

Koney: A Cyber Deception Orchestration Framework for Kubernetes

Mario Kahlhofer
Dynatrace Research
mario.kahlhofer@dynatrace.com

Matteo Golinelli
University of Trento
matteo.golinelli@unitn.it

Stefan Rass
Johannes Kepler University Linz
stefan.rass@jku.at

Abstract—System operators responsible for protecting software applications remain hesitant to implement cyber deception technology, including methods that place traps to catch attackers, despite its proven benefits. Overcoming their concerns removes a barrier that currently hinders industry adoption of deception technology. Our work introduces deception policy documents to describe deception technology “as code” and pairs them with Koney, a Kubernetes operator, which facilitates the setup, rotation, monitoring, and removal of traps in Kubernetes. We leverage cloud-native technologies, such as service meshes and eBPF, to automatically add traps to containerized software applications, without having access to the source code. We focus specifically on operational properties, such as maintainability, scalability, and simplicity, which we consider essential to accelerate the adoption of cyber deception technology and to facilitate further research on cyber deception.

Index Terms—cyber deception, deception policies, honeytokens, honeypots, application layer deception, runtime deception, operator pattern, Kubernetes

1. Introduction

The interest in cyber deception technology, which includes methods that set subtle traps to easily spot, delay, and deter attackers [20], has recently gained renewed attention. The emergence of generative honeypots [35], [42], [45], [58], [66], [71] now allows the rapid generation of enticing deceptive payloads. Simultaneously, modern software application architectures, particularly cloud-native architectures, have become increasingly dynamic and flexible, offering novel opportunities to integrate active defensive measures [34]. We believe that leveraging these opportunities can accelerate the adoption of cyber deception technology by the industry, as they can address two common, yet unexplored, needs of system operators:

- 1) **Policy Documents.** How can cyber deception techniques be formalized “as code”, i.e., expressed as structured documents?
- 2) **Automated Deployment.** How can we implement these policies in real-world software systems, without the ability to own or alter the application’s source code, which is a common constraint faced by system operators?

This offers system operators an alternative to deciphering cyber deception methods from academic papers and subsequently tailoring their understanding to fit a particular technical environment (Figure 1).




Figure 1. State of the art in deploying cyber deception and this work.

We introduce Koney as a tool for the automated deployment of cyber deception policies. While Koney is designed for Kubernetes, the design decisions we present can be leveraged by cloud- and container-based deception research [28], [29], [36], [39], [41], [43], [46], [52], [57], [64], [68], [79], [88]. As the deployment of classic honeypot software is well-explored [26], [44], we initially concentrate on techniques close to the application layer.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- 1) A schema for describing **cyber deception policies**, such as honeytokens in file systems and traps that protect HTTP-based web applications, but not limited to application layer techniques.
- 2) A framework to automate the setup, rotation, monitoring, and removal of cyber deception technology in container orchestration platforms.
- 3) **Koney**, an open-source¹ operator that automates application layer cyber deception in Kubernetes.

2. Problem Statement

Studies note that “organizations are still reluctant to implement cyber deception” [85]. One potential obstacle for system operators could be the technical challenges that researchers have also previously encountered [31], [62]. Kahlhofer and Rass note that “a barrier to widespread adoption of cyber deception technology is its deployment in real-world software systems” [34]. They suggest necessary properties that such technologies must have, including operational aspects like simplicity, maintainability, and

1. <https://github.com/dynatrace-oss/koney>

scalability, and technical aspects such as being resource-efficient, the ability to transparently modify or redirect application data, and avoiding application restarts. We designed Koney with these properties in mind.

Ultimately, we aim to deploy many previously published cyber deception techniques [3], [5], [6], [24], [25], [27], [30], [33], [48], [62], [70], [86], [87] with Koney. Han et al. categorize techniques into network, system, application, and data layers [31]. Deploying classic honeypots is typically simple since they operate on the network layer, where additional workloads can be easily connected, while application and system layer techniques require more pervasive technical methods [34]. Our work primarily focuses on the application layer, for which we identified a representative sample of use cases (Figure 2). We will describe these use cases with policy documents and deploy them to a Kubernetes cluster using Koney.

Honeyfiles. Placing fake files, security tokens, or documents that appear sensitive and appealing to adversaries is one of the original use cases of cyber deception. We distinguish between honeytokens [70] and honeydocuments [6], [86], [87]. Honeytokens are small files with only a few lines of seemingly sensitive text, whereas honeydocuments are entire files, such as Office and PDF documents. Finally, honeydirectories are entire folder structures that contain deceptive files.

