AN ENHANCED NEXT GENERATION SECURITY OPERATION CENTER FRAMEWORK FOR INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY MANAGEMENT

YAU TI DUN

MASTER OF SCIENCE UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG



SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have checked this thesis and in my opinion, this thesis is adequate in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Master of Science.

TS. DR. MOSO FAIZAL BIN AB RAZAK HEAD OF PROGRAM (CYBER SECURITY) FACULTY OF COMPUTING UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG 26600 PEKAN, PAHANG DARUL MAKMUR TEL: 09-431 5589

(Supervisor's Signature)

Full Name : TS. DR MOHD FAIZAL BIN AB RAZAK

Position : HEAD OF PROGRAM (CYBER SECURITY)

Date : 3 AUGUST 2023



STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG or other institutions.



Full Name : Ts YAU TI DUN

ID Number : MCC17003

Date : 3 AUGUST 2023

AN ENHANCED NEXT GENERATION SECURITY OPERATION CENTRE FRAMEWORK FOR INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY MANAGEMENT

YAU TI DUN

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the award of the degree of

Master of Science

Faculty of Computing
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

AUGUST 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Throughout the entirety of this research project, Ts. Dr. Mohd Faizal Bin Ab Razak was there to offer important direction, supervision, and encouragement. I want to begin by expressing my most heartfelt gratitude to him for all of his hard work. My desire to finish this study was considerably bolstered by his leadership, thoughtfulness, and words of support. He instructed me on efficiently carrying out research and providing the results in the shortest time. The opportunity to work and learn under his leadership is an exceptional honour and privilege. Because of everything he has done for me, I owe thanks to him.

Additionally, I'd like to convey gratitude towards Associate Professor Ts. Dr Mohamad Fadli Bin Zolkipli for the idea, guidance and support of my journey as a Throughout the entirety of this research project, Ts. Dr. Mohd Faizal Bin Ab Razak was there to offer important direction, supervision, and encouragement. I want to begin by expressing my most heartfelt gratitude to him for all of his hard work. My desire to finish this study was considerably bolstered by his leadership, thoughtfulness, and words of support. He instructed me on efficiently carrying out research and providing the results in the shortest time possible. The opportunity to work and learn under his leadership is an exceptional honour and privilege. Because of everything he has done for me, I owe thanks to him. In addition, I'd like to thank Associate Professor Ts. Dr Mohamad Fadli Bin Zolkipli for the idea, guidance, and support throughout my journey as a researcher. I owe gratitude to my parents for constantly encouraging me and praying for me to complete my studies. I owe gratitude to my family for their diligence, prayers, and respect in assisting me in completing this research work. Finally, a heartfelt thank you to En Juhari and Cik Hazwani for their role as my research assistants.

I owe gratitude to my parents for constantly encouraging me and praying for me to complete my studies. I owe gratitude to my family for their diligence, prayers, and respect in assisting me in completing this research work.

Finally, a heartfelt thank you to En Juhari and Cik Hazwani, for their role as my research assistant.

ABSTRAK

Saban harian organisai berhadapan dengan serangan siber. Akibatnya, keselamatan siber menjejaskan individu dan entiti. Adalah penting untuk bertindak balas dengan pantas terhadap insiden keselamatan untuk menghalang penyerang daripada mengakses sumber penting apabila serangan siber menjadi lebih canggih. Penyelidikan ini mengenal pasti bidang utama dalam NGSOC, pihak berkepentingan, tadbir urus, keselamatan, teknikal, fungsi dan risikan ancaman. Rangka kerja cadangan disahkan menggunakan soal selidik dan peraturan korelasi menggunakan perisikan ancaman. Untuk mengesahkan keberkesanan keupayaan pengesanan NGSOC, peraturan korelasi digunakan untuk mengesahkan keberkesanan perisikan ancaman. Rangka kerja ini bertujuan untuk membantu merapatkan jurang antara metodologi teori, pelaksanaan proprietari, dan sistem kendiri. NGSOC membantu perniagaan bersedia untuk pencerobohan. Untuk merealisasikan potensi penuh mereka, mereka mesti dicipta dengan betul, digunakan, disepadukan, dinilai secara tetap dan dipertingkatkan dari semasa ke semasa. Mereka meningkatkan keupayaan syarikat untuk melawan penggodam, kerugian kewangan dan pelanggaran data apabila digunakan dengan jayanya.

