

Ghost in the SAM: Stealthy, Robust, and Privileged Persistence through Invisible Accounts

Sebastián R. Castro
scastro9@ucsc.edu
University of California
Santa Cruz, California, USA

Alvaro A. Cárdenas
alacarde@ucsc.edu
University of California
Santa Cruz, California, USA

ABSTRACT

Persistence attacks allow adversaries to maintain access to compromised systems. Despite their wide use by most threat campaigns, they remain understudied in the academic literature. In this paper, we study the concepts and requirements for local invisible accounts and then show new OS-level attacks by implementing these ideas on Windows. In particular, we propose three general design objectives for successful persistence attack vectors. Then, we show how to implement these objectives by bypassing functionality provided by Windows to manage identities. To do this, we first reverse-engineer parts of Windows's authentication and authorization process and propose two attacks: RID Hijacking and Suborner. We show that these attacks affect all versions of Windows since XP and Server 2003, and in combination, they can create stealthy, robust, and privileged accounts.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Security and privacy** → **Software reverse engineering; Software security engineering; Operating systems security.**

KEYWORDS

Persistence; Reverse Engineering; Operating System Security; Authentication; Authorization; Malware; Advanced Persistent Threat; Threat Detection; Forensics; Backdoor;

ACM Reference Format:

Sebastián R. Castro and Alvaro A. Cárdenas. 2024. Ghost in the SAM: Stealthy, Robust, and Privileged Persistence through Invisible Accounts. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Workshop on Research on offensive and defensive techniques in the context of Man At The End (MATE) attacks (CheckMATE '24)*, October 14–18, 2024, Salt Lake City, UT, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3689934.3690839>

1 INTRODUCTION

Microsoft Windows is one of the most popular operating systems for personal computers worldwide. As such, any security issue affecting it also impacts millions of users. New attack vectors that affect specific operating system versions are constantly disclosed, yet the study of adversary persistence in Windows has received comparatively less attention than other types of security issues [13].



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution International 4.0 License.

CheckMATE '24, October 14–18, 2024, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-1230-2/24/10.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3689934.3690839>

Persistence consists of techniques adversaries use to keep access to systems across restarts, changed credentials, and other interruptions that could cut off access to a system they have already compromised [46]. Methods used for *persistence* include Pre-OS attacks, such as infecting the firmware or boot process, and OS attacks changing access or configurations to allow adversaries to maintain their foothold in the system [61].

Independent of the specific operating system or environment, *persistence* has not received adequate attention [13, 47, 49, 65], despite its usage in several threat campaigns [9, 48, 59]. Even though there has been a recent trend of academic research working on the formalization of persistence with taxonomies of their attack types [6, 50, 58, 60], none of them describe the properties of an ideal persistence attack.

This paper attempts to expand the related literature by designing and implementing 'invisible' accounts. We first define the desired properties of a successful persistence attack and then show that invisible accounts provide several benefits over other persistence alternatives, such as hidden services or malware. We then implement an example of an invisible account in Windows and show that the account modifications to achieve our properties cannot be done by the official modules for managing Windows local accounts. Therefore, we reverse-engineered the objects related to authorization and authentication to be able to modify them and achieve our objectives. As our contributions:

- (1) We formalize the properties of a successful persistence attack (stealthiness, robustness, and privilege) and exemplify them through invisible accounts as a persistence attack by showing their advantages over alternative vectors.
- (2) We provide an in-depth reverse-engineer analysis of the Windows NT authentication and authorization system for local accounts and propose two persistence attacks.
- (3) We propose **RID Hijacking** to allow us to authenticate with a known set of credentials of one account and impersonate another, even if the impersonated account has restricted configurations (e.g., the account is disabled).
- (4) We introduce **Suborner** as a way to stealthily create local accounts with impersonation capabilities without leveraging the intended OS resources for local accounts management.
- (5) We make our prototypes openly available ¹².

Our experiments demonstrate that these attacks impact the whole NT authentication/authorization architecture for local accounts, which includes systems from Windows XP to the most

¹<https://github.com/r4wd3r/RID-Hijacking>

²<https://github.com/r4wd3r/Suborner>

recent versions of Windows 10/11 and from Windows Server 2003 to Windows Server 2022.

We clarify that **RID Hijacking** and **Suborner** were previously presented by this paper's first author in industry conferences without proceedings (Black Hat USA [1, 2]). This is the first academic publication describing the main concepts and details not included in previous presentations.

2 MOTIVATION

Suppose an adversary has compromised a system with system-level privileges (e.g., administrator) and wants to retain access if their initial entry point is closed. The attacker could leverage *persistence* attacks involving malicious services, implants, or manipulation of identity representations (e.g., accounts, session tokens, tickets) to prolong their access to the victim.

Classical persistence attacks leave a trail of evidence that defenders can analyze. For example, external implants require additional code that can be detected by a defender using antivirus software, or account modification can be detected by using log files and monitoring the status of existing accounts. In this paper, we propose a new persistence attack that is more stealthy than the current state-of-the-art attacks for local accounts. We propose a new way to use only legitimate system resources to create accounts that could be invisible to the defender.




Figure 1: Scenario of an attacker trying to maintain persistence on a compromised system via account manipulation. An agent of a security tool is monitoring the victim.

Fig. 1 illustrates a traditional account attack. 1) We assume an attacker with administrator privileges, which 2) uses a legitimate user management application to create accounts. 3) These accounts are stored in a data structure with information on all user accounts. The attacker's risk is that by manipulating an account, the activity will be 4) recorded in a system log, and the log can be read by 5) the defender, who can then be alerted of illegal account manipulation. Furthermore, defenders can also 6) monitor accounts via the system-provided resources. This paper aims to show how to bypass these defensive techniques.

In particular, in some operating systems, an *Application Programming Interface (API)* is the only way the kernel offers to manage identities. These functions also immediately log any change made to them. When security solutions are in place, this log cannot be simply removed or tampered. Even if the adversary has total access to the system, altering them or the security agent may trigger

alerts when external systems manage event-based monitoring, the adversary does not control.

Our attacker wants to directly manipulate the accounts' data structures to avoid leaving traces and surpassing any API constraint. By **bypassing the security mechanisms of log creation and the security of account management applications** (the way system administrators can monitor for accounts), account manipulation could be essentially invisible to the defender. The challenge is that these data structures are obfuscated in closed-sourced systems. When the NT architecture was released, Microsoft's CEO advocated for the closed-source nature of privileged data structures to give more security [56]. In this paper, we identify new attacks that show why relying on closed-source security files is insufficient to guarantee trustworthiness, and we argue that open and transparent security structures will facilitate security monitoring and prevent our attacks from succeeding.

3 RELATED WORK

There are several ways to manipulate data and privileges of identities. These tactics, techniques, and procedures are available to the public in different knowledge bases such as *MITRE ATT&CK* [45], where they are classified into various subcategories, such as reconnaissance, exploitation, and post-exploitation. Persistence falls within the post-exploitation category.

63 out of 85 procedures documented in the *MITRE ATT&CK* Framework leverage some form of identity manipulation (e.g., account creation, manipulation, impersonation). However, none of these post-exploitation vectors focus on directly manipulating local accounts' objects. Many tools, such as *Mimikatz* [5], *Kekeo* [4], *ESR SAM Editor* [8], *Rubeus* [53], *Metasploit* [51] and *Impacket* [54] can modify the objects used to represent identities in operating systems. While these solutions can abuse sensitive information from identity representations, none can forge hidden local accounts with stealthiness capabilities during and after their creation.

The concept of invisible local accounts has also been explored, but most approaches only hide accounts from the sign-in window [44, 67]. The closest related work to achieve an invisible account is the *DoucMe* [57] proof of concept, where the attacker leverages the *netapi32::userAdd Win32* API to create a new machine account and disguises it from the user management applications. Still, the account's creation is reported to the OS *Event Logger*, and furthermore, the attacker needs to add the account to privileged local groups, which are more likely to be monitored by defenders.

