M. Wang, "Reinforcement learning with human feedback: Learning dynamic choices via pessimism," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2305.18438, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.18438>
- [16] X. Long, J. Zeng, F. Meng, Z. Ma, K. Zhang, B. Zhou, and J. Zhou, "Generative multi-modal knowledge retrieval with large language models," in *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2014, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, M. J. Wooldridge, J. G. Dy, and S. Natarajan, Eds. AAAI Press, 2024, pp. 18 733–18 741. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i17.29837>
- [17] M. Zyda, "Large language models and generative ai, oh my!" *Computer*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 127–132, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2024.3350290>
- [18] O. AI, "Gpt-4o-mini," <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4o-mini-advanced-cost-efficient-intelligence/>, 2024.
- [19] —, "Gpt-4o," <https://sea.mashable.com/tech/32549/openai-announces-gpt-4o-a-multimodal-voice-assistant-thats-free-for-all-chatgpt-users>, 2024.
- [20] P. Tseng, Z. Yeh, X. Dai, and P. Liu, "Using llms to automate threat intelligence analysis workflows in security operation centers," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2407.13093, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.13093>
- [21] Y. Schwartz, L. Ben-Shimol, D. Mimran, Y. Elovici, and A. Shabtai, "Llmcloudhunter: Harnessing llms for automated extraction of detection rules from cloud-based CTI," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2407.05194, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.05194>
- [22] P. S. H. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, H. Küttler, M. Lewis, W. Yih, T. Rocktäschel, S. Riedel, and D. Kiela, "Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/6b493230205f780e1bc26945df7481e5-Abstract.html>
- [23] D. Edge, H. Trinh, N. Cheng, J. Bradley, A. Chao, A. Mody, S. Truitt, and J. Larson, "From local to global: A graph RAG approach to query-focused summarization," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2404.16130, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.16130>
- [24] "Vulnerability research," 2024, https://talosintelligence.com/vulnerability_info.
- [25] Z. Li, J. Zeng, Y. Chen, and Z. Liang2, "Attackkg open-sourced ground truth," 2022.
- [26] <https://shorturl.at/dgTsP>, state of Security 2024: The Race to Harness AI.
- [27] P. Gao, X. Liu, E. Choi, B. Soman, C. Mishra, K. Farris, and D. Song, "A system for automated open-source threat intelligence gathering and management," in *SIGMOD '21: International Conference on Management of Data, Virtual Event, China, June 20-25, 2021*, G. Li, Z. Li, S. Idreos, and D. Srivastava, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 2716–2720. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3452745>
- [28] D. Mu, A. Cuevas, L. Yang, H. Hu, X. Xing, B. Mao, and G. Wang, "Understanding the reproducibility of crowd-reported security vulnerabilities," in *27th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2018, Baltimore, MD, USA, August 15-17, 2018*, W. Enck and A. P. Felt, Eds. USENIX Association, 2018, pp. 919–936. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity18/presentation/mu>