ABSTRACT

Cyberattacks is becoming more common than ever. As a result, cybersecurity affects individuals and entities. It is crucial to respond rapidly to security incidents to prevent attackers from accessing vital resources as cyberattacks become more sophisticated. This research identify key areas in NGSOC, stakeholder, governance, security, technical, functionality, and threat intelligence. The propose framework is validate using a questionnaire and correlation rules utilizing threat intelligence. In order to verify the efficacy of NGSOC's detection capabilities, correlation rules is use to validate the effectiveness of threat intelligence. The framework is intended to help bridge the gap between theoretical methodologies, proprietary implementations, and standalone systems. NGSOC helps businesses prepare for intrusions. To realize their full potential, they must be properly created, deployed, integrated, evaluated on a regular basis, and enhanced over time. They boost a company's ability to fight against hackers, financial losses, and data breaches when deploy successfully.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION

TITLE PAGE

| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | ii |
|---|------|
| ABSTRAK | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | viii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | X |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Motivation | 2 |
| | |
| 1.3 Problem Statement | |
| 1.4 Aim and Objectives | 4 |
| 1.5 Scope | 5 |
| 1.6 Research Significance | 5 |
| 1.7 Research Organization | 5 |
| CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 7 |
| 2.1 Framework | 7 |
| 2.1.1 NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) | |
| 2.1.2 Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology (COBIT) | |
| 2.1.3 Information Security Management System (ISMS) ISO 27001 | |
| 2.2 Stakeholder | 11 |
| 2.2.2 Service Management | 12 |
| 2.2.3 SOC Management | 14 |
| 2.2.4 Stakeholder Reporting | 18 |
| 2.3.1 Facilities Management | |
| 2.3.2 People Management | 21 |
| 2.3.3 Operational Management | 23 |
| 2.3.4 Framework | 25 |
| 2.4 Security | 27 |
| 2.4.1 Policy, Procedure, and Process | 27 |
| 2.4.2 Physical Security | 30 |
| 2.4.3 Technical Security | 30 |
| 2.4.4 Data Security | 30 |
| 2.4.5 People Security | 30 |
| 2.5 Technical | 32 |
| 2.5.1 SOC Architecture | 33 |

| 252 | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| 2.5.2 | Technology Selection | |
| 2.5.3 | Tool Selection | 35 |
| 2.5.4 | Operations | 37 |
| 2.6 I | Functionality | 39 |
| 2.6.1 | Identify | |
| 2.6.2 | Protect | |
| 2.6.3 | Detect | |
| 2.6.4 | Respond | |
| 2.6.5 | Recover | |
| 2.7 I | ntelligence | 48 |
| 2.8 | Summary | 50 |
| CHAPTER | 3 METHODOLOGY | 51 |
| 3.1 I | Research Methodology | 51 |
| 3.2 | Summary | 58 |
| CHAPTER | 4 RESULT - FRAMEWORK | 59 |
| | Design NGSOC Framework | |
| | Stakeholder | |
| 4.2.1 | Stakeholder requirement | 63 |
| 4.2.2 | Service Management | 63 |
| 4.2.3 | NGSOC Management | 64 |
| 4.2.4 | Stakeholder Reporting | 64 |
| 4.3 | Governance | 65 |
| 4.3.1 | Facilities Management | |
| 4.3.2 | People Management | |
| 4.3.3 | Operational Management | |
| 4.3.4 | Framework | |
| | F ramework | 78 |
| 11 6 | | |
| | Security | 91 |
| 4.4.1 | SecurityPolicy, Procedure, Process | 91 91 |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 | SecurityPolicy, Procedure, Process | 91 91 94 |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 | SecurityPolicy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security | 91 91 94 98 |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 | Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security | 91 91 94 98 |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 | Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 | Security Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 | Security | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.1 | Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security People Security Cechnical Architecture Technology Selection | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 | Security | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.1 | Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security People Security Cechnical Architecture Technology Selection | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 | Security | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 4.6.1 | Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security Fechnical Architecture Technology Selection Tool Selection Operations Functionality | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 4.6.1 4.6.1 | Security | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 | Security Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security Technical Architecture Technology Selection Tool Selection Operations Functionality Identify Detect Protect | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 4.6.4 | Security Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security Technical Architecture Technology Selection Tool Selection Operations Functionality Identify Detect Protect Response | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 | Security Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security Technical Architecture Technology Selection Tool Selection Operations Functionality Identify Detect Protect | |
| 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.3 4.4.4 4.4.5 4.5.1 4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 4.6.4 4.6.5 | Security Policy, Procedure, Process Physical Security Technical Security Data Security People Security Technical Architecture Technology Selection Tool Selection Operations Functionality Identify Detect Protect Response | |

