

# WiP: Deception-in-Depth Using Multiple Layers of Deception

Jason Landsborough<sup>1</sup>, Neil Rowe<sup>2</sup>, Thuy Nguyen<sup>2</sup>, and Sunny Fugate<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NIWC Pacific, San Diego, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, USA

April 2024

## Abstract

Deception is being increasingly explored as a cyberdefense strategy to protect operational systems. We are studying implementation of deception-in-depth strategies with initially three logical layers: network, host, and data. We draw ideas from military deception, network orchestration, software deception, file deception, fake honeypots, and moving-target defenses. We are building a prototype representing our ideas and will be testing it in several adversarial environments. We hope to show that deploying a broad range of deception techniques can be more effective in protecting systems than deploying single techniques. Unlike traditional deception methods that try to encourage active engagement from attackers to collect intelligence, we focus on deceptions that can be used on real machines to discourage attacks.

**Keywords:** multilayer defense, deception-in-depth, cyber deception, honeypot

## 1 Introduction

Cyberattacks are increasing in quantity and sophistication, and increasingly affect our daily lives. Cybersecurity was a \$153.65 billion market in 2022 [12]. Despite all the current security products and decades of research, attackers are still getting into systems. New ideas are needed.

Military organizations have experience with non-cyber attacks over many years, and may provide useful cyberdefense ideas. Nation-states are increasingly mounting cyberattacks against other nation-states and associated organizations. Cyberattacks can often be a force multiplier for traditional military operations. For example, in Operation GLOWING SYMPHONY, US Cyber Command targeted ISIS cyber assets to hurt their operations [22]. Russia has also been using cyberattacks to target Ukraine, such as the CrashOverride malware that affected the power grid [3]. The US military is often a target for cyberattacks. For example, Iran compromised a U.S. Navy Network which took defenders four months to

repair by eliminating the attacker’s access points [36]. Cyberattacks are also cost-effective for intelligence gathering, because organizations do not need a spy on the inside to steal information.

Defensive deception is a promising way to aid cyber defenders. Deception can influence attackers to have false beliefs that impede their operations [28], reducing their asymmetric advantage over defenders of surprise [5, 30]. Deception can also waste the attacker’s time, a valuable resource in the civilian world as well as the military [6, 7, 18]. These delays can give defenders more freedom of maneuver [5].

Defensive cyber deception designed to encourage interaction often uses lures such as honeypots, but these are often easy to detect and ignore. A more varied set of deceptions inspired by traditional cybersecurity and military concepts of defense-in-depth could provide a more balanced approach to deception, especially if it protects real systems. In contrast to deceptions for encouragement that lure an attacker, such as traditional honeypots, discouraging deception tries to help real systems deter attacks.

## 2 Cyber Deception Approaches

We describe here the cyber deception methods we think most effective in providing defense-in-depth. Many cyber deception approaches come from military operations. Network orchestration technologies such as software-defined networking offer opportunities to introduce deception into a network itself, which is useful against the attacker doing network reconnaissance. Host-based deception can be used after an attacker successfully exploits or accesses a system. Data-based deception interferes with reconnaissance, lateral movement, or exfiltration and is often used with data objects such as fake files (honeypots). Honeypots and honeytokens can often be easy to recognize, but there are ways to make it more difficult. Two-sided deception is an approach to not only make honeypots look more realistic, but make real systems look fake. Finally, moving-target defenses can work well with deception to randomize the attacker experience, causing delays, forcing repeated work, and creating anxiety about possible detection.

### 2.1 Military Deception

Deception has been used by militaries for a long time. The U. S. military uses a systematic approach to deception called *MILDEC*, defined as “actions executed to deliberately mislead adversary military, paramilitary, or violent extremist organization decision makers, thereby causing the adversary to take specific actions (or inactions) that will contribute to the accomplishment of the friendly mission” [1]. *MILDEC* plans to deliver deception techniques to a deception target through mechanisms called conduits to affect the target’s quality of information. *MILDEC* categorizes techniques as either physical (such as the movement or training of forces), technical (using conduits such as media or computer networks), or administrative (using resources to signal or deny the deception).