Fixed HTTP responses. By injecting new, previously non-existent, HTTP endpoints into web applications, we can lure attackers and vulnerability scanners to misleading paths [3], [25]. Typically, the aim is to either redirect HTTP requests to honeypots, or directly respond to requests with a deceptive file or payload, such as a fake admin page when someone probes “/wp-admin”. Pages that allow file uploads are called upload sinkholes [24].

HTTP header modification. Vulnerability scanners typically inspect only certain headers [25]. To steer scanners towards incorrect assessments, we can manipulate version numbers (e.g., in the “Server” header field), send incorrect service banners to combat banner grabbing [1], tamper with session cookies to entice adversaries [24], [30], and alter response status codes [37].

HTTP body modification. To realize more invasive use cases, we need to modify the HTTP response body directly. For example, the “robots.txt” file is a common entry point for scanners and adversaries to discover routes that the site owner wants to hide from them. Adding new routes to this file, a process known as “disallow injection” [24], [25], [30], is a valuable cyber deception technique. Deceptive elements may also be directly added to HTML, CSS, and JavaScript sources. For instance, we can add tracking links to register access attempts to pages that only adversaries are likely to visit [27], obfuscate source code by adding deceptive elements to it [24], imitate real security weaknesses and vulnerabilities [33], [62], add deceptive GET or POST parameters such as “admin=false” to hyperlinks [30], [33], [48], or inject hidden form fields [5].

While we don’t consider it part of our primary problem statement, in §7.1 we describe how Koney can be extended to support deception techniques for protocols other than HTTP [44] and domain-specific classes of applications, such as database systems [72] and WordPress plugins [59].




Figure 2. Example use cases of application layer cyber deception.

3. Kubernetes Terminology

This section provides an overview of key terminology and concepts related to Kubernetes.

Kubernetes is an enterprise-ready system for orchestrating container deployments. Figure 3 presents its main components. A *pod* is the smallest deployable unit and contains the software application. A pod consists of at least one *container*, and containers within the same pod share storage and network resources. Containers used for auxiliary tasks such as monitoring are known as *sidecars*. Pods are deployed on a *node*, which can be a physical or virtual machine. A *cluster* is composed of one or more nodes. Clusters have at least one *control plane*, which offers APIs to system operators to manage cluster configuration and workloads. The control plane is typically isolated from the (application) workloads and cannot be easily compromised. *Workloads*, such as pods, are represented by *manifests*, which are formal documents that describe them. Manifests hold metadata, such as the resource name, resource kind (indicating their type), their associated *namespace* (to organize resources), *labels* and *annotations* (custom key-value pairs), and their kind-specific properties. For pods, these include container images, command-line arguments, environment variables, mounted volumes, exposed ports, and more.

Kubernetes can be extended with *operators*, which add custom logic to the Kubernetes API, to facilitate the management of complex applications and clusters. Operators typically install *custom resource definitions (CRDs)*, which represent new kinds of resources with which system operators can interface. *Custom resources*, and more




Figure 3. Components of a Kubernetes cluster.

generally all resource definitions in Kubernetes, describe a desired state. Operators watch for changes to their custom resources (and possibly to the cluster state) and take action to restore and maintain the desired cluster state [32]. The process of restoring the state of the cluster to the desired one is called *reconciliation* and is executed in a loop by the operator, triggered by the control plane.

4. Cyber Deception Policies

Introducing cyber deception policies enables dividing responsibilities between three roles, which typically do not overlap: authors of cyber deception techniques, software application developers, and system operators deploying them. This pattern is especially prevalent in Kubernetes [32] and is followed by popular tools to manage security policies, such as Kyverno [80]. Listing 1 presents the design of a policy document and its structure in pseudo-code. A policy contains:

- 1) A list of traps and their parameterization (§4.1, §4.2). The parameters include the strategy to technically deploy the trap. Deployment strategies are extensively described in §5, as they are implementation-specific. A **trap** consists of the **decoy**, which is the entity that is attacked, and the **captor**, which monitors the decoy [19].
- 2) The criteria for selecting the applications and workloads in which to deploy the traps (§4.3).

Listing 1. PSEUDO POLICY TO ILLUSTRATE ITS BASIC STRUCTURE.

```
kind: DeceptionPolicy
metadata:
  name: sample-boilerplate
spec:
  traps:
    - trapKindOne:      # trap kind and its
      foo: bar          # distinctive properties

      match:            # workload selection
        ...             # see §4.3

      decoyDeployment:  # method for deploying
        strategy: ...  # the trap itself

      captorDeployment: # method for monitoring
        strategy: ...  # access attempts

    - trapKindOne: ...  # more traps
    - trapKindTwo: ...  # (duplicates allowed)
```

4.1. Traps in File Systems

The deployment of a honeypot in a file system can be formally described by its path and content. To closely resemble real security tokens, one may set the file's access mode to `readOnly`. If the file content is longer than a few lines or is binary, the policy must include a URL pointing to the source of the honeypot to be downloaded before deployment. An example of both types of traps is illustrated in Listing 2. These two specifications can also be nested to facilitate the creation of entire honeypot directories, as shown in Appendix A.1.