The limitations of these previous works motivate us to propose new design objectives for successful persistence attacks.

4 THREAT MODEL

Persistence attack vectors require previous access to the victim system by the adversary. The goal of a persistence technique is to prolong the adversary's control over the system, even if the initial attack vector that was leveraged to compromise it is mitigated by the defender (e.g., vulnerability patching, changing credentials) or cut off due to conventional usage (e.g., computer restarts).

We then propose three persistence objectives we want to achieve in our attacks:

Robustness: We want our persistence techniques to resist common operations the users perform (e.g., system reboot, credentials update, network changes).

Stealthiness: We want to evade detection and prevention mechanisms (e.g., endpoint antivirus, network-based IDS/IPS, security event logs) deployed on the target and within its functional environment.

Privilege: We want to obtain the maximum authorization after accessing the compromised system through the persistence vector. This property will guarantee that the adversary can perform operations of at least the same integrity level within the system after being compromised, even if the initial attack path was mitigated.

For our threat model, we consider that the attacker has already compromised the system and has enough permissions to modify the objects within the Identity Storage for local accounts. On Windows systems, this is read/write permission to the *Secure Account Manager (SAM)*, which is conventionally only attributed to high-integrity accounts such as *SYSTEM*. Research on privilege escalation attacks that abuse low privileged read access to SAM, such as *HiveNightmare (CVE-2021-36934)* [23], is out of our scope.

In commercial Operating Systems for personal computers such as *Windows* or *Linux*, identity management operations are performed by a set of functions and structures that interact with other applications, the OS and its primitives. Represented as the *Identity Management Interface* in Figure 1, we classify in this description all the functions and structures that allow the authentication, authentication, validation, and manipulation of identities (e.g. *useradd*[12] for *Linux*, *netuseradd* for *Windows*[30]). We define the *Identity Log* as the set of files and data that registers the events associated with the *Identity Management*. For *Windows* systems, this is the *Windows Event Log* [21]. For *Linux*, the files that store events related to the identities (e.g., */var/log/secure*, */var/log/auth.log*[52])

This paper aims to propose an OS-level persistence technique through identity manipulation that achieves the three objectives above. In particular, we assume a privileged adversary that wants to stealthily manipulate the identity data directly into the *Identity Storage* while preventing a logging event.

5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

We argue that creating our proposed "invisible" accounts through direct identity manipulation achieves the abovementioned objectives. To create them, we formulate the following research questions that we need to answer before implementing a proof of concept of our attack:

RQ1: Where does the OS store the required information of local accounts for their authentication and authorization?

RQ2: What is the format of the structures saving this information?

RQ3: What information is needed from these objects to authorize access to the account?

RQ4: How can we bypass the controls of the *Identity Management Interface* to customize identities?

RQ5: How can we create an account satisfying our three properties without calling the *Identity Management Interface*?

Remark: For mobility and usability with devices that are not necessarily always connected to a network, the default configuration for *Windows* systems validates every authentication/authorization

attempt first with local accounts [42]. Regardless of whether the system is in an (*Active Directory* or standalone), *Windows* by default will always start validating the authentication credentials inside the *SAM*. On this premise, we decided to implement our persistence attack by manipulating local account objects, as this will improve the feasibility of our offensive technique across different scenarios.

6 BACKGROUND

Before we describe our persistence techniques, we summarize the *Windows* Authentication and Authorization process. To do that, we first define the elements involved in this process.

6.1 Windows OS Concepts

Registry: The data required to configure the system constraints for booting, security, and account setup is stored in the *Registry*. Many of its internal values are saved in *UTF-16 Little-Endian*[66], including security data of identities[54] [18]. *Microsoft* describes *registry hives* as a set of keys and values with backup files for data restore[41].

Windows Application Program Interface (API): As described by Yosifovich et al. [66], this is the OS-provided programming interface for user-mode applications and is a set of documented functions that interact with other similar functions and *Native System Services* (*Windows* equivalent of *System calls*). These functions include *API* libraries such as *netapi32.dll*, which include account management functions callable from user-mode applications [30] such as *net user* and *lusrmgr.msc*. It is also known as *Win32 API*.

Accounts as Securable Objects: As defined by *Microsoft*[32], accounts in the *Windows* environment are *Securable Objects*. This means that each of them has an assigned *Security Descriptor* [33] to "describe" its permissions through *Discretionary Access Control Lists (DACs)* and register access attempts to it through *System Access Control Lists (SACLs)* [16]. As *Securable Objects*, the accounts are distinguished by a *Security Identifier (SID)* [34].

Security Identifiers (SID): The *SID* structure is composed of a *Revision Level*, an *Identifier Authority* value used to distinguish the *SID* provider (e.g., an *Active Directory* instance, a domain of a specific machine), and a *Relative Identifier (RID)* [35]. With this implementation, *Microsoft* keeps the *SIDs* consistency of built-in and default *Securable Objects* [38]: each of them will share the same *RID* across different domains, but their *Identifier Authority* value will change in each case.

NTLM Authentication Protocol: For the different *Windows* domain environments, *Microsoft* has created multiple authentication protocols [39] while implementing libraries to allow the operating system to interact with them called *Authentication Packages*. One of these authentication protocols is the *NTLM* user authentication protocol [27]. With *MSV1_0* as its authentication package [29], *NTLM* includes features to authenticate identities within both *Microsoft Active Directory* domains and standalone ones. *NTLM* authentication protocol uses its own *NTLM* hashes to validate local accounts authentication (for standalone domains) or use challenges for domain accounts authentication[27].

Security Accounts Manager (SAM): Implemented as the database to store the *security descriptors*[33] of local accounts (e.g. *NTLM*

hash[27]), the SAM[18] is a registry hive under the HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE (HKLM: SAM\SAM\ key used by the NTLM authentication protocol to allow identities to access a Windows system with local identities. It is also used by the Local Security Authority (LSA) to authorize access to the local accounts based on their associated security descriptors.

Local Security Authority (LSA): Deployed in every Windows system by the Local Security Authority Subsystem Service (LSASS)[25], LSA performs the authentication and authorization of identities on Windows, enforces the security policies stored in the LSA Policy registry hive, and interacts with the Event logging API [21] to store events in the Windows Event Log [17].

Security Reference Monitor (SRM): Yosifovich et al. [66] define it as the kernel-mode component in charge of declaring the security context of identities through Access Tokens and validate/modify identities privileges while reporting the events to the Event Logging functions [21] through its Advanced Local Procedure Call (ALPC) connection with the LSASS service. The Access Tokens[22] generated by the SRM are objects created to represent a process' security context [66] based on the permissions of the identity that was used to forge it.

6.2 Windows Authentication and Authorization

The structure of Windows Authentication and Authorization has been described by multiple researchers [66]. This model involves several submodules that allow the operating system to interact with different domains. Based on the authentication and authorization representation proposed by Yosifovich et al. [66], we highlight in Figure 2 the modules that participate in the authentication and authorization process for Windows local accounts, which includes the following:

Credential Management: The set of Credential Providers described by Microsoft as the “primary mechanism for user authentication” [19] or a set of functions that allow identities to authenticate against the system through different credential types, such as User/Password, PIN, SmartCard or other custom credentials. They also operate within the system the remote authentication via Kerberos tickets [15] or NTLM (standalone and domain-joined based).

In Figure 2, the Credential Management submodule also includes the Windows API functions in charge of managing local accounts from user-mode stored in the netapi32.dll [30] and userenv.dll [36]. Moreover, the submodule includes the WINLOGON[19] process, which handles the login and logoff processes by interacting with the credential providers, the identity management Windows API functions, and LSASS [42].