Military deception methods vary in how well they translate to cyberspace. An assessment of techniques found that insights, lies, and concealment of intentions were the most appropriate for defense [27, 28]. Insights, or expectation of attacker actions, exploit how an attacker

thinks and use that against them, such as knowing what information an attacker is likely to seek. Lies, false responses to questions or requests, are useful because computer systems are usually very accurate in displaying facts true about a system to a user. Concealment of intentions is done by honeypots to encourage interaction by an attacker.

## 2.2 Deception with Network Orchestration

Network orchestration is often done with software-defined networking. It uses two network planes: the data plane through which the traffic is routed and a control plane which modifies network devices. When used for deception, software-defined networking can redirect traffic from a real network to a deceptive network [32]. It can rewrite packets and modify network flows to do this, such as with the OpenFlow software-defined networking framework.

The Chaos system used software-defined networking to assign random IP addresses to hosts, insert fake responses, and redirect traffic to a decoy server [31]. The deception strategy assessed the risk of an asset, and was more likely to do this to risky assets. Risk can be judged by intrusion-detection systems, unexpected connections, or known vulnerabilities.

## 2.3 Host-based Deception

Host-based deception focuses on an attack target. Examples are intelligent software decoys that deceive only when an interface is being abused [18] or when an attacker or malicious code violates certain preconditions. An attacker could see information that incorrectly suggests that they successfully exploited a piece of software. Existing software can be made deceptive without modifying it by implementing a “wrapper” or outer routine around it.

A small-scale human-subject experiment tested the effectiveness of a Windows host-based deception [30]. The goal was to determine if the deception frustrated or slowed the attackers. The participants had information-technology experience, and were given a network of workstations running simulated supervisory control and data acquisition software as well as decoy hosts, and were asked to explore the network. The control group, interacting with real hosts, did perform better than the group that had deception present, indicating that the host-based deception was effective.

## 2.4 Data-based Deception

Honeytokens are objects to entice an attacker to reveal their capabilities or goals. For example, a honeytoken can be a file showing a false network topology, which can entice attackers to use it in searching the network, receiving many error messages. One company offers honeyfiles in a variety of formats which contain “beacons” that transmit data to the defender about attacker activities [35]. Weaknesses of honeytokens are that beacons may only be triggered upon read of a file, and may not be triggered at all if read offline. Yuill et al. developed a honeyfile file system to better monitor access of these files [38].

Honeytokens for tabular data were studied by Shabtai et al. [29]. One experiment created honeytokens containing fake profiles of people with attributes such as age, country, eye color, job title, and education level; these could help track phishing and identity theft. Another experiment had students playing the role of a banker approving loans. Bankers

got a commission from loans they approved for the bank, and a larger commission if they misused the data by referring the customer to a private funding source. Fake loan requests that could earn large commissions were created using their honeypot generator. They found that including the fakes in 20% of the list of loans resulted in detecting 100% of the loans that were referred to a private funding source, so the fakes helped detect illegal actions.

## 2.5 Fingerprinting Honeypots and Honeytokens

Much research has examined “fingerprinting” (identifying honeypots and honeytokens) by default configurations, their instrumentation or alerting mechanisms, or their missing features. The Shodan security tool scans networks and reports information about Internet-connected devices; it has a proprietary algorithm to recognize honeypots, which they call a Honeyscore [33]. It provides a probability between 0.0 and 1.0 that a honeypot is at a given IP address. A study of ICS honeypots found that Shodan’s Honeyscore had a precision of 70.3%, using a Honeyscore of 0.5 or above as a positive result [26].