Listing 2. SPECIFICATION OF HONEYTOKENS AND -DOCUMENTS.

```
- filesystemHoneytoken:
  path: /run/secrets/service_token
  content: very-secret-token
  readOnly: true
- filesystemHoneydocument:
  path: /root/passwords.docx
  source: https://srv.test/honey.docx
```

Appendix A.1 contains full-length sample policies for traps in file systems. Those also illustrate two strategies for the deployment of decoys, the “exec” method (§5.1.1) and volume mounts (§5.1.2); as well as the Tetragon strategy for monitoring file access attempts (§5.2.1).

4.2. Traps in Web Applications

To define fixed HTTP responses, we chose a formulation similar to Baitroute [65] and HASH [14], comprising two parts: an expression to match HTTP requests by path and method, and the corresponding response. Listing 3 illustrates responding with predefined content, which resembles a trivial honeypot. This also enables responding with an HTTP redirect, as demonstrated in Appendix A.2.

Listing 3. SPECIFICATION OF A STATIC HTTP RESPONSE.

```
- httpResponse:
  request:
    match: ^/wp-admin # regex: starts with
    method: GET       # filter on GET only
  response:
    status: 200
  headers:
    Content-Type: text/html
    body: "<html><!-- --></html>"
```

To modify or add headers and change the status code of genuine HTTP responses, the response specification is altered to include a status and a `setHeader` directive, as shown in Listing 4. The `removeHeaders` directive enables removing response headers from HTTP responses.

Listing 4. SPECIFICATION FOR MUTATING HTTP HEADERS.

```
- httpHeaderMutation:
  request:
    match: "*" # regex: match all paths
    method: GET # filter on GET only
  response:
    status: 404 # override
  setHeaders:
    Server: nginx/1.2.4
    X-ApiServer: honeypot.test
  removeHeaders:
    - Cookie
```

To enable modification of the body of HTTP responses, we employ different “engines”. Listing 5 illustrates how to use the “regex” engine, which searches for a matching pattern and replaces it with another. This engine also supports group expressions. For example, to inject a script in the head of an HTML page we have a group that matches the prefix plus the inner HTML (`<head>.*`) and a group that matches the suffix (`</head>`). This is replaced with the first group (`$1`), the injection content, and the second group (`$2`). Note that all the examples follow the syntax of the Golang regexp package [77]. To further filter what responses are modified (e.g., transform HTML but not images), we support filters in the response section, such as `matchHeaders`.

Listing 5. SPECIFICATION FOR MUTATING THE HTTP BODY.

```
- httpBodyMutation:
  request:
    match: "*" # match all paths
    method: GET # GET only
  response:
    matchHeaders:
      Content-Type: text/html
    bodyMutations:
      - engine: regex
        match: "(?si)(<head>.*)(</head>)"
        replace: "$1<script></script>$2"
```

Appendix A.2 presents full-length sample policies for traps in web applications. Decoy and captor deployment with Istio is explained in §5.1.3 and §5.2.2, respectively.

4.3. Selecting Resources

Every trap needs to specify the resources it targets. Koney uses labels and selectors, which is a standard method of organizing and selecting resources in Kubernetes [11]. We adopt Kyverno’s syntax [80], because we find it well-organized and easy to use. Moreover, since Kyverno is a popular tool, many users might already be familiar with its syntax. Resource selection (Listing 6) works by defining one or more “resource filters”, combined by `any` or `all` connectives. `any` applies traps if any filter matches (logical OR), whereas `all` only applies traps to resources matching every filter (logical AND). A resource filter contains one or more distinct selectors:

- `selector.matchLabels`: Matches resources with exactly these labels. If multiple pairs are given, resources must possess **all** of them.
- `selector.matchExpressions`: A method to formulate complex filter expressions, as specified in the official Kubernetes API [11].
- `namespaces`: Matches resources within **any** namespace listed. If omitted, it matches all possible namespaces.
- `containerSelector`: Traps such as honeytokens operate on an individual container file system. This selector filters which containers are affected. If omitted, all containers will be affected (equivalent to the wildcard selector `"*"`).
- `ports`: Traps such as HTTP-based traps intercept network traffic. This selector filters which ports are intercepted. If omitted, it will match all ports.

One of `selector` or `namespaces` (or both) must be specified to make a valid filter. Multiple selectors within one filter are evaluated with a logical AND.