| | 4.8 | Summary | 117 |
|----|------|---|-----|
| СН | APTE | R 5 FRAMEWORK VALIDATION | 118 |
| | 5.1 | Correlation Rules Process Flow | 118 |
| | 5.2 | Hermes Ransomware V2.1 | 120 |
| | 5.3 | Use of AES with RSA | 123 |
| | 5.4 | Indicator of Compromised (IOC): | 123 |
| | 5.5 | Affected File Formats | 124 |
| | 5.6 | Impact | 124 |
| | 5.7 | Vulnerability | 124 |
| | 5.8 | Recommendation | 125 |
| | 5.9 | Correlation Rules For "Ransomware Hermes V2.1." | 125 |
| | 5.10 | Filtering | 126 |
| | 5.11 | Enriching | 126 |
| | 5.12 | Aggregating | 127 |
| | 5.13 | Combining Rules | 127 |
| | 5.14 | Actions | 128 |
| | 5.15 | IOC matching | 128 |
| | 5.16 | Analytics And Baselining | 128 |
| | 5.17 | Performance Considerations | 129 |
| | 5.18 | Discussion | 130 |
| | 5.19 | NGSOC Framework Validation Survey | 138 |
| | 5.20 | Summary | 154 |
| СН | APTE | R 6 CONCLUSION | 155 |
| | 6.1 | Study Revisit | 155 |
| | 6.2 | Conclusion | |
| | 6.3 | Limitation Of Research | 160 |
| | 6.4 | Future Research | 161 |
| RE | FERE | NCES | 162 |
| ΑP | PEND | IX A PUBLICATION | 168 |
| | | ication 1 IJNAA | |
| | | ication 2 IJASEIT | |
| | | ication 3 IOP | |
| | | ication 4 ICSECS-ICOCSIM | |
| | | ication 5 CORE OUJ | |
| | | | |
| Αľ | PEND | IX B Questionnaire | |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1.1: Summary of problem statement | 13 |
|---|----|
| Table 2.1: Pros and Cons of the SOC Model | 25 |
| Table 2.2: Comparison between all frameworks in the aspect of stakeholder | 29 |
| Table 2.3: Security Analysts Roles | 32 |
| Table 2.4: Staff Duties and Training Needs | 33 |
| Table 2.5: Counteraction Capabilities | 35 |
| Table 2.6: Deployment Scenarios | 35 |
| Table 2.7: Various Form Of SOC | 37 |
| Table 2.8: Framework | 38 |
| Table 2.9: Comparison between all frameworks in the aspect of governance | 39 |
| Table 2.10: Comparison between all frameworks in the aspect of security | 44 |
| Table 2.11: Technical Domain | 45 |
| Table 2.12: Technical Criteria | 50 |
| Table 2.13: Comparison between all technical frameworks | 52 |
| Table 2.14: Heatmap of tools used by SOC | 53 |
| Table 2.15: Correlation Technique | 58 |
| Table 2.16: Comparison between all functionality frameworks | 62 |
| Table 2.17: Levels of intelligence | 62 |
| Table 2.18: Sources of intelligence | 63 |
| Table 2.19: Comparison between all intelligence frameworks | 64 |
| Table 3.1: Questionnaire | 68 |
| Table 4.1: NGSOC Models Comparisons | 72 |
| Table 4.2: Certificates and Experience in the NGSOC area | 84 |
| Table 4.3: Responsibilities of Security Analysts | 84 |
| Table 4.4: Duties and Training for Each Tier in NGSOC | 84 |
| Table 4.5: Comparisons between Counteraction Capabilities in NGSOC | 88 |
| Table 4.6: Comparisons between Centralized and Distributed NGSOC | 87 |
| Table 4.7: Various Form Of NGSOC | 90 |
| Table 4.8: Framework | 91 |
| Table 4.9: Disciplines in ISO 27001:2013 | 93 |

