DIGITAL GENERATIONS TIRANA, ALBANIA | 5-9 JUNE 2023

Cyber Threats of Shadow IT in Dutch Higher Education and Research

Joost Gadellaa, SURF

TNC23; Tirana, Albania











Context: IT in Higher Education Institutions (1/2)

TECHNOLOGY NEWS FEBRUARY 5, 2020 / 5:22 PM / UPDATED 3 YEARS AGO

University of Maastricht says it paid hackers 200,000-euro ransom

By Reuters Staff

2 MIN READ

AMSTERDAM (Reuters) - The University of Maastricht on Wednesday disclosed that it had paid hackers a ransom of 30 bitcoin -- at the time worth 200,000 euros (\$220,000) -- to unblock its computer systems, including email and computers, after an attack that unfolded on Dec. 24.

Ransomware attacks have become commonplace, with insurers raising cyber security premiums by as much as 25% after hacker targets in 2019 included companies, hospitals and airports.

University Vice President Nick Bos said the university had decided to pay the ransom after considering the alternatives, which would have included rebuilding its entire IT network from scratch.

"The least secure place in the universe?" (Bongiovanni, 2019)





Context: IT in Higher Education Institutions (2/2)

- In higher education institutions (HEIs), staff and students have freedom in arranging IT facilities.
- The sector has an open character:
 - Sharing of knowledge
 - Cooperation in research and education
- Balancing institution-wide IT solutions with the autonomy of departments and individuals







"hardware, software, or services built, introduced, and/or used for the job without explicit approval or even knowledge of the organization" (Haag & Eckhardt, 2017)







Tertiary Study on the Phenomenon of Shadow IT

- Development over time from Spreadsheets to Cloud
- · Definitions get mixed, new terms are often coined
- The area matures with Kopper & Westner (2016)



Taxonomy of Shadow IT by Kopper & Westner (2016)



Mapping Study on Cybersecurity Consequences of Shadow IT

- Research does seldom cover practical or technical details
- Often on the governance level:
 - Lack of control
 - Not compliant
 - Blind spots
- No doubt about that shadow IT can cause security problems, but not worked out why or how exactly





Context: Governance of Shadow IT

- HEIs value an open IT environment; a total ban is not an option
- Identifying and managing *all* Shadow IT instances would be extremely difficult
- Instead, a risk-based approach is chosen; map out possible problems and perform targeted mitigations







Goal: To understand *how* the presence of shadow IT in HEIs can cause cybersecurity problems, as a first step for work on risk-based governance



MRQ: "What is the role of shadow IT in the cyber threat landscape of Dutch higher education institutions?"





MRQ: "What is the role of shadow IT in the cyber threat landscape of Dutch higher education institutions?"		Research Method(s)					
SQ1:	"How is shadow IT defined and differentiated from similar concepts?"	Literature review, tertiary study					
SQ2:	"What cyber threats are commonly associated with shadow IT?"	Literature review, mapping study					
SQ3:	"What types of shadow IT are observed in Dutch higher education?"	Expert interviews					
SQ4:	"Which cyber treats related to shadow IT are perceived by experts?"	Expert interviews					
SQ5:	"Which recurring patterns can be identified in these occurences and cyber threats?"	Synthesis of SQ3 and SQ4					

Data Analysis

Coding process:

- Open coding
- Axial coding with some emerging and some pre-defined semantic domains:

Codebook reliability:

- 2 researchers coded 11 interviews
- Code saturation: 1,35% new codes after 10 interviews
- 104 codes, applied 726 times



Meta model of Semantic Domains based on CORAS (Lund et al., 2011)



Occurrences

- Divided into a topology of shadow IT, adapted from Mallmann et al. (2019)
- Everything exists, highly different between institutions



- Software is top-of-mind
- Especially cloud services can be very small or very large
- Self-developed applications in research are unique
- Devices add variety

Threat Components

- Captured with the lens of CORAS (Lund et al., 2011) to operationalize 'cyber threat'
- Experts focused on vulnerabilities, scenarios and incidents; rest is left implicit



Unwanted incidents

- Unauthorized access	(16/6)
- Data breach	(13/6)
- Leaked credentials	(9/6)
Commercial use of data	(7/4)
- Ransomware and extortion	(6/4)
Abuse of computer resources	(5/3)
Unavailability of system or data	(5/2)
Unexpected costs	(3/2)
Discontinuation of services	(2/2)
Student fraud	(1/1)