Another study tried to recognize instances of a honeypot called GasPot that mimics a device which measures the level of a tank [39]. It identified these characteristics of the device as relevant:

- Use of the default configuration with well-known hard-coded values.
- Implementation of only a subset of a protocol claimed by the device.
- Replies to queries with static values or highly predictable changes.
- Use of a traditional computing operating system instead of a more special-purpose operating system.

With the above characteristics, the study could identify 17 GasPot instances on the Internet, whereas Shodan’s Honeyscore detected only 9, with no false positives. Gaspot responded quicker than real Automatic Tank Gauging devices which could also be used as an indicator. GasPot’s output also indicated that it was running on Linux, since real devices used the carriage return and line feed for a new lines. Gaspot originally only implemented 5 commands defined in the protocol used by real devices, which was also suspicious.

Thinkst offers a honeytoken service which they call Canarytokens. They offer their honeytokens in formats such as Microsoft Office documents, PDF files, Web bug reports, QR codes [35]. A study tested the PDF honeytoken offered by Thinkst [34]. Two techniques were used to detect the honeytoken: They sniffed network traffic to find DNS requests to the *canarytokens.net* domain associated with Thinkst, and they parsed the PDF file and found an obfuscated link pointing to the same *canarytokens.net* domain. The same authors found other canarytokens had fingerprintable features, such as that AWS keys generated by Thinkst had the substring “AKIAYVP4CIPP” [21]. Furthermore, executable honeytokens were all signed by the same certificate, and documents were created from the same base template with the same universally unique identifier, the same file size, and old file creation dates.

## 2.6 Two-Sided Deception and Fake Deception

Attackers can use tools to detect clues of deceptions such as honeypots and avoid interacting with them [33, 39]. Defenders can use this desire to avoid honeypots to their advantage. A sophisticated attacker in particular, like an advanced persistent threat group, is especially unlikely to target a system they suspect is a honeypot [30, 24, 25, 8]. Defenders can deliberately provide false clues of honeypots to steer attackers away from real systems and towards safer systems that can further waste their time. Honeypots often have default parameter values or implement only a subset of a protocol.

Two-sided deception is a strategy where defenders make honeypots look more realistic while making real assets look less realistic. It can be modeled by game theory [17], as in the honeypot selection game of Pibil et al., an extensive-form model which is extended to allow selection or modification of features on either a real or fake machine [23]. Their work is motivated by the signaling game of Carroll and Grosu [2]. Their model consists of two machines and two features which represent “signals” that can be revealed to the attacker. The defender can change one feature (configuration) with an associated cost, and the attacker observes the state of the machine. They find a small advantage with deception when the cost to modify the features are the same.

## 2.7 Moving-Target Defense and Deception

Much like conventional defenses, an attacker with sufficient time can learn enough about a system to recognize fakes. A way to prevent this is to use moving-target defenses in which the system environment such as IP addresses frequently changes. It works much like a dealer in a casino shuffling a deck of cards to defeat card counting. It makes obsolete what the attacker has learned and requires them repeating reconnaissance and testing. Moving-target defenses have been applied to many aspects of cyber defense including software diversity [16, 10, 14], n-variant program execution [37], and network topology shuffling [11].

Moving target defenses are not necessarily deceptive, but deception can improve them by obscuring information about what they are doing. The Chaos system [31] described in section 2.2 is an example. It assigned random IP addresses to risky hosts. MT6D [4] used Internet Protocol address shuffling in the large address space of the IPv6 protocol to conceal assets. It routinely reassigned addresses, even with active connections in place.

## 3 Evaluating Cyber Defenses

With so many deception options, it is important to evaluate their effectiveness. Many methods can evaluate cyber defenses. An expensive option is to use professional red teams to explore and try to compromise a system or network. This approach was taken in the Tularosa study on the effectiveness of deception [6]. This is not feasible for all organizations, but tools can reduce the cost.