- [29] "Introduction to stix," 2024, <https://oasis-open.github.io/cti-documentation/stix/intro.html>.
- [30] A. Virkud, M. A. Inam, A. Riddle, J. Liu, G. Wang, and A. Bates, "How does endpoint detection use the MITRE ATT&CK framework?" in *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. Philadelphia, PA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2024, pp. 3891–3908. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenix-security24/presentation/virkud>
- [31] R. Sommer and V. Paxson, "Outside the closed world: On using machine learning for network intrusion detection," in *31st IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2010, 16-19 May 2010, Berkeley/Oakland, California, USA*. IEEE Computer Society, 2010, pp. 305–316. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2010.25>
- [32] 2017.
- [33] X. Liao, K. Yuan, X. Wang, Z. Li, L. Xing, and R. A. Beyah, "Acing the IOC game: Toward automatic discovery and analysis of open-source cyber threat intelligence," in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Vienna, Austria, October 24-28, 2016*, E. R. Weippl, S. Katzenbeisser, C. Kruegel, A. C. Myers, and S. Halevi, Eds. ACM, 2016, pp. 755–766. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978315>
- [34] G. Husari, E. Al-Shaer, M. Ahmed, B. Chu, and X. Niu, "Ttpdrill: Automatic and accurate extraction of threat actions from unstructured text of CTI sources," in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, Orlando, FL, USA, December 4-8, 2017*. ACM, 2017, pp. 103–115. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3134600.3134646>
- [35] S. M. Milajerdi, B. Eshete, R. Gjomemo, and V. N. Venkatakrishnan, "POIROT: aligning attack behavior with kernel audit records for cyber threat hunting," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2019, London, UK, November 11-15, 2019*, L. Cavallaro, J. Kinder, X. Wang, and J. Katz, Eds. ACM, 2019, pp. 1813–1830. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319535.3363217>
- [36] V. Legoy, M. Caselli, C. Seifert, and A. Peter, "Automated retrieval of att&ck tactics and techniques for cyber threat reports," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2004.14322, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.14322>
- [37] K. Satvat, R. Gjomemo, and V. N. Venkatakrishnan, "Extractor: Extracting attack behavior from threat reports," in *IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy, EuroS&P 2021, Vienna, Austria, September 6-10, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 598–615. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP51992.2021.00046>
- [38] J. Zeng, Z. L. Chua, Y. Chen, K. Ji, Z. Liang, and J. Mao, "WATSON: abstracting behaviors from audit logs via aggregation of contextual semantics," in *28th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2021, virtually, February 21-25, 2021*. The Internet Society, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/watson-abstracting-behaviors-from-audit-logs-via-aggregation-of-contextual-semantics/>
- [39] S. N. Bhatt, P. K. Manadhata, and L. Zomlot, "The operational role of security information and event management systems," *IEEE Secur. Priv.*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 35–41, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2014.103>
- [40] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. L. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray, J. Schulman, J. Hilton, F. Kelton, L. Miller, M. Simens, A. Aspell, P. Welinder, P. F. Christiano, J. Leike, and R. Lowe, "Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, Eds., 2022. [Online]. Available: http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/b1efde53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html
- [41] Y. Liu, Y. Xue, D. Wu, Y. Sun, Y. Li, M. Shi, and Y. Liu, "Propertygpt: Llm-driven formal verification of smart contracts through retrieval-augmented property generation," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2405.02580, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.02580>
- [42] J. C. Yang, M. Korecki, D. Dailisan, C. I. Hausladen, and D. Helbing, "LLM voting: Human choices and AI collective decision making," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2402.01766, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.01766>
- [43] I. Chalkidis, "Investigating llms as voting assistants via contextual augmentation: A case study on the european parliament elections 2024," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2407.08495, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.08495>
- [44] L. Zheng, W. Chiang, Y. Sheng, S. Zhuang, Z. Wu, Y. Zhuang, Z. Lin, Z. Li, D. Li, E. P. Xing, H. Zhang, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stoica, "Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, Eds., 2023. [Online]. Available: http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/91f18a1287b398d378ef22505bf41832-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html
- [45] https://github.com/splunk/security_content/tree/develop/detections/network_splunk_Open-sourced_Rules.
- [46] "Vulnerability reports in cisco talos," 2024, https://talosintelligence.com/vulnerability_reports#disclosed.
- [47] "Top 10 most common mitre tactics& techniques," 2022, <https://redcanary.com/threat-detection-report/techniques/>.
- [48] C. Proof, "Top 10 attack techniques financial organizations should monitor in 2024," 2024, <https://go.cyberproof.com/hubfs/Infographic%20-%20Top%2010%20attack%20techniques%20financial%20organizations%20should%20monitor%20in%202024.pdf>.
- [49] "The top ten mitre att&ck techniques," 2020, <https://www.picussecurity.com/resource/the-top-ten-mitre-attck-techniques>.
- [50] "Atomic red team™ is a library of tests mapped to the mitre att&ck framework. security teams can use atomic red team to quickly, portably, and reproducibly test their environments." 2022, <https://github.com/redcanaryco/atomic-red-team/tree/master/atomics>.
- [51] T. Burt, "Microsoft report shows increasing sophistication of cyber threats," 2020, <https://blogs.microsoft.com/on-the-issues/2020/09/29/microsoft-digital-defense-report-cyber-threats/>.
- [52] "Darpa transparent computing (tc) program: Engagement 3," 2018.
- [53] "Our open-sourced datasets and more details," 2024, <https://sites.google.com/view/intelx11>.
- [54] D. Harper and R. Mabe, "The cost of cybersecurity for it systems," 2020, https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/cyber_cost_brief_it_cast_25_aug_2020_harper_mabe.pdf.
- [55] N. Rastogi, S. Dutta, A. Gittens, M. J. Zaki, and C. C. Aggarwal, "TINKER: A framework for open source cyberthreat intelligence," in *IEEE International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications, TrustCom 2022, Wuhan, China, December 9-11, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1569–1574. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TrustCom56396.2022.00225>
- [56] M. O. Ozmen, R. Song, H. Farrukh, and Z. B. Celik, "Evasion attacks and defenses on smart home physical event verification," in *30th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2023, San Diego, California, USA, February 27 - March 3, 2023*. The Internet Society, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/evasion-attacks-and-defenses-on-smart-home-physical-event-verification/>
- [57] R. Uetz, M. Herzog, L. Hackländer, S. Schwarz, and M. Henze, "You cannot escape me: Detecting evasions of SIEM rules in enterprise networks," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2311.10197, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.10197>