| Table 4.10: Process in Security Incident Response | 107 |
|--|-----|
| Table 4.11: Secure Physical and Environmental Control and descriptions | 109 |
| Table 4.12: Equipment Controls and Subsections | 111 |
| Table 4.13: Technology Selection | 123 |
| Table 4.14: Tools Selection Criteria | 125 |
| Table 5.1: Hermes Ransomware | 137 |
| Table 5.2: Indicator of compromise for Hermes Ransomware v2.1 | 148 |
| Table 5.3: Building Correlation Rules for Ransomware | 149 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1.1: Research organization | 15 |
|---|-----|
| Figure 2.1.1: Building Blocks of SOC | 18 |
| Figure 2.1.2: Building Blocks of NGSOC | 18 |
| Figure 2.2: Location and Centralization of SOCs, 2017 | 25 |
| Figure 2.3: Incident Response Process | 41 |
| Figure 2.4: Architecture Model | 46 |
| Figure 2.5: Data Aggregation | 48 |
| Figure 2.6: Technical Operation Flow of a SOC | 51 |
| Figure 3.1 Research Methodology | 69 |
| Figure 3.2: Threat Intelligence Function | 70 |
| Figure 3.3: Building Complex Correlation Rules | 70 |
| Figure 3.4: Lab simulation flow | 71 |
| Figure 4.1: NGSOC Framework | 71 |
| Figure 4.2: Classification of Stakeholders | 72 |
| Figure 4.3: Governance Role | 75 |
| Figure 4.4: NGSOC Design Facilities | 78 |
| Figure 4.5 NGSOC Organization Chart | 82 |
| Figure 4.6: ISMS ISO 27001 Framework | 92 |
| Figure 4.7: ISMS ISO 27001 Discipline | 94 |
| Figure 4.8: PDCA Model Structure for ISMS | 96 |
| Figure 4.9: Phase 1 in PDCA Model | 97 |
| Figure 4.10: Phase 2 in PDCA Model | 98 |
| Figure 4.11: Phase 3 in PDCA Model | 99 |
| Figure 4.12: Phase 4 in PDCA Model | 101 |
| Figure 4.13: Process to Obtain ISO 27001:2013 Certification | 104 |
| Figure 4.14: Ongoing ISO 27001 Audit Cycle | 105 |
| Figure 4.15: Security of NGSOC | 103 |
| Figure 4.16: Security Incident Escalation Process | 115 |
| Figure 4.17: Methods in Technical Security | 123 |
| Figure 4.18: Technical Overview in SOC | 122 |
| Figure 4.19: General architecture concept in GNSOC | 123 |
| Figure 4.20: The Architect Detail of NGSOC | 124 |

