

PhishED:

Automated contextual feedback for reported Phishing

Adam Jenkins, Nadin Kokciyan, Kami Vaniea; University of Edinburgh

{adam.jenkins, nadin.kokciyan, kami.vaniea}@ed.ac.uk



URL

for

Amsterdam, Netherlands

breakdown

example

domain

Language

explained to

cues

the user

age of the

Project Overview

People often receive suspicious emails that claim to be from trusted persons or organisations (e.g., a bank), but are actually from attackers aiming to deceive recipients into giving away valuable information, known as phishing.

In this project, we are developing the PhishED system that will support people by providing automatically generated advice to suspicious emails they report Using contextual cues the advice is meant to both help make an informed decision and provide education in a teachable moment.

Proposed Solution

PhishEd leverages Artificial Intelligence's ability to extract and reason about contextual features of phishing in support of user decision making. Example of such features are::

Contextual keywords - If a reported email uses terms like "shutdown", "email", and "account", the user may think that such a message was sent through an organization.

Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) - If an email contains the "PayPal" keyword but the URLs do not lead to PavPal's official website, that information can be provided to the user.

Email headers - E.g. the From address can be checked against DKIM signatures or whitelists of organisation domains.

Template Initial Designs

MSc Thesis: Design of Auto Responses Created initial designs for PhishEd, using a shown in Figure 2.

NEAT & SPRUCE

We will improve our template

user-centered approach creating final mock up designs by integrating Microsoft security warning design guidance, designed for use within their own product teams, see Figure 1.

When you involve the user in a NEAT security or privacy

decision, explain the decision using these 6 elements:

PROCESS: Give the user actionable steps to follow to make a good decision

RISK: Explain what bad thing could happen if the user makes the wrong decision

UNIOUE KNOWLEDGE user has: Tell the user what information they bring to the deci-

SOURCE: State who or what is asking the user to make a decision

CHOICES: List available options and clearly recommend one

EVIDENCE: Highlight information the user should factor in or

Microsoft

Ask yourself: Is your security or privacy UX:

NECESSARY? Can you change the architecture to eliminate or defer this

EXPLAINED? Does your UX present all the information the user needs to make this decision? Have you followed SPRUCE? (see back) ACTIONABLE? Have you determined a set of steps the user will realistically

Figure 2: Initial design of automated responses by Zeyu Zhang (MSc)



email

Traffic Light

highlight risk

levels or facts

Sender email

highlighting

domain and

authentication

information from

address.

headers

Colour Scheme to

Take Your Time!

Don't click any links, buttons or attachments yet. They may be used to get your privacy.

We can't guarantee it is phishing or not, but you can!

Thank You, Zeyu!

This email is from:

elxw.fa.sender@workflow.mail.em3.oraclecloud.com

Your Inquery ID: 10083

You are the most suitable one to judge this email. If you see many red/yellow ones, be particularly careful.

(!) No other strange things are found in this link.

Be aware of folloing findings.

We have also scanned the languages in this email.

There is 1 link in this email

Leboncoinpaiementpro.fr

Still confused?

Provide reassurance. encourage using unique knowledge to make an informed decision

Future Work

Iterative Design Improve on our initial designs using a User centered design process. Focus groups with potential users to inform designs.

Evaluation

Lab studies will identify suitability with potential users.

Develop an Outlook add-in, and then deploy and monitor the usage of tool in a longitudinal study with partner organisation.

NEAT

Figure 1: Microsoft's NEAT and SPRUCE guidelines for Security Warning Design