Local Security Authority Subsystem (LSASS): As mentioned in Section 6.1, this is the process that enforces the policies and security within the operating system LSA. It queries the LSA Policy registry hive to retrieve the policies to enforce, handles the authentication packages to retrieve the security descriptors of the identities, communicates with the SRM to authorize the access based on access tokens, and reports the result of these events to the Event Logger [21].

Even though it includes all the needed modules to perform authentication and authorization through different protocols (e.g., kerberos.dll authentication package for Kerberos authentication [15]),

in our representation, we are only remarking the modules used for local account identity management. This also includes the undocumented SAM Server (samsrv.dll) [42] module which directly interacts with the SAM registry hive.

Executive: Microsoft defines it as a set of “kernel-mode components that provide a variety of services to device drivers” [40]. These services include management capabilities for processes, memory, and objects. The SRM is part of the Executive.




Figure 2: Overview of Authentication and Authorization modules for Windows Local Accounts [66]. The diagram highlights the OS modules that intervene with the local accounts management

7 UNDERSTANDING THE SAM

To address our first two research questions, we need to find the account objects and then reverse engineer the format of the closed-source binaries where they are stored.

7.1 Finding Account Objects

While the SAM database has been documented before [27, 66] and there have been solutions that partially implement certain of its objects' structures [3, 5, 54], the specific storage of the authentication and authorization, the specific copies that are used by each part of the process, and the specific format of the files storing that information have not been publicly documented before. Therefore in this first research challenge, we seek to identify the **objects required to represent a functional local account within the operating system**.

Modern versions of Windows have several additional binaries and objects that have been added to the local accounts, yet many of them are optional. To find the objects needed for the OS to interpret these keys as a legitimate account, we studied the SAM registry hive in one of the earliest versions: Windows XP. After creating a local account on the system through the net user command [30], while only setting its username and password, we looked for changes within the SAM. As a result, we obtained the keys and values created to represent a local account:

Names/{username}: Created under the \Domains\Account\Users\Names key, it is added with the specified username and a REG_BINARY with length 0 and setting its Type as the RID of the account

Users/{00000RID}: Created under the \Domains\Account\Users key, it has as name an 8-digit hexadecimal representation of the account's RID, and includes multiple *REG_BINARY* objects that describe the account

Account Objects: These are the binaries and values stored inside the registry keys and contain the attributes of the local accounts. By default, we found that all the latest versions of the *Windows* OS represent local accounts with the objects *F*, *V*, and *Supplemental-Credentials* when they are created. However, more objects [28] can be included for additional account features.

We decided to corroborate these results on newer versions of the operating system. By creating an account using the same method on the latest *Windows 11*, our experiment showed that the minimum binaries required to store the local account *security descriptors* are *F* and *V* (aside from the keys and the *Names* binary). We tested this by creating local accounts or removing their additional objects from the *SAM*, and tested their functionality (authentication, authorization, and execution) through both interactive and remote sessions [28]. This allows us to answer RQ1:

RQ1: Where does the OS store the required information of local accounts for their authentication and authorization?
A: The *F* and *V* binaries contain the essential information for a functional local account on *Windows NT* systems

Determining the exact objects used to represent the essential *security descriptors* of a local account reduces the cost of our analysis efforts from the entire *SAM* registry hive to only these two binaries. The next step in our research process was trying to understand their structure.

7.2 Format of F and V

Even though *Microsoft* has not publicly documented the structure of the *F* and *V* binaries, some researchers have analyzed them for password dumping purposes [5, 51, 54] or resetting the forgotten password of local accounts [3]. This helped us to confirm that the *F* and *V* binaries contain critical account information such as the encrypted *NTLM* hash, constraints for the account (e.g., *enabled*, *logonHours*), and multiple copies of the account's relative identifier *RID*. However, these structures were incomplete and did not include details of the account's objects.

Some researchers have performed previous reverse engineering efforts to understand these structures [3, 5, 7]. However, we found some inconsistencies, including differences in the attribute names, undocumented structures, or missing implementation details. For instance, the open-source password editor for local accounts *chntpw* [3] incorrectly describes the purpose of the *RID Copy* value stored in *F*.

We have evaluated the *F* and *V* structures proposed by these authors and ranked the ones implemented for *V* in *Mimikatz* by Delpy, B. et al. [5] as the most precise. This structure was not only consistent with the ones proposed by the other authors but also covered in more detail their usage in newer versions of *Windows*, including the recent *AES* encryption model for *NTLM* hashes [24]. Nevertheless, *Mimikatz* does not implement the *F* binary for local accounts.

For the *F* binary, we initially used the structure proposed in *chntpw*[3]. We tested the precision of this structure by creating multiple local accounts on both *Windows XP* and *Windows 11* machines and confirmed the inconsistencies of their *F* representation. We tried to adjust it based on our account properties manipulation and studying the changes that this caused within the *F* binary.

Using the proposed structures of Delpy, B. et al. for the *V* binaries and our initial variation of the *chntpw* *F* structure as a base point, we started the study of the *security descriptors* of local accounts inside the *SAM*.

Table 1 shows our structure representation of the *F* binary. The *F* binary has a fixed size since its values are not dynamic. Some of these values are stored in reverse hex. We believe that the *F* name stands for its size type, which is *fixed*.

Table 1: Structure of the *F* binary inside HKLM:SAM\SAM\Domains\Account\Users*

| Offset | Attribute | Size (Bytes) |
|--------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 0x00 | Revision | 2 |
| 0x02 | Unknown | 2 |
| 0x04 | Unknown | 4 |
| 0x08 | Last logon | 8 |
| 0x10 | Unknown | 8 |
| 0x18 | Password last set | 8 |
| 0x20 | Unknown | 8 |
| 0x28 | Last incorrect password | 8 |
| 0x30 | RID Copy | 4 |
| 0x34 | Unknown | 4 |
| 0x38 | Account Control Bits (ACB) | 2 |
| 0x3A | Unknown | 2 |
| 0x3C | Country code | 2 |
| 0x3E | Unknown | 2 |
| 0x40 | Invalid password count | 2 |
| 0x42 | Total logins since creation | 2 |
| 0x44 | Unknown | 12 |

V has in total 17 attributes that are dynamic in size (and as for *F* and "fixed," we believe that the *V* stands for "variable" size).

As mentioned before, we based our description on the *Mimikatz* [5] *V* structure. However, during our tests, we noted that the first *V* attribute is represented by Delpy et al. [5] as *unknown*. We confirmed that this attribute describes permissions of the accounts by validating how it changes whenever an account is added to a group (e.g., *Administrators*).

Table 2: Structure of the *V*'s entry headers inside HKLM:SAM\SAM\Domains\Account\Users*

| Offset | Attribute | Size (Bytes) | Description |
|--------|-----------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| 0x00 | offset | 4 | Attribute's value offset from 0xCC |
| 0x04 | length | 4 | Length of the attribute's value |
| 0x04 | unknown | 4 | Unknown |

Since these implementations are not documented, we deduced how the operating system interacts with *V* during account management operations. Using our *Windows 11* and *Windows XP* systems, we analyzed both our modified *V* structure and the *SAM* when changing the account attributes. We confirmed that the first half of the binary contains the headers of the values, and the second

part (after offset $0xCC$ contains their values, which justifies why the *offset* in the *value* header uses $0xCC$ as a base.