| Figure 4.21: Technology Selection | 128 |
|---|--------|
| Figure 4.22 NGSOC Functionality | 129 |
| Figure 4.23: Threat Intelligence Method | 132 |
| Figure 4.24: Threat Intelligence Flow | 133 |
| Figure 5.1: Correlation Rules Update Flow | 136 |
| Figure 5.2: NGSOC Correlation Rules Structure | 137 |
| Figure 5.3: Visualization of a BMP file before and after being encrypted by this | |
| ransomware | 139 |
| Figure 5.4: File drop by ransomware | 140 |
| Figure 5.5: Script to delete shadow copy | 140 |
| Figure 5.6: Additional File drop by ransomware | 141 |
| Figure 5.7: Infection Alert | 142 |
| Figure 5.8: Adding more information regarding Indicator of compromise | 145 |
| Figure 5.9: Lab simulation flow and result | 146 |
| Figure 5.10: Security Analyst initiates the incident analysis | 146 |
| Figure 5.11: Security Analyst manual validation using IOC | 147 |
| Figure 5.12: Security Analyst searching for malicious activity | 147 |
| Figure 5.13: Security Analyst identifies and confirms "No Petya" malware attack | 148 |
| Figure 5.14: Security Analyst initiates the incident analysis | 148 |
| Figure 5.15: Security Analyst immediately identifies the correlation triggered | 149 |
| Figure 5.16: Security validates the alert information and confirms to initiate the in | cident |
| escalation process. | 149 |
| Figure 5.17: Type of organization where respondent currently working | 152 |
| Figure 5.18: Respondent Job Role | 153 |
| Figure 5.19: Responder length of working experience | 153 |
| Figure 5.20: Responder prioritization requirement when building NGSOC | 154 |
| Figure 5.21: Order of prioritization requirement when building NGSOC | 154 |
| Figure 5.22: Responder services requirement when building NGSOC | 155 |
| Figure 5.23: Order of services requirement when building NGSOC | 155 |
| Figure 5.24: Inclusion of Service Level Agreement (SLA) In NGSOC | 156 |
| Figure 5.25: Type Of NGSOC Services Implemented | 156 |
| Figure 5.26: Provide Periodic Input To Stakeholder | 157 |
| Figure 5.27: NGSOC Provide Facility Management Documentation Such As Police | cy, |
| Process and Guidelines | 157 |

| Figure 5.28: Documentation Provided Meet ISO27001 Standard | 158 |
|---|-----|
| Figure 5.29: NGSOC Have Organization Chart And Job Scope | 158 |
| Figure 5.30: NGSOC Key Focus Area In Term Of People, Process and Technology | 159 |
| Figure 5.31: NGSOC Formal Third-Party Review Of Controls | 159 |
| Figure 5.32: NGSOC Have Specific Documented Policy, Procedure And Processes | 160 |
| Figure 5.33: NGSOC Has Physical Security Perimeter Control | 160 |
| Figure 5.34: NGSOC Have Technical Security Perimeter Control | 161 |
| Figure 5.35: NGSOC Have Data Security Control | 161 |
| Figure 5.36: Frequency Of Security Awareness Training For NGSOC Staff | 162 |
| Figure 5.37: SOC have a clearly defined NGSOC design/architecture document | 162 |
| Figure 5.38: NGSOC design/architecture document covers the technology selection | |
| (e.g., SIEM, log management) | 162 |
| Figure 5.39: NGSOC design/architecture document covers the tool selection (e.g., | |
| ticketing system, Endpoint Detection & Response) | |
| 163 | |
| Figure 5.40: NGSOC have an incident management workflow defined &documente | d |
| | 163 |
| Figure 5.41: NGSOC monitoring covers all the assets in organization | 164 |
| Figure 5.42: Security solutions that the NGSOC monitor | 164 |
| Figure 5.43: NGSOC have a process to update correlation rules or playbook to detect | et |
| threats | 165 |
| Figure 5.44: NGSOC have a formal incident response plan | 165 |
| Figure 5.45: NGSOC have a formal Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery plan | 165 |
| Figure 5.46: NGSOC have the Business Continuity Plan tested annually | 164 |
| Figure 5.47: NGSOC have subscribed to cyber threat intelligence feeds | 164 |
| Figure 6.1 : Six Domain of NGSOC Framework | 168 |
| Figure 6.2: NGSOC Framework | 169 |