“Breach and attack” simulations can be used to test defenses less expensively. Some are commercial products such as Cobalt Strike, and some are open-source. MITRE offers the Caldera tool (<https://caldera.mitre.org/>) that manages actions with a centralized

Command and Control server and uses a plugin modules to accomplish subtasks. Another popular option is the Atomic Red Team that provides a library of tests for defenses (<https://atomicredteam.io/>). Both are open-source and mapped to the MITRE ATT&CK framework.

An organization called MITRE Engenuity offers attacking and defensive tool evaluations based on the ATT&CK matrix. In 2022 they evaluated two security vendors for deception, CounterCraft and SentinelOne [20]. The attacker they modeled was APT29, which is affiliated with Russian intelligence. The attacker code does not appear to use the Caldera framework but provides a collection of scripts. No evaluation score is given, but the released data shows the result of deception for various attacker techniques.

MITRE offers two other useful tools for planning active defenses including deception, each tied to the ATT&CK attack framework. The D3FEND matrix lists traditional passive defenses, and the ENGAGE matrix lists more active defenses. These provide useful tactics for testing both passive and active defenses against various attacks.

## 4 Research Methodology

To research how new and existing deceptions can contribute to deception-in-depth, we will examine multilayered deception architectures. It is important to assess not only the effectiveness of the deceptions themselves, but how the success or failure of each deception affects the success or failure of the others.

We identify three generic logical layers for deception: the network, the host, and the data. These represent areas where an attacker can interact with a system and acquire information. We consider the network layer to be what is accessible externally over a network connection without user or kernel-space access. For example, routing of packets and querying a system with a network protocol would be network-layer activities. Host-layer activities would typically involve a user interface such as a shell or graphical display on a host.

Other deceptive layers can include deception on machines that act as a relay or dashboard for information, such as interfaces for control systems. Deception can be built into hardware as a physical layer of deception. We can also consider an attacker layer, where a defender “hacks back” the attacker, compromising their tools to introduce false information.

Knowing what deceptions to use requires knowing what techniques an attacker might use. We explored this in our earlier work examining advanced persistent threat techniques [15]. We used the MITRE APT groups dataset, where we identified the two most common techniques for a given tactic and candidate deceptions [19]. The most promising deceptions were network deception, fake users, fake system information, and fake file-system tools. We explored three publicly described attack campaigns to assess if deceptions could have been useful in thwarting those attacks. We also discussed modeling the connections between layers using conditional probabilities. Certain deceptions are more effective at different layers, but attributes of the attacker’s reaction to the deception are also important to consider. Measures of the attacker’s engagement include patience, adaptability, suspiciousness, alertness, and skill.

We describe the two phases of our proposed research below.

## 4.1 Phase 1 Work – Ongoing

First we must create an attack scenario based on the APT techniques identified in our prior work [15]. We then must validate implemented deceptions using open-source tools such as Caldera mentioned in Section 3. Open-source attacker simulation tools can help experiments by automating the processes of many trials in a controlled environment. They could also help sharing the evaluation results or the artifacts such as scripts and configurations with other research groups.

We will identify ways to fingerprint some common honeypots, and figure ways to provide those clues to attackers while still enabling a system to be used for non-honeypot purposes, expanding the ideas in Section 2.6. This could be achieved using deceptive network orchestration inspired by work described in Section 2.2.

An efficient way to do this is to identify the characteristics of well-known honeypots, and our preliminary selection considered five factors:

- The honeypot must be *open-source*. Proprietary honeypots tend to be “black boxes” hard to analyze.
- The honeypot is *popular*. This increases the odds that an attacker may be familiar with it and knows how to detect it. It may also mean that the honeypot runs services people have found useful, such as those similar to real machines in their network.
- The honeypot is *maintained*. That means it is likely to work with updated versions of software and operating systems.
- The honeypot should be *Linux-based* for ease of development and applicability to servers. If the honeypot wants to look like a Windows machine or embedded system, it may have to modify features of the operating system besides the deceptive services they run.
- The honeypot has been publicly tagged as a honeypot by existing *fingerprinting tools or approaches*. This will simplify deceptions that discourage the attacker.