As seen in Table 2, each attribute has its own 12 bytes long header that describes it. Table 3 shows that the first value in the header is the *Offset from $0xCC$* , the second one is the length of the value of the attribute, which is stored in the second part of *V*, and the third one is Unknown but in our experiments was always set to 0. These values are stored in *little-endian* (and *UTF-16-LE* for *strings*) [41])

Table 3: Structure of the *V* binary inside HKLM:SAM\SAM\Domains\Account\Users*

| Offset | Attribute | Size Type |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| $0x00$ | User Permissions | Dynamic |
| $0x0C$ | Username | Dynamic |
| $0x18$ | Full Name | Dynamic |
| $0x24$ | Comment | Dynamic |
| $0x30$ | User Comment | Dynamic |
| $0x3C$ | Unknown | Unknown |
| $0x48$ | Home Dir | Dynamic |
| $0x54$ | Home Dir Connect | Dynamic |
| $0x60$ | User Logon Script Path | Dynamic |
| $0x6C$ | Profile path | Dynamic |
| $0x78$ | Workstations | Dynamic |
| $0x84$ | Hours allowed | Dynamic |
| $0x90$ | Unknown | Unknown |
| $0x9C$ | LM Hash | Static |
| $0xA8$ | NTLM Hash | Static |
| $0xB4$ | NTLM History | Static |
| $0xC0$ | LM History | Static |
| $0xCC$ | Value User Permissions | Specified in header |
| $0xCC + \text{username.offset}$ | Value Username | Specified in header |
| $0xCC + \text{fullname.offset}$ | Value Full Name | Specified in header |
| $0xCC + \text{comment.offset}$ | Value Comment | Specified in header |
| ... | ... | ... |

In summary, we obtained a detailed representation of the binaries that contain the essential *security descriptors* values needed for a local account to be functional. We are finally able to answer RQ2:

RQ2: What is the format of the structures saving this information? A: Our representation of the structure of the *F* and *V* binaries can be seen in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Our next challenge is to discover the exact values employed for authentication and authorization, how the OS accesses and processes them, and where we find something exploitable when we directly modify them in the SAM.

8 ATTACKS

In this section, we elaborate on each of the attacks we propose. We explain how they work and the challenges we overcome to develop successful attacks against the Windows NT authentication and authorization architecture.

Figure 3 shows how the authentication process works for Windows systems. In this scenario, we see that the user 1) authenticates first with the credentials of Account 2 (A2), then 2) the *Identity Management Interface* (e.g., LSASS) validates the information of the account inside the *Identity Storage* (i.e., SAM) to retrieve account permissions and constraints (e.g., contents of *F* and *V*), and 3) then




Figure 3: Standard authentication and authorization process.

authorize the access to the user based on this information (i.e., primary access token attached to the users process).

8.1 RID Hijacking

An attacker can abuse the authentication process by deploying the **RID Hijacking** attack against the victim as follows: Figure 4 shows that, different from the conventional scenario (Fig.3), the attacker can 1) authenticate with the credentials for A2, then 2) the *Identity Management Interface* will validate A2 credentials and constraints for authentication (e.g., account enabled/disabled, operational hours), but 3) will authorize the access to the system as A1. In summary, the attacker will authenticate as A2, and the system will authorize the access as A1, ignoring A1 account constraints.




Figure 4: Authentication and authorization process with RID Hijacking .

From the previous analysis of the *F* and *V* structures, we can infer that *WINLOGON* performs the authentication process for local accounts through user/password credentials by extracting the *Username*, *LM Hash*, *NTLM Hash*, *NTLM History* and *LM History* along with the system's policy verification by *LSA* for the account. Nonetheless, it was unclear to us how the *Primary Access Token* was forged based on the *security descriptors* stored in these binaries.

Based on the well-known *Linux* persistence technique of editing the */etc/passwd* file to assign the *root's uid 0* to another existent user entry [11, 55], we believe that the *Windows* OS authorization process would have a similar behavior based on one or more of the

local accounts' *RID* copies. Different from *Linux* systems, *Windows* does not store in plaintext a file containing the *RID* that identifies each account but stores this data in the *SAM*. We tested our hypothesis by experimenting with each of the multiple *RID* copies stored in each account key set. By using a virtual *Windows XP* system and debugging tools with *kernel-debug* capabilities [10, 20], we performed several login attempts while analyzing the system behavior by altering the values of the *RID* copies. As a result, we discovered the security issue that makes **RID Hijacking** possible.

By using only the defined OS resources for *Windows* local accounts, **RID Hijacking** allows us to assign the *RID* of any existing account to a different one on the same compromised system. This also includes the built-in identities, such as the Administrator account identified by *RID* 500. By abusing this technique, an adversary can:

- Assign the privileges of the victim account to the attacker account, even if the victim account has any restrictions (e.g., disabled, login out of logon hours).
- Authenticate with the attacker account credentials (also remotely, depending on the system's configuration) and obtain authorized access as the victim account.
- After successful authentication with the attacker account credentials, the OS will register any operation executed on the event log as the victim account.

To perform the attack, the adversary must have read/write access to the *SAM* within the compromised system, which is commonly achieved by accessing the registry as *NT SYSTEM*. Then, the adversary should access the *SAM F* object of the account that will be used as the attacker account located under the path *HKLM: SAM\Domains\Account\Users*\F*. Finally, the adversary should overwrite the *RID Copy* value of the opened *F* binary value with the hexadecimal number of the victim's *RID*. In other words, the adversary should set the *F*'s *RID Copy* attribute of the attacking account with the *RID* of the victim account to perform the attack.

To change the value of the *F* binary, an adversary could use the default registry editing tools such as *regedit*. However, in specific scenarios, this is not convenient due to the monitoring of event logs and execution of privileged apps. This is why we have created two artifacts: A *Ruby* module compatible with the *Metasploit*[51] framework and a *Powershell*[31] script that can be executed independently. The artifacts, by default, use the *built-in Guest* account as the attacking account and set the *built-in Administrator* account as the victim account. Nevertheless, our artifacts allow us to configure these two parameters freely.

8.1.1 Security issues. **RID Hijacking** takes advantage of the *Windows NT* authentication/authorization model for local accounts. In particular, we discovered that it abuses the *Primary Access Token* generation process, which is the first *access token* created by the OS for an identity after it is successfully authenticated.

While performing kernel-debugging tasks using *IDA Pro* [10] and *WinDBG*[20] against the *Windows XP* authorization process with an account with a corrupted *F* binary, we discovered that the **Primary Access Token is forged based on the *RID Copy* stored in the *F* binary for a successfully authenticated identity**. Our experiment demonstrated that the OS forges this object and assigns

the privileges based on the information of the identity that owns that *RID*.




Figure 5: Authentication process for a Windows local account with a corrupted SAM

For the scenario described in Figure 5, we assume that the authentication is performed through user/password credentials via interactive logon or network-based login. We also assume that the attacker has compromised the system and wants to perform the attack to use the built-in *Guest* account (*RID*: 501/0x1f5) and wants to attack the built-in *Administrator* account (*RID*: 500/0x1f4). However, as stated before, we have used the *Guest* account as an example, yet the attack is reliable with any local account stored in the *SAM*:

- (1) The *LSASS* service communicates with the *MSV1_0.dll* authentication package. It sends the username and *NTLM* hash for the password entered by the user through the start of the login process. In this scenario, the username is *Guest*.
- (2) *MSV1_0.dll* asks for the *Guest* information to the *SAM Service*.
- (3) *SAM Service* accesses the *SAM Names* subkey for the *Guest* user.
- (4) *SAM Service* obtains the type of the binary value stored in the *Names/Guest* subkey, which is a copy of *Guest*'s *RID* in hexadecimal format.
- (5) *SAM Service* uses the obtained *RID* to access the *Users*' subkey that contains the account objects (e.g., *F*, *V*).
- (6) *SAM Service* acquires the information of these objects, which include the corrupted *RID Copy*, the stored *NTLM* hash, the account restrictions (e.g., enables/disabled, logon hours, etc.), and all the remaining attributes.
- (7) *SAM Service* sends back all the information obtained to the *MSV1_0.dll* authentication package to continue with the authentication process.