REFERENCES

- A. Gorod, R. Gove, B. Sauser, and J. Boardman, (2007) "System of systems management: A network management approach," in Proc. IEEE Int. Conf.
- Y. O Abel, A.O. Fransica, (2023) Mitigating cybercrimes in an evolving organizational landscape
- Akalanka, Shanith, Perera, Madushanka, Amila (2021). The Next Gen Security Operation Center
- Babu Veerappa Srinivas, (2014) SECURITY OPERATIONS CENTRE (SOC) IN A UTILITY ORGANIZATION.
- Bank Negara Malaysia. (2018, September 4). *Risk Management in Technology (RMIT)*. Retrieved from Bank Negara Malaysia: http://www.bnm.gov.my/index.php?ch=57&pg=144&ac=725&bb=file
- Bhatt, S., Manadhata, P. K., & Zomlot, L. (2014). The Operational Role of Security Information and Event Management Systems. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 12(5), 35-41.
- B.A.Nor, P. Maria, F. Steven, and C.Nathan, (2012) "Incident prioritisation using analytic hierarchy process (AHP): Risk Index Model (RIM)" Security and Communication Network DOI: 10.1002/sec.673.
- B.A.Nor, P.Maria, F.Steven, P.Maria, and C.Nathan, (2011) " A risk index model for security incident prioritization", 9th Australian Information Security Management Conference, Edith Cowan University, Perth Western Australia, 5th -7th December.
- B.Ahmad, (2017) "Intrusion Detection With Tree-Based Data Mining Classification Techniques BY Using KDD DataSet." European Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology Vol.5, No.6, pp.11-18.
- Byung, I K. Nakhyun, K. Seulgi, L. Hyeisum, C. Junhyung, P. (2018). A Study on a Cyber Threat Intelligence Analysis (CTI) Platform for the Proactive Detection of Cyber Attacks Based on Automated Analysis
- Cichonski, P., Millar, T., Grance, T., & Scarfone, K. (2012). Computer Security Incident Handling Guide. *NIST Special Publication*, 800(61), 1-147.
- Crowley, C. (2017). Future SOC: SANS 2017 Security Operations Center Survey. Maryland: SANS Institute.

- C. Pfleeger, J. Margulies and S. Pfleeger, (2015) Security in computing.

 Matt Stevens, (2017) Security Information and Event Management (SIEM).
- Chuvakin, A., Schmidt, K., & Phillips, C. (2012). Logging and log management: the authoritative guide to understanding the concepts surrounding logging and log management. Newnes.
- Cyber Security article for Mirai Botnet, (2021) Cloudflare Inc. https://www.cloudflare.com/learning/ddos/glossary/mirai-botnet/
- D. Shahjee, N. Ware, (2022) Integrated Network and Security Operation Center: Systematic Analysis
- E.Allison Newcomb, J.H.II Robert., H.Steve., (2016) "Effective Prioritization of Network Intrusion Alerts to Enhance Situational Awareness", Conference Paper. IEEE Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics (ISI)
- Frost & Sullivan. (2017). Global Information Security Workforce Study.
- F.Alserhani. (2013) "A framework for Multi-stage Atrack Detection." Conference: Electronics, Communications and Photonics Conference (SIECPC), 2013Saudi International
- Gordon, A. (2015). Service Level Agreements (SLA) (Vol. 4). Auerbach Publications.
- Grobler, M., Jacobs, P., & Niekerk, B. v. (2017). Cyber Security Centres for Threat Detection and Mitigation. *Threat Mitigation and Detection of Cyber Warfare and Terrorism Activities*, 21-51.
- G.S.-Tangil, E.Palomar, A.Ribagorda, and I.Sanz., (2015) "Providing SIEM systems with self-adaptation." Information Fusin 21.
- Honoree, J. (2017). Understanding The Role Of Triangulation In Research. *SRJIS*,4/31, 91-95. Retrieved December 7, 2018, from http://www.srjis.com/pages/pdfFiles/149544238718. HONORENO JOHNSON.pdf
- ISACA. (2012). *COBIT 5: An Introduction*. Retrieved from ISACA: http://www.isaca.org/COBIT/Documents/An-Introduction.pdf
- ISO/IEC. (2013). *Information Technology -- Security Techniques -- Information Security Management Systems -- Requirements (ISO/IEC 27001:2013)*. Retrieved from https://www.iso.org/standard/54534.html