Table 1 compares some candidate honeypots to the above criteria.

Table 1: Honeypots

Honeypot	Open source	Popular	Maintained	Linux-based	Fingerprinting
Kippo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Tool
Cowrie	Y	Y	Y	Y	Approach
(Thinkst) Open Canary	Y	Y	Y	Y	N?
Glastopf	Y	Not anymore?	N	Y	Approach
Conpot	Y	Y	N?	Y	Approach
Dionaea	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
(SANS) DShield	Y	N?	Y	Y	Unknown
MongoDB-HoneyProxy	Y	N?	Y	Y	Unknown
GasPot	Y	N?	Y	Y	Approach
Honeyd	Y	N	N	Y	Approach

Deception can also be designed against post-exploitation techniques such as living-off-the-land attacks on the host-based deception layer. These are when an attacker uses existing system tools in their attack rather than downloading their own tools. False system information or file system tools are the most promising. But we also plan to get feedback from professional red-teamers within our professional network and also deploy honeypots to find other promising deceptions. Variety in deceptions is essential to their effectiveness.

## 4.2 Phase 2 Work

Because good attackers combine many techniques during an attack campaign, deception-in-depth should increase the effectiveness of defensive cyber deception interfering with an attacker. We will develop an architecture and criteria for how, why, and where to use multiple layers of deception for a given threat model. A good candidate deception should be compatible with many known attacker techniques, and have well-defined preconditions and postconditions so that defenders or automation can match them to possible attacks. Tracking deceptions and triggering events is also important for interoperability, and may be tied to a defender’s goal. For example, observable actions by an attacker could weaken a deception or could be a form of signaling.

Deceptions interact in several ways. An attacker may not notice or react to a single deception, but multiple deceptions may create a cumulative effect in which an attacker does respond once the deceptions exceed a threshold. People often wait to make real-time decisions until enough pieces fall into place [13], and this could be modeled as a threshold of cumulative deception.

In general, we can assign conditional probabilities that deceptions work given that the attacker has seen another deception previously [15]. We can also assign costs to both the attacker and defender, and then reason about the resulting decision trees to find an optimal defense. Figure 1 shows a tree for a scenario where an attacker is presented with a false excuse that a network is down. The costs to the attacker are  $c_i$ , the cost of initial connection, and  $c_{nw}$ , the cost of maintaining the connection. The benefit to the attacker is identified as  $b_{nw}$ , the benefit of maintaining the network connection. The probability of alertness is represented as  $p_n$ , the probability the attacker notices the false excuse. The attacker’s suspiciousness is represented as  $p_b$ , the probability that the attacker believes the excuse. Adaptability can be represented as  $p_g$ , the probability that the attacker gives up, and  $p_r$ , the probability that the attacker retries.

Decision-tree analysis may be unnecessary for the many attackers that are looking for easy targets, since simple deceptions may suffice in getting them to leave. We will try to identify such deceptions to simplify planning. Advanced persistent threat actors do not generally seek easy targets, but they can still be risk-averse because surprising events interrupt their carefully designed plans, and can cause them to waste resources. Some determined attackers enjoy a challenge and are unwilling to be discouraged from an attack. They are similar to red-teamers who try many attack methods to identify flaws in their target. We need to learn clues to identify the type of adversary that an attacker represents.