- [58] M. Nawrocki, J. Kristoff, R. Hiesgen, C. Kanich, T. C. Schmidt, and M. Wählisch, "Sok: A data-driven view on methods to detect reflective amplification ddos attacks using honeypots," in *8th IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy, EuroS&P 2023, Delft, Netherlands, July 3-7, 2023*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 576–591. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP57164.2023.00041>
- [59] Q. Wang, W. U. Hassan, D. Li, K. Jee, X. Yu, K. Zou, J. Rhee, Z. Chen, W. Cheng, C. A. Gunter, and H. Chen, "You are what you do: Hunting stealthy malware via data provenance analysis," in *27th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2020, San Diego, California, USA, February 23-26, 2020*. The Internet Society, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss-paper/you-are-wh-at-you-do-hunting-stealthy-malware-via-data-provenance-analysis/>
- [60] C. Rossow, C. J. Dietrich, C. Grier, C. Kreibich, V. Paxson, N. Pohlmann, H. Bos, and M. van Steen, "Prudent practices for designing malware experiments: Status quo and outlook," in *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2012, 21-23 May 2012, San Francisco, California, USA*. IEEE Computer Society, 2012, pp. 65–79. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2012.14>
- [61] E. Pauley and P. McDaniel, "Understanding the ethical frameworks of internet measurement studies," in *2nd International Workshop on Ethics in Computer Security, 2023*.
- [62] <https://isc.sans.edu/honeypot.html>, dShield Honeypot.
- [63] <https://www.virustotal.com/gui/home/upload>, analyse suspicious files, domains, IPs and URLs to detect malware and other breaches, automatically share them with the security community.
- [64] <https://research.splunk.com/detections/>, splunk-Customized Detection Rules.

Appendix

1. More Examples

Examples on the vector database in our GraphRAG



(a) Clusters in our vector database of GraphRAG. (b) One example in one cluster.

Figure 11: Demonstration of our vector database in GraphRAG.

As shown in Figure 11, clusters in our vector database of GraphRAG demonstrates the relevant entities and relationships in existing procedures. When generating the new procedures, it could first go through the knowledge graph and then generate the specific procedures.

2. More Detailed Prompts

Table 12: The detailed prompt for IoC extraction.

Guidelines :
Below is the instruction to finish the task:

- The IoCs should include IP addresses, domain names, URLs, file hashes, etc.
- Focus on terms that describe the nature of the attack, the software, or methods being used.
- The output needs to be in JSON format.
- If there is no IoC in the report, return an empty list.