- J.A. Altena Nijmegen, (2012) ISO/IEC 27002 Baseline Selection Control selection based on effectiveness and cost within a fixed budget.
- János, F. D., & Dai, N. H. (2018). Security Concerns Towards Security Operations Centers. *Applied Computational Intelligence and Informatics (SACI)*.
- Josh Fruhlinger (2020). The CIA Triad: Definition, components and examples. CSO Asean Online. Retrieved from https://www.csoonline.com/article/3519908/the-cia-triad-definition-components-and-examples.html
- Jungsuk Song, Younsu Lee, Jang-Won Choi, Joon-Min Gil, Jaekyung Han and Sang-Soo Choi, (2017) Practical In-Depth Analysis of IDS Alerts for Tracing and Identifying Potential Attackers on Darknet.
- K. Sebastian, M.D Schultz, P. Seele, (2021) Cyberattacks as "state of exception" reconceptualizing cybersecurity from prevention to surviving and accommodating
- K. Zetter, (2016) "Why hospitals are the perfect targets for ransomware," Wired, 2016.
- K. Zetter, (2016) "4 ways to protect against the very real threat of ransomware," 2016.
 [Online]. Available: https://www.wired.com/2016/05/4-ways-protectransomware-youre-target/
- Kowtha, S., Nolan, L., & Daley, R. (2012). Cyber Security Operations Center Characterization Model and Analysis. *IEEE*, 470-475.
- Kristie Magowan (2020). *IT Governance vs IT Management: Mastering the Differences*. BMC Blogs. Retrieved from https://www.bmc.com/blogs/governance-vs-management/
- Keragala, Dilshan. (2017) Detecting Malware and Sandbox Evasion Techniques. 1st ed. Dilshan Keragala, 2016.
- K. Anya, H.K. Myong, Z. L. Jim, Alex V., (2014)" A Framework for Event Prioritization in Cyber Network Defense," Center for High Assurance Computer Systems Information Technology Division.
- Luke Irwin (2019). How to Document the Scope of Your ISO 27001 ISMS. IT Governance UK. Retrieved from https://www.itgovernance.co.uk/blog/how-to-document-the-scope-of-your-isms
- MANFRED V, FABIAN B, INES F, AND GÜNTHER P (2020) Security Operations Center: A Systematic Study and Open Challenges IEEE

- Max V H, Guy G, Gilad T, Rolan K, Cristian P, Dumitru D, Adrian R, Louis B, Samuel F, Jose F R, Esteban A, Matthieu B and Marco S. (2021) A Shared Cyber Threat Intelligence Solution for SMEs
- M. Pokrinchak and M. M. Chowdhury, (2021) "Distributed Denial of Service: Problems and Solutions," IEEE International Conference on Electro Information Technology (EIT).
- MDEC. (2018). *Industry Guidance For Next-Generation Managed Security Operating Centre*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Miloslavskaya, N. (2016, August). Security operations Centres for information security incident management. In *Future Internet of Things and Cloud (FiCloud)*, 2016 IEEE 4th International Conference on (pp. 131-136). IEEE.
- N. Miloslavskaya,(2020) "Security zone infrastructure for network security intelligence centers,".
- M. Vielberth, F. Bohm, I. Fichtinger, and G. Pernul, (2020) Security operations center: A systematic study and open challenges,
- Nabil, M., Soukainat, S., Lakbabi, A., & Ghizlane, O. (2017). SIEM selection criteria for an efficient contextual security. *Networks, Computers, and Communications* (*ISNCC*), 1-6.
- NetIQ Corporation. (2016, September). *Operations Center Service Level Agreement Guide*. Retrieved from NetIQ: https://www.netiq.com/documentation/operations-center-57/pdfdoc/service_level_agreement/service_level_agreement.pdf
- NIST. (2018). *Cybersecurity Framework's Five Functions*. Retrieved from NIST: https://www.nist.gov/cyberframework/online-learning/five-functions
- NIST 800-150 (2016) Guide to Cyber Threat Information Sharing
- Nicolett and K. Kavanagh, (2017) "Magic quadrant for security information and event management.".
- N. Skabcovs and A. Latkov, (2011) "Enterprise security perimeter E-mail server protection," 2011 Baltic Congress on Future Internet and Communications.
- N. Hernandez, (2018) "NoC and SOC integration opportunities increased Efficiency incident response cyber security," SANS Inst., Bethesda, MD, USA, Tech. Rep.,