As systems become more complex, automation becomes as essential for defenders as for attackers. Automated planning methods from artificial intelligence could help and we will investigate them. We still expect humans to have some supervisory control with such au-






Figure 1: Decision tree for the “network is down” false excuse

tomation, however. Coordinating tasks and boundaries will be important when multiple deception methods are combined, since that could lead to conflicting or sub-optimal solutions if deployed haphazardly. “Working agreements” are a proposed technique allowing an operator and automated system to negotiate a suitable approach to sharing responsibilities. This approach has promise for defining role boundaries, improving calibration of trust, and improving transparency of decision-making [9]. We believe this approach can be directly applied to cyber scenarios where well-defined roles and competencies can help guide multi-layer deception. Setting expectations is particularly true in a situation where the defender must successfully manage emergent properties of a complex composition of deceptions across many layers of the network and computing environment. Working agreements seem useful for managing defenses in environments where there are impacts to legitimate users such as discouraging deceptions on a real server. A technique like working agreements may also be useful for evaluating an automation’s trust in defenders. Fake or low quality working agreements can be presented to defenders to test their responses. Enabling such working agreements could flag further scrutiny to determine if the defender is losing vigilance or is possibly an insider threat. Zero-trust architectures now popular also may also offer new defensive opportunities because they can affect the relevance of deceptions.

## 4.3 Evaluation

We are planning three evaluation phases to validate our work. In the first phase, we will validate our deceptions against standard attacker tools to determine if the tools convey the deception or crash. The second phase will be an adversarial assessment in an controlled environment. This will likely use tools such as Caldera to automate experiments in an isolated lab environment. This phase will also include control experiments where deception is not present.

The third phase will be an adversarial assessment in an uncontrolled environment. This may involve deploying deception to the Internet. A challenge with deploying to the Internet is that the quality of the attacker will be unpredictable, and advanced persistent threats are unlikely to target a random host on the Internet. Internet-based evaluations can still offer results useful for defenders considering deception in such an environment.

Evaluation metrics are important for measuring effectiveness of a defense plan. Whether the deception affected the attacker's behavior is one important measure. If deception is successful, it could cause the attacker to fail to achieve their important goals. The type of failure state is also important to observe. With an accurate simulation of an attacker, we can measure timing characteristics of their actions or the number of steps they take, since often it is desirable to give defenders additional time to mitigate an attack by slowing the attackers rather than stopping them abruptly.

## 5 Conclusion

Defensive cyber deception is a promising tool to aid cyber defenders in protecting the security of their networks and systems. To increase chances of deception interfering with an attacker, a more holistic deception-in-depth strategy is desirable. We discussed several deception methods that can be useful in a multilayered deception approach. We described our recent and ongoing work in examining attacker techniques, evaluation strategy, and popular honeypots. We also discussed our research plan for developing a deception-in-depth architecture to aid defenders in protecting real systems. The components and deployment considerations for deception-in-depth need to be studied more carefully to ensure such an approach can be used effectively.

## Acknowledgements

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. This work was supported by Science, Mathematics And Research for Transformation (SMART) Scholarship for Service Program. Angela Tan created the false excuse scenario and decision tree.

## References

- [1] Military deception. Technical Report Joint Publication 3-13.4, 2012.