Listing 6. EXAMPLE ON SELECTING RESOURCES.

```
match:
  any:
    - resources: # resource filter
      selector:
        matchLabels:
          example-label: true
      namespaces:
        - production
      containerSelector: "*"
      ports:
        - 80
```

5. The Koney Operator

Koney automates deployment and monitoring of traps in Kubernetes and is built using the Operator SDK [83], a framework for developing Kubernetes operators with Golang. Figures 4 and 5 show deployment strategies for honeytokens, and for HTTP-based traps, respectively.

❶ Koney’s reconciliation loop is invoked every time a **DeceptionPolicy** resource is created, updated, or deleted. Updating a policy, e.g., to rotate traps, is equivalent to deleting the old policy and creating a new one.

5.1. Decoy Deployment Strategies

The Koney operator can deploy decoys with different strategies. The following sections describe the supported strategies and their implementation in the Koney operator.

5.1.1. containerExec Strategy. This strategy deploys file system honeytokens by executing shell commands directly in a container. 2A Commands are executed in the selected containers using the Kubernetes API, by sending HTTP POST requests to the API server. First, Koney creates the necessary directories in the container, if they do not already exist, using the `mkdir` command. Next, the operator creates honeytokens using the `echo` command, redirecting the output to the desired file. Note that we use `echo` instead of `touch` because in the case where the file already includes content and we want to update it to be empty, `touch` would not overwrite it. To avoid command injection vulnerabilities, the operator encodes the file’s content in octal format before executing the command in the container. We do not use `base64` or hexadecimal encoding because they might not be available in all containers and shells. After creating the file, the operator checks that the file was created successfully and that the content is correct using the `cat` command, verifying the output. Finally, if the file is configured to be read-only in the deception policy, the operator sets the file permissions to 444 using the `chmod` command.

5.1.2. volumeMount Strategy. This strategy deploys honeytokens by mounting a volume to the selected containers on the specified path. The operator first creates a **Secret**, which is a Kubernetes object that contains sensitive data, with the content of the honeytokens. 2B Koney then configures a volume in the selected deployment with




Figure 4. Deployment strategies for placing honeytokens.

the `Secret` as the source and mounts it to the selected containers within the deployment. Kubernetes will then re-create the pods with the mounted honeytokens because we changed the deployment, which serves as a blueprint for creating pods. The operator also sets the volume to be read-only, if specified in the policy, to prevent the honeytokens from being modified from within the container.

5.1.3. istio Decoy Strategy. This strategy first requires the Istio service mesh [78] to be installed in the cluster. A service mesh enables system operators to centrally monitor and control all cluster traffic. Istio places a reverse proxy in front of application containers by putting a sidecar container into every pod. The sidecar intercepts all incoming and outgoing traffic and applies the rules defined in Istio’s `VirtualService` resources. (2) Koney creates a virtual service for each trap specified in the deception policy. If the trap is a fixed HTTP response, the operator generates a `HTTPDirectResponse` route action. For traps that require modifying the HTTP response headers, the operator generates a `HTTPRewrite` route action. Finally, for traps that require modifying the body of the HTTP response, we instead create an `EnvoyFilter` resource with a `WebAssembly` (WASM) extension. Our WASM extension, a compiled C++ program, implements several “engines” for modifying HTTP bodies.

5.2. Captor Deployment Strategies

Captors are responsible for monitoring access attempts to the decoys. The following sections describe Koney’s supported strategies for deploying captors.

5.2.1. tetragon Strategy. This strategy first requires the Tetragon operator to be installed in the cluster. Tetragon [84] can trace system calls and monitor file access attempts with eBPF [60], a Linux kernel technology. (3) Koney creates a `TracingPolicy` resource for each trap specified in the deception policy. This policy monitors function calls related to file access. Specifically, we monitor `security_file_permission` and `security_mmap_file` kprobes with the path of the honeytokens as the argument. (4) We configure the tracing policy to perform a request to a designated webhook URL when it detects a file access attempt. This URL is the address of a web server managed by Koney, which, when it receives a request from Tetragon, reads Tetragon’s logs, identifies the trap that was accessed, and logs the incident.




Figure 5. Deployment strategies for placing HTTP-based traps.

5.2.2. istio Captor Strategy. Decoys placed with Istio (§5.1.3) must also be monitored with Istio. (2) Koney creates an `EnvoyFilter` for each trap specified in the deception policy. (3) The filter contains a WASM extension that will invoke a webhook URL managed by Koney when the affected HTTP request is matched. When Koney receives a request from Istio, it reads Istio’s logs, identifies the triggered trap, and logs the incident. This strategy is best applied on HTTP routes that are prone to attacks.

5.3. Auxiliary Functions

The Koney operator provides additional features to assist system operators, as briefly outlined below.