- Onwubiko, C. (2015). Cyber Security Operations Centre: Security Monitoring for Protecting Business and Supporting Cyber Defense Strategy. *Cyber Situational Awareness, Data Analytics, and Assessment (CyberSA)*, 1-10.
- Official Manual of Splunk®, Enterprise Alerting Manual, version 8.2.2, Copyright © 2021 Splunk Inc.
- Palo Alto Networks. (2018, December 26). *Build a Next-Generation SOC Techbrief*. Retrieved from Palo Alto Networks: https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/resources/techbriefs/build-next-generation-soc
- R.Leonard, H. Felix, D.R.Gabi, (2017) "Modeling and Learning Incident Prioritization." The 9th IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Data Acquisition and Advanced Computing Systems: Technology and Applications., Bucharest, Romania
- Ristov, Sasko & Gusev, Marjan & Kostoska, Magdalena. (2011). *Information Security Management System for Cloud Computing*. ICT Innovations 2011 Web Proceedings ISSN 1857-7288
- S.Pritpal., B.Sunny, K.Krishan, (2015) "Performance Enhancement of a Malware Detection System using Score Based Prioritization of Snort Rules." 2015 International Conference on Green Computing and Internet of Things.
- S. Riyanat, H. Alex, G.H. Robert, B.Robin, M. Rajarjan, (2014) "OutMet: A New Metric for Prioritising Intrusion Alerts using Correlation and Outlier Analysis", 39th Annual IEEE Conference on Loca Computer Networks.
- SANS, (2017) *Understanding-intrusion-detection-systems*. SANS Institute InfoSec Reading Room.
- Sander Dorigo, (2018) Security Information and Event Management, Master Thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Shenk, J. (2014). Ninth Log Management Survey Report. Maryland: SANS Institute.
- Schinagl, S., Schoon, K., & Paans, R. (2015). A framework for Designing a Security Operations Centre (SOC). *IEEE*, 2253-2262.
- Survey Monkey. (2017). *Using quantitative research effectively*. Retrieved from Survey Monkey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/using-quantitative-research-effectively/
- S. A. Mirheidari, S. Arshad, and R. Jalili. (2013): Alert Correlation Algorithms: A survey and taxonomy. In Cyberspace Safety and Security.

- The Hacker News (2021). Why Human Error is the #1 Cyber Security Threat to Businesses in 2021. Retrieved March 2, 2022, from https://thehackernews.com/2021/02/why-human-error-is-1-cyber-security.html
- Thomas D. Wagner (2014). Sharing Cyber Intelligence in Trusted Environments A Literature Review.
- Torres, A. (2015). Building a World-Class Security Operations Center: A Roadmap. SANS Institute.
- Townsend, M. (2017, June 10). How a crippling shortage of analysts let the London Bridge attackers through. Retrieved November 5, 2018, from https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/jun/10/london-bridge-attackers-intelligence-overload
- T. Su, S. Wang, Y. Chen and C. Liu, (2016) "Attack detection of distributed denial of service based on Splunk," International Conference on Advanced Materials for Science and Engineering (ICAMSE).
- Wood, P., & Egan, G. (2017). Symantec Internet Security Report 2017 (Rep.). Mountain View, CA: Symantec Corp.
- Yuan, S., & Zou, C. (2011). The security operations center is based on correlation analysis. *Communication Software and Networks (ICCSN)*, 334-337.
- Yau T D, M Faizal, M F Zolkipli, Tan F B, Ahmad F (2021) Grasp on Next Generation Security Operation Centre (NGSOC): Comparative Study