The process of authentication ends with the verification of restrictions performed by the *MSV1_0.dll* authentication package, along with the comparison of the *NTLM* hash of the entered password and the one stored in the *V* binary. If successful, the authorization process will start based on the information retrieved from the *SAM*, which includes the *RID copy* value retrieved from the corrupted *F* value.

The authorization process continues as described in Figure 6:

- (8) *MSV1_0.dll* receives and validates the information obtained from the *SAM*. It will validate the account restrictions and then compare the *NTLM* hash of the entered password and




Figure 6: Authorization process for a Windows local account with a corrupted SAM

the *NTLM* hash stored and encrypted in the *SAM*. If no restrictions impede the authentication and the *NTLM* hash matches with the stored one, *MSV1_0.dll* will send the user information (including the *RID copy*) back to *LSASS* and generates the locally unique identifier *LUID* for the session.

- (9) *LSASS* will retrieve the permissions and privileges information from the groups that the account **owner of the *RID Copy* value** belongs to and the information stored in the *LSA Policy*. Then, it will communicate via *ALPC* with the *Security Reference Monitor (SRM)* to forge the *Primary Access Token* based on the **corrupted value of *RID Copy***.
- (10) *LSASS* will finalize the authorization process by completely forging the *Primary Access Token* containing the permissions and privileges of the victim account (i.e., Built-in *Administrator* identified with *RID 500*).

Since *LSASS*, which loaded the connection with the kernel-process *SRM*, trusts the information obtained from the *SAMSRV* – *SAM* registry hive, the *access token* will be created based on all the security data retrieved from the *SAM*, including the corrupted *RID copy*. This analysis answers our third and fourth research questions:

RQ3: What information is needed from these objects to authorize access to the account? A: *The Windows OS provides the authorization to local accounts through Access Tokens. We found that the Primary Access Token is forged based on the RID Copy value of the F binary*

RQ4: How can we bypass the controls of the Identity Management Interface to customize identities? A: *By writing directly to the binaries representing a local account, it is possible to alter the identity without calling the Windows User Management API functions. Moreover, it is possible to create local accounts without the constraints that these functions may impose.*

This technique satisfies the three properties of ideal persistence: it is *robust* since it uses the OS resources to describe local accounts, it is *stealthy* due to its impersonation capabilities, and the usage of legitimate accounts. It is *privileged* because it can easily acquire the permissions of the desired victim account. Nonetheless, **RID**

Hijacking requires the existence of at least two accounts: the attacker and the victim.

With the lessons learned from this first attack, we now use it as a stepping stone to launch more sophisticated attacks to persist stealthily on a compromised system.

8.2 Suborner

Suborner solves the dependency of two accounts (attacking and victim) from the attack proposed in the last section. This new technique aims to maintain access to a compromised machine by creating a hidden account with post-authentication impersonation capabilities while avoiding triggering any alerts on the victim. Figure 7 shows that, different from the **RID Hijacking** scenario (Fig.4), the attacker can create an "invisible" account with custom properties (i.e. *A3*), then 1) authenticate with the credentials for *A3*, then 2) validation is performed with *A3* credentials and constraints for authentication, but 3) again the authorization is given as *A1*.




Figure 7: Authentication and authorization process with Suborner .

In more detail, the attack works by:

- Dynamically crafting a local account without calling the *Win32 API* functions designed to do so (e.g., *netapi32.dll::netuseradd*).
- Hiding the new attacking identity from the Windows Account Management Applications (e.g., *net*, *lusrmgr.msc*) by abusing the default Windows behavior for accounts with an appended dollar sign \$ and configuring the identity as a machine account by dynamically modifying the account's control bits (*ACB*).
- Leveraging account impersonation through **RID Hijacking** which abuses the OS authorization mechanisms for *Primary Access Token* generation

To illustrate the benefits of our attack, we can consider the following scenarios where an attacker has already compromised a victim, but an administrator is actively monitoring the system for indicators of compromise within the output of the user management applications and the *Windows Event Log*.

- **Scenario 1: net user add:** The simplest persistence method is adding a new user through the command prompt using the *net user* application. This creates a new identity that can be

used to access the machine, yet it also generates a *Windows Event* with ID 4720[17]. This ID is easily noticeable by many solutions since it is the event that describes the creation of a new account within the system. Moreover, the new account can also be easily spotted by reviewing the output of user management applications (e.g., *lusrmgr.msc*, *net users*); thus, its access can be revoked.

- **Scenario 2: net user add with an appended dollar sign to the username:** The scenario of adding a dollar sign to the username to create a service-like account has been recently popularized by well-known researchers [57]. However, even with this technique, the account creation event 4720[17] is still registered in the *Windows Event Log*, making it easy for the defense team to spot through event log analysis. Therefore, this approach also breaks our property of *stealthiness*, and it is not totally feasible.
- **Scenario 3: Invoke netuseradd API to craft a machine account:** Creating a machine account by calling the *netapi32.dll* function *net user add* may require constructing a structure that holds all the information of the desired account (e.g., *USER_INFO_1* [37]). This structure may require specific attributes such as username, privilege (e.g., admin, standard user, guest), and flags. To create a machine account with the benefits of the dollar sign by setting one in the *username* attribute and establishing the *flags* attribute to *0x1000*[37]. Nonetheless, the execution of this call may result in a 4741 event; though less commonly monitored and it is considered as low in importance [17][26], it is still recorded. The account may not appear in the output of the user management applications, but it is still possible for an administrator to detect its creation and remove the adversary's access.

These scenarios help to illustrate the main challenge we faced during this research: How to create an invisible account without calling the *Win32 API* preventing its recording in the *Windows Event Log*.

To successfully deploy this attack on a compromised system, the adversary must have read/write access to the SAM. As in the previous attack, the adversary can achieve this with the *NT SYSTEM* privileges on the compromised system.

To maintain the *stealthiness* property of the attack, it is important to consider the two possible scenarios that may allow the detection of the malicious account: during its creation and after its creation. To prevent the recording of the attacker account creation to the *Windows Event Logger*, the adversary must write all the objects that commonly represent a standard local account directly to the SAM without calling the *Identity Management Interface* (e.g., *Win32 API netapi32.dll::netuseradd*). To prevent the detection of the malicious account after its deployment on the compromised machine, it is necessary to leverage other OS behaviors for different local accounts.

Figure 8 represents the general overview of the attacking account creation by directly writing its objects to the SAM. The overall process of creating an account with **Suborner** consists of crafting three binaries and the registry keys that hold them, respectively. Within the *HKLM: SAM\SAM* registry path, we write the objects as follows:





Figure 8: Overview of the Suborner attack by directly writing local account objects


- (1) Obtain the highest available RID for local accounts to find an available RID for the new attacking account.
- (2) Create the *Domains\Account\Users\Names* with the specified username (e.g., *attacker\$*). Then create the key's default *REG_BINARY* and assign the available RID number obtained in the previous step as its *Type*.
- (3) Based on the new RID of the account, create a registry subkey under *Domains\Account\Users* with the new RID in hexadecimal as the name of it in an 8-digit format (e.g., *1001, 0x000003E9*).
- (4) Craft the objects of the account. For the attack purposes, only the *F* and *V* attributes are needed:
 - Craft the *V* attribute containing the defined username and the encrypted *NTLM* hash that represents the defined password for the attacking account
 - Craft the *F* attribute to set the account as *Enabled*, specify the victim local account to impersonate by setting its RID in *RID Copy*, and setting the *Account Control Bits (ACB)* to describe the account as a non-standard user (e.g., *WORK-STATION_TRUST_ACCOUNT 0x80*).
 - Write the changes to the SAM.

Our artifact currently clones the objects of an existent local account and modifies the attributes that make the attack feasible. Nonetheless, one of the challenges we faced while creating our proof of concept was the password encryption process for local accounts.