Policy Validation. Koney validates deception policies before deploying traps. This includes validating syntax and avoiding policy conflicts, such as two policies attempting to place a honeytokens at the same file path. However, Koney cannot guarantee that traps will not interfere with the genuine flow of an application they target.

Existing Resources. The `mutateExisting` field in a deception policy specifies if traps should be deployed to already running workloads. If enabled, Koney targets all matching workloads. If disabled, traps are applied only to newly created resources post-policy creation.

Workload Annotations. Every time Koney modifies a workload, it places an annotation on that workload that contains JSON-encoded metadata about the deployed traps. Annotations are used by Koney during cleanup to identify what needs to be removed.

Status Conditions. Koney tracks the deployment status of traps via so-called status conditions, applied directly to deception policy objects. These conditions report the number of deployed traps and indicate possible errors, helping system operators troubleshoot deployment issues.

Alerts. When a honeytokens is accessed or an HTTP-based trap is triggered, Koney outputs a JSON-formatted log line to standard output in the `alerts` container within the operator’s pod. We assume that system operators have monitoring software to centrally process these alerts.

6. Evaluation

We examine three questions: (§6.1) Which cyber deception techniques can be modeled in our policy documents and implemented by Koney? (§6.2) What are the trade-offs of Koney’s deployment strategies? (§6.3) How fast can Koney create, modify, and remove traps?

6.1. Use Case Coverage

Table 1 compares typical use cases of application layer cyber deception (§2) with a representative sample of related tools and frameworks, which we also describe in related work (§8). This comparison is mainly dictated by the architectural constraints of specific frameworks. Koney and Cloxy [24] employ reverse proxies, theoretically allowing unrestricted modification of all web traffic. Baitroute [65] is a software library integrated at compile-time, designed to embed new deceptive endpoints without modifying existing ones. HASH [14] is a classic honeypot deployed alongside applications, which inhibits HASH from modifying the application traffic.

TABLE 1. USE CASE COVERAGE OF APPLICATION LAYER CYBER DECEPTION TOOLS AND FRAMEWORKS (AS OF APRIL 2025)

	Koney	Cloxy [24]	Baitroute [65]	HASH [14]	DcyFS [73]	Beesting [49]
Open-Source Framework	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Capable of Orchestration ¹	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Honeytokens	●	—	—	—	●	●
Honeydocuments	●	—	—	—	●	○
Honeydirectories	●	—	—	—	●	○
Fixed HTTP Responses						
URL Redirection	●	●	●	●	—	—
Static Page, Honeyurl	●	●	●	●	—	—
Upload Sinkhole	○ ²	●	○ ²	○ ²	—	—
HTTP Header Modification						
Version Trickery, Fake Banner	●	●	○ ³	○	—	—
Status Code Tampering	●	○ ⁴	○ ³	○	—	—
Cookie Tampering	○	○ ⁵	○	○	—	—
HTTP Body Modification						
robots.txt Mod., Disallow Inj.	●	●	○	○	—	—
HTML, CSS, JS Modification	●	●	○	○	—	—
Tracking Links	●	●	○	○	—	—
Code Obfuscation	○	●	○	○	—	—
Weak Code Injection	●	●	○	○	—	—
GET / POST Param. Injection	●	●	○	○	—	—
Hidden Form Fields	●	●	○	○	—	—

¹ Does this framework help manage and coordinate the deployment of several traps across multiple containers or processes?

² No native support, but can be achieved by redirecting to a honeypot.

³ Baitroute would replace the entire HTTP response with a new one.

⁴ Designed to deceive automated web scanners, not configurable.

⁵ Designed to append decoy cookies, not to modify existing ones.

This comparison omits works such as Decepto [64], HoneyKube [28], [29], or the Kubernetes Storm Center [79], as they use Kubernetes to build complete “honey-clusters” but do not inject traps into the application layer.

6.2. Operational Trade-Offs

Kahlhofer and Rass introduced various properties to evaluate technical methods that implement deception techniques [34]. We focus on evaluating a subset of them, namely detectability (how well a method can detect attacks), simplicity, maintainability, scalability, inconspicuousness (how hard it is for attackers to identify a technical method), and non-interference with genuine application assets, or as Gupta et al. put it, to “not make the [overall] system less secure” [28], [29].

The Operator Pattern. Separating policy documents from the tools that implement them improves maintainability and scalability, at the cost of increased complexity. A Kubernetes operator is easy to integrate into a cluster, similar to a plugin; however, since this also grants them broad privileges, it risks disrupting existing workloads. The Kubernetes Operator Threat Matrix [12] is a useful resource to assess the risks of operators, in general.

Placing Honeytokens in Containers. Koney places honeytokens by executing shell commands in running containers (§5.1.1) or by defining volume mounts (§5.1.2).