Overview of Threat Component categories



Linking them

Linking them!		Linerabilities	No 119 CT 118 CC 01	No. 01 10 00 00	P. 62 11 100	Act of the second	(1110 00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0	2 M 01 01 01 01 2 M 01 01 01 01 2 01 01 01 01 2 01 01 01 2 01 01 2 01 01 2 01 01 2 01 2	1.2.1.1.2.2.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	Unality of or of the second se		
		Occurence	\$ \\$	$\langle \diamond \rangle \langle \diamond \rangle$	2 (Q.)	% * %	V V	\$\$\$ \\$	\$ 100 1	6 (3 / 3 /	107
	Self-aquired devices	Unmanaged PC's										
		Research equipment								_		
		Server hardware										
		Mobile phones and tablets										
		Control systems and OT										
		AV equipment										
		Devices managed by others										
		Networking devices										
 Also served as 		Storage devices										
	Self-aquired software	Unspecified software										
input to		Locally installed apps										
prioritize the	Unapproved cloud services	Web-apps										
modelling of		Cloud storage										
modeling		Cloud productivity suite										
attack paths	Self-made solutions	Sheets and databases										
·		Self-developed software										
		Self-built websites										
		Ad-hoc coupling of systems										

thc23











Takeaways from the Modelling of Attack Paths

- Three main cases:
 - 1) The 'classic' network infiltration scenario (a 'Maastricht')
 - 2) Lack of control of data causing unintended harm
 - 3) Misconfigurations causing problems between users
- The detailed modelling allowed for linking to solutions
- Many scenario's could be linked to solutions. Problems dependend on the institutions' measures already in place





Limitations

- Modeling remains an exercise in semantics and ontology
- Complete overview of occurrences and threats, but not of the links between them
- 'How often named' is an indicator for importance
- Results on prevention, detection and mitigation were not anticipated





Conclusions

MRQ: "What is the role of shadow IT in the cyber threat landscape of Dutch higher education institutions?"

- Shadow IT is an inherent part of HEIs IT environment
- Three main scenarios
- The role of shadow IT in the cyber threat landscape can be very manageable when assumed and accounted for





Shadow IT problems can be

- Prevented with guidance, policy and usable official solutions that are aligned to user needs
- **Detected** with monitoring and scanning, and by keeping users on managed devices for as long as possible
- **Mitigated** by many already known technical measures
 - Multi-factor authentication
 - Zero-trust network architecture
 - Mobile device management
 - Proper password policies
 - Endpoint detection and response

•

. . .



Shadow IT problems can be Prevented

"And we are also pushing [departments] to play a role in this with [IT] coaches and little teams that will also think within such a [department] about: yes, **what do we need? What will we face in the future?** What is our teaching staff working on? What IT support do they have? That starts slowly, starts growing and, yeah, starts to work. I think that will become the best solution or the biggest solution for shadow IT: to just **have that conversation** [...] so that people can voice their desires and needs somewhere."

"I do notice that in the past, we had a lot more shadow IT. See, it used to be very easy for a user to walk to [an electronics store] and buy [a network attached storage] system and put it under their desk. [...] At **one point we adopted the policy of: yes, we can also manage that kind of thing.** We are not going to get fussy about that. [...] If you want, we also manage your [storage] [...]. But next time, preferably don't do it."

"That is also why **we have deployed large-scale central storage in various flavors**. Very good ones with redundancy, backup, ransomware protection, and things like that. A very cheap one, which is **cheaper than any commercial provider**."





Shadow IT problems can be Detected

"Yes, and **we scan the network regularly**, so if we **come across things like [compromised devices]**, then.... Look, sometimes a new device like that comes in, is quickly connected, without them requesting a separate connection for it, for example. You come across things like that. [...] We use a security system, **intrusion detection, and protection system on our network**. And it has been able to stop quite a few attacks over the years we have been using it. So in that respect, I am less afraid than at an average other institution."

"If you lose your managed laptop, then you can sleep easy. If you lose your [unmanaged laptop], then sorry, you have to solve it yourself. We are trying to change that with different programs, so **mobile device management** for example. But you notice, that because those devices are actually owned by the [department], you do get resistance to those kinds of efforts."

Keeping users on managed devices and networks for as long as possible!





Shadow IT problems can be Mitigated

- Basic security measures (source: english.ncsc.nl)
- · Problems depend on these measures
- Help them with:
 - Data classification, least privilege
 - Security awareness and culture





Shadow IT problems can be

- Prevented with guidance, policy and usable official solutions that are aligned to user needs
- **Detected** with monitoring and scanning, and by keeping users on managed devices for as long as possible
- **Mitigated** by many already known technical measures
 - Multi-factor authentication
 - Zero-trust network architecture
 - Mobile device management
 - Proper password policies
 - Endpoint detection and response

•

. . .





Thank you Any questions?

joost.gadellaa@surf.nl











References

Bongiovanni, I. (2019). The least secure places in the universe? A systematic literature review on information security management in higher education. Computers & Security, 86, 350–357.

Kopper, A., & Westner, M. (2016). Towards a Taxonomy for Shadow IT. AMCIS 2016 Proceedings. Americas Conference on Information Systems.

Lund, M. S., Solhaug, B., & Stølen, K. (2011). Model-Driven Risk Analysis. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Mallmann, G. L., de Vargas Pinto, A., & Maçada, A. C. G. (2019). Shedding Light on Shadow IT: Definition, Related Concepts, and Consequences. Lecture Notes in Information Systems and Organisation, 31, 63–79.





Cyber Threats of Shadow IT in Dutch Higher Education and Research

Joost Gadellaa, SURF

TNC23; Tirana, Albania