8.2.1 SAM Encrypted NTLM Hash Calculation. Before we started our study, the encryption process of the local account's passwords in the SAM had been vaguely documented [27][66]. There have been implementations that extract the secrets from the SAM [54][5][3][51]. Yet, none replicate the OS encryption process to store a local account's password in the SAM. On the other hand, Microsoft enforced the encryption of the SAM hashes with *AES-128-CBC+IV* in Windows 10 v1607 (14393.4530) [24]. Previously, the operating system used *MD5* to encrypt the *NTLM* hash. Some tools can extract the *NTLM* hash with this new encryption model [5][54][51], yet to the best of our knowledge, this is the first non-official implementation of the password encryption process for local accounts that



(a) Overview of NTLM Encryption process to the SAM registry hive



(b) DES Keys calculation



(c) SysKey decryption

Figure 9: Suborner password encryption process for Local Accounts on Windows

implements both previous MD5 encryption and AES-128-CBC+IV encryption.

Our proof of concept of **Suborner** implements the password encryption by first calculating the required keys to encrypt the plain text password to the SAM Encrypted Hash stored in the V NTLM Hash attribute. Our implementation first calculates the DES Keys (Figure 9b) based on the little-endian unsigned integer version of the attacking account's RID (e.g., E9030000). The RID is permuted based on the 7-byte long static arrays K1 and K2 plus a parity bit, resulting in two 8-byte long DES keys.

Described in Figure 9c, the SysKey decryption implemented in our proof of concept will:

- (1) Extract the class data values of the subkeys *JD*, *Skew1*, *GBG*, *Data* located in the LSA Policy registry hive.
- (2) Concatenate the extracted values and permute the resultant string based on the specified static array (Figure 9c). This will produce the victim's Bootkey.
- (3) Extract the F binary of the HKLM: SAM\SAM\Domains\Account key to determine the encryption model that is in place (MD5 or AES), the Encrypted Syskey and additional values:

- If MD5 ($F[0x00] = 0x02$), it will retrieve the Encrypted Syskey from $F[0x80]$ and calculate the MD5 hash for the value stored at $F[0x70]$ concatenated with the String 1, the Bootkey, and the String 2. The Encrypted Syskey will be RC4 decrypted by using the MD5 hash as the key.
- If AES ($F[0x00] = 0x03$), it will retrieve the Encrypted Syskey from $F[0x88]$ and the IV from $F[0x78]$. The decryption of the Syskey is done by using the Bootkey as the key and the obtained IV.

After obtaining the needed keys, our implementation of **Suborner** leverages them to proceed to replicate the password encryption process performed by the operating system (as described in Figure 9a):

- (1) Plaintext password is MD4 hashed as a UTF-16 string. This is the resulting NTLM hash.
- (2) The NTLM hash is split in half, resulting in two strings NTLM Half 1 and NTLM Half 2.
- (3) Each half is encrypted with the respective DES key previously obtained (Figure 9b).
- (4) The two DES encrypted halves of the NTLM hash are concatenated to create the resultant DES Encrypted NTLM Hash.

- (5) The *DES Encrypted NTLM Hash* is encrypted with the obtained *Syskey* (Figure 9c):
 - If *MD5/RC4*, the *RC4* encryption key is generated by *MD5* hashing the string concatenating the *Syskey*, the 8-digit little-endian representation of the *RID*, and the specified string (Figure 9a). The *SAM Encrypted Hash* is obtained by encrypting the *DES Encrypted NTLM Hash* with *RC4* and the obtained *MD5* digest as the key.
 - If *AES*, we specify the 16-byte *IV* to use. This value will be stored in the custom *V:NTLMHash* attribute along with the *SAM Encrypted Hash*, which is obtained by encrypting the *DES Hash Encrypted* value with the *Syskey* and the defined *IV*.
- (6) The *SAM Encrypted Hash* is stored in the custom *V* attribute of the created account.

In summary, **Suborner** describes a new technique that achieves our desired objectives. This is also the answer to our final question:

RQ5: How can we create an account satisfying our three properties without calling the *Identity Management Interface A*: *With our attack, we can create a robust persistence vector by using the OS resources for identity management, which is stealthy due to the bypass of the Win32 API functions for account management, while maintaining the desired privileges through RID impersonation.*

9 EVALUATION

We have performed different tests of the implementations of our attacks to show we are successfully addressing and satisfying the proposed three objectives for our techniques: stealthiness, robustness, and privileged persistence. We emphasize that these attacks are executable without our proof of concepts: they can be executed as living-off-the-land (LOTL) attacks that only use legitimate OS resources.

9.1 Effectiveness

We have tested these attacks against multiple versions of Windows (XP, 7, 8.1, 10, 11) and Windows Server (2003, 2012), including the latest version of Windows 11 and Windows 2022. We used virtual machines and tested our attacks on standalone and domain-joined systems. To evaluate the access from the attacker system, we evaluated accessing the accounts via interactive logon (i.e., physical access) and remote login. For remote login, we tried to access the systems through *Remote Desktop Protocol (RDP)*, *Windows Remote Management (WinRM)*, and the *Server Message Block* protocol (*SMB*) by using legitimate tools (e.g., *PsExec*) as well as open-source offensive tools [51, 54].

We confirmed that both attacks persist after the victim is rebooted. Moreover, we use the user management applications to validate any changes in the local accounts after the attack (e.g., *net user*, *lusrmgr.msc*), and we confirmed that no change was registered during the account modification, creation, or even before or after the authentication. We also monitored the Windows Event Log with a default configuration when performing the attack and accessing the system as the attacker. Depending on the event log configuration, an authentication attempt as an invisible account

using **Suborner** could be registered. However, it is harder to distinguish if the account shares the exact name of a legitimate system (e.g., domain controller, same system machine name). After that event, all the operations are registered as the attacker-designed account.

We performed access against the victim systems as the default Guest account, a new standard user account, and an invisible account created with **Suborner**. We confirmed that it is possible to assign the privileges of the built-in administrator account to both, even if the administrator is disabled. We also performed tests using custom accounts with elevated privileges, resulting in a functional privileged session by authenticating as an unprivileged account. After accessing the system with an unprivileged account or a **Suborner** account, we confirm the privileges obtained by validating the session's access token with legitimate tools (e.g., *whoami /priv*, *ProcessExplorer*), and writing in privileged folders (e.g., *System32*). However, our tests showed that the attacks are reliable on all versions by authenticating interactively via *SMB* and *RDP*. We confirmed that these attacks do not work on domain controller systems and that access via *WinRM* is reliable on versions before Windows 10.

9.2 Signature and Behavioral Analysis

One of the objectives we want to ensure is the stealthiness of our attacks. This can be evaluated through multiple tests. The initial one involves the study of the modules we have developed with multiple EDR and antivirus solutions through *VirusTotal* [62–64]. Most of these solutions involve signature-based and behavioral-based analysis, looking for particular patterns within the image (e.g., byte strings associated with malicious images) or emulating the Windows API calls to determine malicious behavior during the image execution.

For **RID Hijacking**, we created two modules: one designed for *Metasploit* [51] as a post-exploitation module, and one for *Powershell* [31]. The first one [62] was not detected by *VirusTotal*. However, the *Powershell* one was detected by 2 of the solutions used in *VirusTotal* [63]. For **Suborner**, we created a C# module and compiled it for 32-bit and 64-bit architectures. After analyzing it with *VirusTotal*, we confirmed that only 1 of the *VirusTotal* Antivirus solutions detected the artifact [64]. This means the module can be written on disk or loaded on a victim through *Powershell* prompts using different approaches, such as file-less reflection, without being detected by most solutions.

Considering that we do not implement any obfuscation for antivirus evasion in our modules, these results contribute to one of our initially proposed objectives: Achieving stealthiness in our attack vector.