Executing shell commands is simple, flexible, leaves no trace for attackers, and can be done without restarting applications. This approach relies on a file system that is not read-only and binaries such as `sh` and `echo`, which makes it difficult to support every container – impossible even for distroless container images, as they only include the application and necessary runtime dependencies. Also, it is generally not good practice to execute shell commands in production containers (§7).

Defining volume mounts solves these issues, while also improving transparency, since system operators can easily locate them in manifests. However, this requires restarting the application because volume mounts cannot be attached to running containers.

Monitoring with eBPF. Koney uses eBPF to detect when a process accesses a honeytoken (§5.2.1). Since eBPF programs run in kernel space, attackers can hardly bypass or identify this detection mechanism. eBPF is a well-established technology within the Kubernetes ecosystem, thus providing good maintenance and scalability characteristics. All eBPF programs operate with a limited instruction set and have read-only access to kernel data structures, ensuring workloads remain undisturbed.

Reverse Proxies. Koney relies on the Istio service mesh to place Envoy proxies in front of application containers (§5.1.3, §5.2.2). A service mesh, while not necessarily easy to set up initially, provides a very scalable and typically well-maintained foundation [40]. Reverse proxies can manage and monitor all incoming and outgoing application traffic, allowing them to detect attacks on traps and potentially also taking on additional intrusion detection functions. Reverse proxies often come with a significant latency overhead [91], which could make them unsuitable for high-performance scenarios. These interposed systems, if not properly configured, may interfere with application workloads or reveal their presence to attackers if proxies append identifiable details.

6.3. Operational Performance

Koney can be added to any Kubernetes cluster in minutes by executing a few `kubectl` commands. Koney deploys traps immediately after a new `DeceptionPolicy` resource is added to the cluster. Most traps are deployed within seconds; some require a container restart, resulting in a short downtime unless replicas are available. Alerts that appear when traps are triggered are slightly delayed because Tetragon and Istio logs are currently processed asynchronously every 30 seconds. We did not conduct a quantitative evaluation of these processes because it is evident that automated workflows are inherently quicker than the manual deployment of cyber deception techniques.

7. Discussion

This section discusses our design choices and identifies challenges and opportunities for future work.

Treating deception technology as policy objects, like Kubernetes does, makes it manageable and accelerates its adoption. Deception technologies frequently demand unconventional tricks to maintain secrecy, which system operators are reluctant to adopt. A first useful step is to increase transparency for system operators by making deception technologies manageable policy objects. We presented Koney to 6 security engineers in our team, who appreciated that Koney annotates workloads that it manipulates, that policy documents report their deployment status, and that each trap’s deployment is automatically validated by programmatically accessing it after creation.

When adopting deception technology, system operators must choose between having many dynamic parts in production, risking interference, or integrating deception technology earlier in the software development life cycle. Authors of policy documents still need to be careful not to impair or break existing workloads with their traps. Mounting honeytokens via bind mounts or executing OCI hooks as Beesting [49], [50] does can be done with minimal interference, while intercepting HTTP communication with reverse proxies is riskier. In addition, Koney’s deployment strategies may also trigger other security tools. During tests in a AWS EKS cluster, AWS GuardDuty generated security alerts due to suspicious activities by privileged pods because our “exec” strategy executes shell scripts in pods (§5.1.1), which is also typical for malware. Although allow-listing Koney resolves this, ideally, deception technology would be integrated earlier in the software development life cycle, e.g., at compile-time like Baitroute [65]. However, this is often challenging or impossible, especially with third-party software. Consequently, we encourage more research on the risk levels posed by cyber deception technologies.

Service meshes and reverse proxies are flexible and extensible, but research is needed to resolve their performance overhead. Although Koney and Cloxy [24] do not yet support certain use cases of deception in web applications (§6), their flexible proxy-based architecture should allow future extensions. However, the costly setup process for a service mesh, including Istio [78] and Linkerd [81], and its invasive nature remain disadvantageous. Performance also deteriorates, as reverse proxies consume extra memory and CPU resources and increase network latency [91]. Still, their prevalence in research [4], [5], [24], [30], [51], [62] indicates a lack of practical alternatives. There are function-hooking-based alternatives that are also more resource-efficient [34], but they add a considerable amount of system complexity.

eBPF is a great choice for designing captors for containerized workloads, but its peculiarities should not be underestimated. eBPF is a popular and natural fit for cloud-native environments [67]. Monitoring honeytokens access attempts with Tetragon (§5.2.1) is simple, as Tetragon provides `TracingPolicy` custom resources and a guide to file monitoring [38]. Falco [76] offers a similar solution, which we plan to support in future work. Although these tools exist, developing eBPF programs remains challenging. We experienced some issues when

installing eBPF hooks, likely due to incompatibilities with Linux kernel versions in our test clusters. Additionally, Tetragon throttles event generation to avoid overloading the kernel, potentially dropping honeytokens access events in busy clusters. Nonetheless, eBPF technology, if engineered with care, appears favorable over alternatives such as custom file systems [73] or function hooking [37].