- [2] Thomas E Carroll and Daniel Grosu. A game theoretic investigation of deception in network security. *Security and Communication Networks*, 4(10):1162–1172, 2011.
- [3] CISA. Crashoverride malware. URL: <https://www.cisa.gov/news-events/alerts/2017/06/12/crashoverride-malware>.
- [4] Matthew Dunlop, Stephen Groat, William Urbanski, Randy Marchany, and Joseph Tront. Mt6d: A moving target ipv6 defense. In *2011-MILCOM 2011 Military Communications Conference*, pages 1321–1326. IEEE, 2011.
- [5] Kimberly Ferguson-Walter, Sunny Fugate, Justin Mauger, and Maxine Major. Game theory for adaptive defensive cyber deception. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual Symposium on Hot Topics in the Science of Security*, pages 1–8, 2019.
- [6] Kimberly Ferguson-Walter, Temmie Shade, Andrew Rogers, Michael Christopher Stefan Trumbo, Kevin S Nauer, Kristin Marie Divis, Aaron Jones, Angela Combs, and Robert G Abbott. The Tularosa study: An experimental design and implementation to quantify the effectiveness of cyber deception. Technical report, Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States), 2018.
- [7] Kimberly J. Ferguson-Walter, Maxine M. Major, Chelsea K. Johnson, and Daniel H. Muhleman. Examining the efficacy of decoy-based and psychological cyber deception. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 1127–1144. USENIX Association, August 2021. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/ferguson-walter>.
- [8] Javier Franco, Ahmet Aris, Berk Canberk, and A Selcuk Uluagac. A survey of honeypots and honeynets for internet of things, industrial internet of things, and cyber-physical systems. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 23(4):2351–2383, 2021.
- [9] Robert S Gutzwiller, Sarah H Espinosa, Caitlin Kenny, and Douglas S Lange. A design pattern for working agreements in human-autonomy teaming. In *Advances in Human Factors in Simulation and Modeling: Proceedings of the AHFE 2017 International Conference on Human Factors in Simulation and Modeling, July 17–21, 2017, The Westin Bonaventure Hotel, Los Angeles, California, USA 8*, pages 12–24. Springer, 2018.
- [10] Andrei Homescu, Stefan Brunthaler, Per Larsen, and Michael Franz. Librando: transparent code randomization for just-in-time compilers. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer & Communications Security*, pages 993–1004, 2013.
- [11] Jin Bum Hong, Seunghyun Yoon, Hyuk Lim, and Dong Seong Kim. Optimal network reconfiguration for software defined networks using shuffle-based online mtd. In *2017 IEEE 36th Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS)*, pages 234–243. IEEE, 2017.
- [12] Fortune Business Insights. Cyber security market size, share & covid-19 impact analysis, by security type (network security, cloud application security, endpoint security, secure web gateway, application security, and others), by enterprise size (small & medium enterprise and large enterprises), by industry (bfsi,

- it and telecommunications, retail, healthcare, government, manufacturing, travel and transportation, energy and utilities, and others), and region forecast, 2023-2030, 2023. URL: <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/industry-reports/cyber-security-market-101165>.
- [13] Gary A. Klein. *Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions*. The MIT Press, 09 2017. doi:10.7551/mitpress/11307.001.0001.
- [14] Jason Landsborough, Stephen Harding, and Sunny Fugate. Removing the kitchen sink from software. In *Proceedings of the Companion Publication of the 2015 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, pages 833–838, 2015.
- [15] Jason Landsborough, Thuy Nguyen, and Neil Rowe. Retrospectively using multilayer deception in depth against advanced persistent threats. In *HICSS*, 2024 (To appear).
- [16] Per Larsen, Andrei Homescu, Stefan Brunthaler, and Michael Franz. Sok: Automated software diversity. In *2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 276–291. IEEE, 2014.
- [17] Mohammad Sujan Miah, Marcus Gutierrez, Oscar Veliz, Omkar Thakoor, and Christopher Kiekintveld. Concealing cyber-decoys using two-sided feature deception games. In *HICSS*, pages 1–10, 2020.
- [18] James Bret Michael and Richard Riehle. Intelligent software decoys. *Engineering Automation for Reliable Software-Interim Progress Report (10/01/2000-9/30/2001)*, page 80, 2001.
- [19] MITRE. Groups. URL: <https://attack.mitre.org/groups/>.
- [20] MITRE. Apt29 deceptions, 2022. URL: <https://attackervals.mitre-engenuity.org/trials-deceptions/apt29-deceptions/>.
- [21] Mohamed Msaad, Shreyas Srinivasa, Mikkel M Andersen, David H Audran, Charity U Orji, and Emmanouil Vasilomanolakis. Honeysweeper: Towards stealthy honeypot fingerprinting techniques. In *Nordic Conference on Secure IT Systems*, pages 101–119. Springer, 2022.
- [22] NPR. How the u.s. hacked isis, 2019. URL: <https://www.npr.org/2019/09/26/763545811/how-the-u-s-hacked-isis>.
- [23] Radek Píbil, Viliam Lisý, Christopher Kiekintveld, Branislav Bošanský, and Michal Pěchouček. Game theoretic model of strategic honeypot selection in computer networks. In *Decision and Game Theory for Security: Third International Conference, GameSec 2012, Budapest, Hungary, November 5-6, 2012. Proceedings 3*, pages 201–220. Springer, 2012.
- [24] Neil C Rowe. A model of deception during cyber-attacks on information systems. In *IEEE First Symposium on Multi-Agent Security and Survivability, 2004*, pages 21–30. IEEE, 2004.