The output format is as follows:
{"ioc": ["IOC1", "IOC2", ...]}

Examples :

Below is an example of IoCs:
Anomalous Outbound Traffic on the Network

- Ip Address:
- Domain Name:

Unusual User Account Activity

- file hash
- URL

Table 13: The detailed prompt in in-context learning in classifying the tactics and techniques.

Guidelines :
Tactics represent the "why" of an ATT&CK technique or sub-technique. It is the adversary's tactical goal: the reason for performing an action. For example, an adversary may want to achieve credential access.
Techniques represent 'how' an adversary achieves a tactical goal by performing an action. For example, an adversary may dump credentials to achieve credential access.
Below is the instruction to finish the task:

- You need to analyse the techniques used in the attack.
- Make sure that the techniques are one of the techniques above.
- The output needs to be in JSON format.

Table 14: The detailed prompt for LLM as a judgment.

Guidelines :
Below is the instruction to finish the task:

- You need to verify whether the technique exists in the report.
- If the technique exists in the report, you need to output YES and the reason.
- If the technique does not exist in the report, you need to output NO and the reason.
- The output needs to be in JSON format. The output format is as follows:
{"if_exist": "YES/NO", "reason": "REASON"}

Table 15: The detailed prompt for procedure generation. The red and green component is mutable regarding the report content and the GraphRAG's response.

Background :
 You are a helpful assistant for a cybersecurity analyst. You will be given a cyber threat intelligence (CTI) report.

Task :
 Your task is to extract procedures and transform it into a structured format.
 The procedure is the steps taken by the attacker to achieve their goal.
 The procedure usually contains entities, actions, and relationships.

Guidelines :
 Below is the instruction to finish the task:

- Do not extract the tactic and technique used in the attack, only the procedure.
- The results need to be presented in a clear format, preferably in paragraphs.
- Each procedure should conform to the format of the procedure: <entity> <relationship> <action>
- Use 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 ... to list the steps.
- You need to pay most attention to IoCs (Indicators of Compromise) and entities.
- The output needs to be in JSON format.

The output format is as follows:
 {"procedure": ["1. PROCEDURE1", "2. PROCEDURE2", "3. PROCEDURE3", ...]}

Input:
 The original report is as follows: {attack_report}
 The analysis report is as follows: {GraphRAG_response}

Final prompt:
 Background + Task + Guidelines + Input

Table 16: The detailed guidelines for rule generation.

Guidelines :
 Below is the instruction to finish the task:

- Your generated rules should be in YAML format.
- Your generated rules should be diverse in nature, ensuring a wide variety of rules and reducing redundancy as much as possible.
- The rules you generate need to catch as many malicious logs as possible, but they need to be specific. You cannot generate general rules.
- You need to think about the extended operations of the attack to generate corresponding rules with extended meanings.
- Generate sigma rules as much as possible!
- No explanation needed.
- Do not generate any other irrelevant characters or words.
- Do not generate "id" for the rule.

Table 17: The detailed prompt for rule judgment.

Guidelines :
 Below is the instruction for the task:

- You should be very tough on the rules. If the rule is not relevant to the CTI report, you should filter it out.
- If the rule is too general and does not match the CTI report, you need to filter it out.
- If the rule should be kept, the "relevant" field should be set to "YES".
- If the rule should be filtered out, the "relevant" field should be set to "NO".
- The output format should be in JSON format.

Below is the json format:
 {"reason": "REASON", "relevant": "YES/NO"}

Table 18: The detailed guidelines for field study, which generates rules for web application logs.

Guidelines :
 Below is the instruction for the task:

- Your generated rules should be in YAML format.
- Your generated rules should be diverse in nature, ensuring a wide variety of rules and reducing redundancy as much as possible.
- The rules you generate need to catch as many malicious logs as possible, but they need to be specific. You cannot generate general rules.
- Generate sigma rules as much as possible!
- No explanation needed.
- Do not generate any other irrelevant characters or words.
- Do not generate "id" for the rule.
- The fields in the sigma rule should only be 'user_agent', 'extracted_source', 'url', which means the selection should be based on these fields.