Cyber deception policy documents provide structure to the intricate nature of deception technology. The YAML structure proposed in this work (§4) is a first step to provide a concrete structure for deception technology. Good API design is an iterative process between users and developers. For the next iteration, we would consider whether deployment strategies for decoys and captors should rather be placed elsewhere to further separate the roles of deception designers and technical engineers. Our current structure also lacks the means to write conditional and stateful deception policies, such as activating deception objects only for unauthenticated users or after detecting anomalous behavior patterns.

Minimizing the operational cost of deploying deception technology ultimately benefits defenders. Our core idea is to make the use of deception technology as straightforward as flipping a feature flag. This is not only practical, but also intriguing in theory. Operational costs can be an inhibitor to effective moving target defense (e.g., leveraging game theory or other methods) if the defender shall adapt deception strategies dynamically. This problem has been observed theoretically and findings indicate that neglecting the costs of switching strategies may explain why individuals behave differently from what game theory predicts for a rational adversary and defender. [54], [55].

7.1. Extensions

Since Koney operates directly inside the cluster with elevated privileges, its capabilities can be easily extended to achieve any cyber deception technology that can be installed at runtime. Of the 19 technical methods described by Kahlhofer and Rass [34], the current design of Koney could support 17 of them. This includes adding new pods, containers, or services to the cluster, running shell commands when containers start, modifying environment variables, and even installing custom file systems such as DcyFS [73] if Koney is installed with privileged access to nodes. Only techniques that require access to source code, modification of container images, the build pipeline, or similar “early” parts of the software development life cycle are not addressed by Koney.

Koney could easily be extended with policies that deploy classic honeypots [44] for protocols such as FTP, SSH, or SMTP as long as container images are available for them; similar to the T-Pot project [17], which facilitates the deployment of more than 20 different containerized honeypots. Deception techniques for domain-specific applications are also realizable if they can be installed by reconfiguring application artifacts. Adding new configuration files to containers can be done with the “exec” method (§5.1.1) or with volume mounts (§5.1.2). Similarly, Koney could also change or add environment variables in manifests. Deceptive data can also be inserted into databases if Koney connects to them within the cluster using provided database credentials.

8. Related Work

The evolution of cyber deception has advanced from honeypots [53], [69] to honeytokens [70], and is currently focused on at least three problems: finding effective traps [7], [10], [21], [22], [33], [61]–[63], recently aided by generative AI [35], [42], [45], [58], [66], [71]; developing game-theoretical models [47], [90]; and creating novel cyber deception techniques [19], [23], [31], [89].

The literature on the operational aspects of modern cyber deception is relatively scarce [26], [34], possibly due to the assumption that the industry could address these challenges independently. However, the limited adoption of these technologies suggests underlying research-worthy issues. Although many works built proof-of-concepts to demonstrate novel cyber deception techniques [3]–[6], [25], [27], [30], [37], [48], [59], [86], [87] and the deployment of classic honeypot software is well-surveyed and reviewed [26], [31], [44], we have not found any publications that present an open-source cyber deception orchestration framework for the application layer. It is also crucial to note that a substantial portion of the literature uses the term “framework” to refer to theoretical frameworks rather than software frameworks and tools.

8.1. Works on Deception in File Systems

Beesting [49], [50] places honeytokens in Kubernetes with OCI hooks and, like Koney, volume mounts. An OCI hook is code that runs on container events; they use a hook on container startup to create honeytokens in the container. Unlike Koney, which mutates manifests via the Kubernetes API, Beesting uses the node resource interface (NRI) [74], a standardized method for adding custom logic to container runtimes. For monitoring file access, Beesting also uses eBPF programs, but natively, without Tetragon.

DcyFS [73] is an overlay file system that transparently injects honeytokens. Unique to this approach is that these file system views are created on a per-process basis only.

Many early works implemented tools for placing honeytokens [6], [9], [86], [87], but these were typically meant to assist with experimental evaluations and were not described in detail or made publicly available.

8.2. Works on Deception in Web Applications

Cloxy [24] is a deception-as-a-service software framework that implements most HTTP-based traps discussed herein (§2), much like Koney. Cloxy uses mitmproxy [13] as a reverse proxy placed in front of applications to intercept network communication. Koney uses Istio, which utilizes the Envoy proxy [75]. Envoy is built for real-world use, offering much better performance [18] than mitmproxy, which is intended for rapid prototyping.