- [25] Neil C Rowe, E John Custy, and Binh T Duong. Defending cyberspace with fake honeypots. *J. Comput.*, 2(2):25–36, 2007.
- [26] Neil C. Rowe, Thuy D. Nguyen, Marian M. Kendrick, Zaki A. Rucker, Dahae Hyun, and Justin C. Brown. Creating effective industrial-control-system honeypots. In *53rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 2020.
- [27] Neil C. Rowe and Hy S. Rothstein. Two taxonomies of deception for attacks on information systems. 2004. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:142238729>.
- [28] Neil C Rowe and Julian Rrushi. *Introduction to cyberdeception*. Springer, 2016.
- [29] Asaf Shabtai, Maya Bercovitch, Lior Rokach, Ya’akov Gal, Yuval Elovici, and Erez Shmueli. Behavioral study of users when interacting with active honeypots. *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security (TISSEC)*, 18(3):1–21, 2016.
- [30] Temmie Shade, Andrew Rogers, Kimberly Ferguson-Walter, Sara Beth Elsen, Daniel Fayette, and Kristin E Heckman. The moonraker study: An experimental evaluation of host-based deception. In *HICSS*, pages 1–10, 2020.
- [31] Yuan Shi, Huanguo Zhang, Juan Wang, Feng Xiao, Jianwei Huang, Daochen Zha, Hongxin Hu, Fei Yan, and Bo Zhao. Chaos: An sdn-based moving target defense system. *Security and Communication Networks*, 2017, 2017.
- [32] Toru Shimanaka, Ryusuke Masuoka, and Brian Hay. Cyber deception architecture: Covert attack reconnaissance using a safe sdn approach. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 2019.
- [33] Shodan. Honeypot or not? URL: <https://honeyscore.shodan.io/>.
- [34] Shreyas Srinivasa, Jens Myrup Pedersen, and Emmanouil Vasilomanolakis. Towards systematic honeypot fingerprinting. In *13th International Conference on Security of Information and Networks*, pages 1–5, 2020.
- [35] Thinkst. Canary tokens, 2023. URL: <https://canarytokens.org/>.
- [36] The Verge. Iranian hack of us navy network was more extensive and invasive than previously reported. URL: <https://www.theverge.com/2014/2/18/5421636/us-navy-hack-by-iran-lasting-for-four-months-say-officials>.
- [37] Alexios Voulimeneas, Dokyung Song, Per Larsen, Michael Franz, and Stijn Volckaert. dmvx: Secure and efficient multi-variant execution in a distributed setting. In *Proceedings of the 14th European Workshop on Systems Security*, pages 41–47, 2021.
- [38] Jim Yuill, Mike Zappe, Dorothy Denning, and Fred Feer. Honeyfiles: deceptive files for intrusion detection. In *Proceedings from the Fifth Annual IEEE SMC Information Assurance Workshop, 2004.*, pages 116–122. IEEE, 2004.

- [39] Mohammad-Reza Zamiri-Gourabi, Ali Razmjoo Qalaei, and Babak Amin Azad. Gas what? I can see your gaspots. studying the fingerprintability of ICS honeypots in the wild. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual industrial control system security (ICSS) workshop*, pages 30–37, 2019.