9.3 Windows Security Mechanisms

To prevent file-less attacks and execution of malicious attacks within the command prompts of the OS, Microsoft has created the *Anti-Malware Scanning Interface (AMSI)* [14]. *AMSI* constantly scans for user input, looking for malicious strings associated with different tactics, techniques, and procedures leveraged by adversaries. *AMSI* also connects to *Microsoft Defender* to report the anomalies. We have tested the *Powershell* module for **RID Hijacking** and the

C# module for **Suborner** on Windows 11. The experiment proved that our artifacts do not trigger any alarm to *Microsoft Defender* after loading them to *Powershell* and executing them to perform the actual attack.

We performed various experiments to evaluate if our attacks are reported through the different authentication protocols used in Windows. Since these attacks target local accounts, we confirmed no reporting to outside protocols when the registry hives are modified locally. This can be interpreted as a capability for stealthiness during the execution of our artifacts.

Access to the SAM registry is not commonly monitored for multiple reasons, and one of them is that legitimate libraries constantly update the local account objects and their attributes with usual values, such as the last login date or last changed password. If an EDR solution were to monitor every access to these objects, multiple false positives would be raised every time legitimate functions access these attributes. This is why the *Windows API* is the one that usually reports any anomaly to the *Event Log*.

In default configurations, we confirmed that executing our attacks does not trigger any event in the Event Log that proves the access to the SAM registry hive. *SAMSRV RPC* [28] calls may result in events writing within the Event log under specific configurations. However, even though the approach is considered stealthy in specific scenarios, modifying the local account objects through RPC has proved not feasible since it is also constraining. Particularly, we noticed that by using it, our attack might lose the impersonation capabilities since the OS does not allow to modify the *RID Copy* attribute that triggers the *Security Reference Monitor* unexpected behavior when creating the *Primary Access Token*.

10 ETHICAL DISCLOSURE

We contacted the email address of *Microsoft Security Response Center (MSRC)* secure@microsoft.com to report our findings. First, we disclosed **RID Hijacking** to MSRC and did not receive an email reply. However, 10 months later, after presenting this research at Black Hat USA, a member of the *Microsoft Security Response Team* reached out to us via a direct message on Twitter, stating that his team had received several external queries as to why *Microsoft* had not patched our attack. The representative said that he could not find our email reporting the attack and that a spam filter had probably caught it. Regarding a patch, he said that:

This doesn't appear to be something we would have addressed via a security update since it's a backdooring technique and not a vulnerability in the traditional sense.

We also reported **Suborner** to MSRC. We received a reply a month later with the following text:

This report describes persistent attacks on a compromised machine running as SYSTEM. As such we have determined that this submission does not meet the definition of a security vulnerability for servicing.

Microsoft's responses imply that persistence is often overlooked. They acknowledge that our attacks create a backdoor but do not meet the classical definition of vulnerabilities. We confirmed that

at the moment of submission of this paper, our attacks still work for *Windows XP, Server 2012, 8.1, 10, and 11*.

11 CONCLUSIONS

Our attacks show the lack of enforcement of the *complete mediation principle* for account management in Windows. To preserve the system's integrity, the OS should enforce complete mediation to access identity storage and access logs.

A defense-in-depth approach could also look for inconsistencies in the authorization's stored information. The current design of Windows makes it difficult to detect inconsistencies created by a privileged adversary. Detecting these inconsistencies is harder when these critical resources are obscure (closed-source) and only intended to be accessible by closed-source OS modules. With this approach, users and defenders may only rely on the application's interpretation of these resources in lieu of the data that is actually stored in them.

From a vendor's perspective, we believe that integrity validation routines of critical resources and hardware-based protection for them, such as the ones proposed with the *Microsoft Pluton* [43] security processors, could reduce the effectiveness of these persistence attacks. Users of the operating system can monitor access to the registry to detect indicators of compromise.

Our work introduces a new realm of user-mode persistence attacks on *Operating Systems*. Our attack model proposes an approach to stealthily forge or customize identities on *Operating Systems* without the constraints of its *Identity Management* applications, opening the door to other potential attacks. We have demonstrated how inconsistencies in OS critical resources can be abused by privileged adversaries to maintain access to a compromised system.

Our proof of concepts and a clearer representation of critical objects used by *Windows* to store identity information can improve a defenders' understanding of *Windows* identity management to detect and prevent persistence attacks while using the OS resources to protect their assets. Regarding the *Windows OS* identity management for local accounts, many unknown account properties are still managed by closed-source functionalities. Future efforts may be oriented to improve the general understanding of the *Windows Identity Management* model along with the discovery of new variants of this attack model. Although they might be easier to detect on open-source *Operating Systems*, we argue that similar attacks could be extended to other OSs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We want to thank Microsoft for their assistance on these findings. We thank the research community for their support and contributions, and the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions. This research was partially sponsored by the Army Research Office and was accomplished under Grant Number W911NF-23-1-0373. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors, and W911NF2310373 should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Army Research Laboratory or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Government purposes, notwithstanding any copyright notation herein.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sebastián Castro. 2018. RID Hijacking: Maintaining Access on Windows Machines. In *Black Hat USA 2018*. <https://www.blackhat.com/us-18/arsenal.html#rid-hijacking-maintaining-access-on-windows-machines>
- [2] Sebastián Castro. 2022. Suborner: A Windows Bribery for Invisible Persistence. In *Black Hat USA 2022*. <https://www.blackhat.com/us-22/arsenal/schedule/#suborner-a-windows-bribery-for-invisible-persistence-27976>
- [3] chntpw. [n. d.]. chntpw. <http://www.chntpw.com>
- [4] Benjamin Delpy. [n. d.]. Kekeo. <https://github.com/gentilkiwi/kekeo/>
- [5] Benjamin Delpy. 2011. Mimikatz. <https://github.com/gentilkiwi/mimikatz>
- [6] Amelie Dieterich, Matthias Schopp, Lars Stiemert, Christoph Steininger, and Daniela Pohn. 2023. Evaluation of Persistence Methods Used by Malware on Microsoft Windows Systems. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Information Systems Security and Privacy (ICISSP 2023)*. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0011710200003405>
- [7] Jiang Du and Jiwei Li. 2016. Analysis of the Structure of SAM and Cracking Password Base on Windows Operating System. In *International Journal of Future Computer and Communication*, Vol. 5, No. 2.
- [8] ELCOMSOFT. [n. d.]. ESR SAM Editor. https://www.elcomsoft.com/help/en/esr/esr_samdbeditor.html
- [9] L. Salazar et al. 2024. A Tale of Two Indostroyers: It was the Season of Darkness. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 165–165. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP54263.2024.00162>
- [10] Hex-Rays. [n. d.]. IDA Pro. <https://hex-rays.com/ida-pro/>
- [11] IBM. [n. d.]. Root account. <https://www.ibm.com/docs/en/aix/7.2?topic=passwords-root-account>
- [12] Michael Kerrisk. [n. d.]. useradd(8) — Linux manual page. <https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man8/useradd.8.html>
- [13] Platon Kotzias, Leyla Bilge, Pierre-Antoine Vervier, and Juan Caballero. 2019. Mind Your Own Business: A Longitudinal Study of Threats and Vulnerabilities in Enterprises.. In *NDSS*.
- [14] Microsoft Learn. 2021. Antimalware Scan Interface (AMSI). <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/amsi/antimalware-scan-interface-portal>
- [15] Microsoft. [n. d.]. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/security/kerberos/kerberos-authentication-overview>
- [16] Microsoft. 2021. Access Control Lists. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthz/access-control-lists>
- [17] Microsoft. 2021. Appendix L: Events to Monitor. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/identity/ad-ds/plan/appendix-l--events-to-monitor>
- [18] Microsoft. 2021. Audit SAM. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/security/threat-protection/auditing/audit-sam>
- [19] Microsoft. 2021. Credential Providers. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthn/credential-providers-in-windows>
- [20] Microsoft. 2021. Debugging Tools for Windows (WinDbg, KD, CDB, NTSD). <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-hardware/drivers/debugger/>
- [21] Microsoft. 2021. Event Logging. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/eventlog/event-logging>
- [22] Microsoft. 2021. Event Logging. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthz/access-tokens>
- [23] Microsoft. 2021. HiveNightmare (CVE-2021-36934) Windows Elevation of Privilege Vulnerability). <https://msrc.microsoft.com/update-guide/vulnerability/CVE-2021-36934>
- [24] Microsoft. 2021. KB5004605: Update adds AES encryption protections to the MS-SAMR protocol for CVE-2021-33757. <https://tinyurl.com/3j6r4wvn>
- [25] Microsoft. 2021. LSA Authentication. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthn/lsa-authentication>
- [26] Microsoft. 2021. Monitoring Active Directory for Signs of Compromise. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/identity/ad-ds/plan/security-best-practices/monitoring-active-directory-for-signs-of-compromise>
- [27] Microsoft. 2021. MS-SAMR Security Account Manager. https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/openspecs/windows_protocols/ms-samr/
- [28] Microsoft. 2021. MS-SAMR: Security Account Manager (SAM) Remote Protocol (Client-to-Server). https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/openspecs/windows_protocols/ms-samr/
- [29] Microsoft. 2021. MSV1_0 Authentication Package. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthn/msv1-0-authentication-package>
- [30] Microsoft. 2021. NetUserAdd function (lmaccess.h). <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/lmaccess/nf-lmaccess-netuseradd>
- [31] Microsoft. 2021. Powershell documentation. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/powershell/>
- [32] Microsoft. 2021. Securable Objects. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthz/securable-objects>
- [33] Microsoft. 2021. Security Descriptors. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthz/security-descriptors>
- [34] Microsoft. 2021. Security Identifier. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthz/security-identifiers>
- [35] Microsoft. 2021. SID Components. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/secauthz/sid-components>
- [36] Microsoft. 2021. userenv.h header. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/userenv/>
- [37] Microsoft. 2021. USER_INFO_1 structure (lmaccess.h). https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/lmaccess/ns-lmaccess-user_info_1
- [38] Microsoft. 2021. Well-Known SID Structures. https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/openspecs/windows_protocols/ms-dtyp/
- [39] Microsoft. 2021. Windows Authentication. Overview. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/security/windows-authentication/windows-authentication-overview>
- [40] Microsoft. 2021. Windows Kernel Mode Executive Support Library. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-hardware/drivers/kernel/windows-kernel-mode-executive-support-library>
- [41] Microsoft. 2021. Windows registry information for advanced users. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/troubleshoot/windows-server/performance/windows-registry-advanced-users>
- [42] Microsoft. 2023. Credentials Processes in Windows Authentication. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-server/security/windows-authentication/credentials-processes-in-windows-authentication>
- [43] Microsoft. 2024. Microsoft Pluton security processor. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/security/information-protection/pluton/microsoft-pluton-security-processor>
- [44] Microsoft Forum. [n. d.]. Create Hidden User. <https://answers.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/forum/all/creating-a-hidden-user/0b4c00af-4354-4479-b0bb-b160ef84022d>
- [45] Mitre. [n. d.]. MITRE ATT&CK Framework. <https://attack.mitre.org/>
- [46] MITRE. 2024. Persistence, Tactic TA0003. <https://attack.mitre.org/tactics/TA0003/>
- [47] Abhijit Mohanta and Anoop Saldanha. 2020. Persistence Mechanisms. In *Malware Analysis and Detection Engineering: A Comprehensive Approach to Detect and Analyze Modern Malware*. Berkeley, CA: Apress, 213–216. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-6193-4_8
- [48] Elizabeth Montalbano. 2024. Novel EDR-Killing 'GhostEngine' Malware Is Built for Stealth. *Dark Reading* (2024). <https://www.darkreading.com/cyberattacks-data-breaches/novel-edr-killing-ghostengine-malware-stealth> Accessed: 2024-06-20.
- [49] Ori Or-meir, Nir Nissim, Yuval Elovici, and Lior Rockach. 2019. Dynamic Malware Analysis in the Modern Era — A State of the Art Survey. In *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 52, no. 5. 88:1–88:48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3329786>
- [50] Muhammad Rana, Munam Shah, and Osama Ellahi. 2021. Malware Persistence and Obfuscation: An Analysis on Concealed Strategies. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Automation & Computing, University of Portsmouth*.
- [51] Rapid7. [n. d.]. Metasploit. <https://www.metasploit.com/>
- [52] Red Hat. [n. d.]. Identity Management Log Files and Directories. <https://tinyurl.com/2p8ddhmz>
- [53] Will Schoeder. [n. d.]. Rubeus. <https://github.com/GhostPack/Rubeus>
- [54] SecureAuth. [n. d.]. Impacket. <https://www.secureauth.com/labs/open-source-tools/impacket/>
- [55] AArthi Sing. [n. d.]. Editing /etc/passwd File for Privilege Escalation. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows-hardware/drivers/kernel/windows-kernel-mode-executive-support-library>
- [56] Slate. [n. d.]. Don't listen to Bill Gates. The open-source movement isn't communism. <https://slate.com/technology/2005/11/the-open-source-movement-isn-t-communism.html>
- [57] Ben Ten. [n. d.]. doucMe. <https://github.com/ben0xa/doucme>
- [58] Duc Tran Le, Truong Duy Dinh, Phuoc Nguyen, Ammar Muthanna, and Ahmed El-latif. 2023. Exploring Common Malware Persistence Techniques on Windows Operating Systems (OS) for Enhanced Cybersecurity Management: Detection and Mitigation Strategies. In *Cybersecurity Management in Education Technologies*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003369042-7>
- [59] Unit 42. 2024. Manic Menagerie Targets Web Hosting and IT: Threat Report. <https://unit42.paloaltonetworks.com/manic-menagerie-targets-web-hosting-and-it/> Accessed: 2024-06-20.
- [60] Jorik van Nielen. 2023. *Dynamic Detection and Classification of Persistence Techniques in Windows Malware*. Master's thesis. University of Twente.
- [61] Antonio Villalón-Huerta, Hector Marco-Gisbert, and Ismael Ripoll-Ripoll. 2022. A Taxonomy for Threat Actors' Persistence Techniques. *Computers & Security* 121 (2022), 102855.
- [62] Virus Total. 2024. VirusTotal Analysis of RID Hijacking Metasploit Module. <https://www.virustotal.com/gui/url/4cfb24f056d7d669982f32a9912e0bf34b6749a168509042edcd015c40498db1>
- [63] Virus Total. 2024. VirusTotal Analysis of RID Hijacking Powershell Module. <https://www.virustotal.com/gui/url/a4a5478d0aa412a570db90789358ec1a4fabb449ed7e7f6e69db275b7fe5c1e>
- [64] Virus Total. 2024. VirusTotal Analysis of Suborner C# Module. <https://www.virustotal.com/gui/url/950fc6295d583a60a7309e422926eff796d0874571f6ee0baade777c3d060246>

- [65] Matthew Webb. 2018. *Evaluating tool based automated malware analysis through persistence mechanism detection*. Master's thesis. MKansas State University. <https://krex.k-state.edu/handle/2097/38783>
- [66] Pavel Yosifovich, Mark E. Russinovich, David A. Solomon, and Alex Ionescu. 2017. *Windows Internals, Part 1: System Architecture, Processes, Threads, Memory Management, and More (7th Edition)* (7th ed.). Microsoft Press, USA.
- [67] YouTube. [n. d.]. Create Invisible Account in Windows XP. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_FB-dKtaOs8