Most works use reverse proxies to add deception to HTTP communication [4], [5], [24], [30], [51], [62]. If access to the source code and recompiling applications is possible, which Koney does not assume, then software libraries can be used: Baitroute [65] is a library for Go, Python, and JavaScript that can serve vulnerable-looking endpoints. Its rules define what traps are served and closely resemble the structure of Koney’s definition of traps for fixed HTTP responses (§4.2).

Exceptions to approaches based on reverse proxies include the work of Kern [37], who used `LD_PRELOAD` to intercept libc functions responsible for network communication, and the work of Reti et al. [56], who modified packages directly with Netfilter and Scapy [8].

In the context of Kubernetes, HoneyKube [28], [29] was among the first works to use Kubernetes as a platform to deploy honeypot microservices. The Kubernetes Storm Center [79] aims to gather threat intelligence by building complete “honeyclusters”. Decepto [64] generates decoys as clones of production microservices running in Kubernetes. All of these studies share a focus on classic network-based honeypots, and did not inject traps into the application layer. KubeDeceive [2] is different again, as they intercept API calls to the control plane.

8.3. Works on Deception Policies and Operators

Although abstract concepts, processes, and strategies for cyber deception have been proposed [15], [16], [89], we have not yet seen any reports on how to describe these with code. The Honeyquest tool [33], intended to measure the enticingness of cyber deception, introduced a minimal language called HoneYAML to describe their cyber traps. Baitroute [65] and HASH [14], two tools for creating low-interaction web-based honeypots, introduced a YAML structure to describe their traps, similar to the specification of HTTP-based traps in our policy documents (§4.2).

Using Kubernetes operators for policy enforcement is a common practice. The Open Policy Agent (OPA) [82] allows system operators to write policy documents as code and moves the policy decision-making process out of the software and into OPA. Kyverno [80] supports security policies that can validate, mutate, generate, and clean up any Kubernetes resource. However, a general-purpose Kubernetes operator for cyber deception has not yet appeared in the literature.

9. Conclusion

This work conceptualized cyber deception policies, which describe deception technology “as code”, and Koney, a cyber deception orchestration framework. Kubernetes proved to be an ideal enabling technology for Koney, allowing versatile integration of cyber deception. The prevalence of Kubernetes in industry also brings synergies, as research and application share the same platform. We demonstrated that treating deception technology as policy objects makes it manageable for system operators and helps to separate responsibilities between deception technique authors, software application developers, and system operators. Koney’s technical implementation employs cloud-native technologies, such as services meshes and eBPF, which we also see as beneficial for future research on cyber deception, beyond use cases for the application layer, and for platforms other than Kubernetes.

Acknowledgments

We thank Farooq, Anis, Josef, Werner, and the anonymous reviewers for their useful feedback. We acknowledge the support of the MUR PNRR project PE SERICS – SecCO (PE00000014) CUP D33C22001300002 funded by the European Union under NextGenerationEU.

References

- [1] M. Albanese, E. Battista, and S. Jajodia, "A Deception Based Approach for Defeating OS and Service Fingerprinting," in *2015 IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security*, ser. CNS '15. Florence, Italy: IEEE, Sept. 2015, pp. 317–325.
- [2] A. Aly, M. Fayez, M. Al-Qutt, and A. Hamad, "KubeDeceive Unveiling Deceptive Approaches to Protect Kubernetes Clusters," Dec. 2023.
- [3] T. Angeli, D. Reti, D. Schneider, and H. D. Schotten, "False Flavor Honeypot: Deceiving Vulnerability Scanning Tools," in *2024 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, ser. EuroS&PW '24. Vienna, Austria: IEEE, July 2024, pp. 399–406.
- [4] F. Araujo, K. W. Hamlen, S. Biedermann, and S. Katzenbeisser, "From Patches to Honey-Patches: Lightweight Attacker Misdirection, Deception, and Disinformation," in *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '14. Scottsdale, Arizona, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Nov. 2014, pp. 942–953.
- [5] T. Barron, J. So, and N. Nikiforakis, "Click This, Not That: Extending Web Authentication with Deception," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. ASIA CCS '21. Virtual Event, Hong Kong: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2021, pp. 462–474.
- [6] M. Ben Salem and S. J. Stolfo, "Decoy Document Deployment for Effective Masquerade Attack Detection," in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*, ser. DIMVA '11. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Springer, July 2011, pp. 35–54.
- [7] M. Bercovitch, M. Renford, L. Hasson, A. Shabtai, L. Rokach, and Y. Elovici, "HoneyGen: An Automated Honeytokens Generator," in *Proceedings of 2011 IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics*, ser. ISI '11. Beijing, China: IEEE, July 2011, pp. 131–136.
- [8] P. Biondi, "Scapy," SecDev. [Online]. Available: <https://scapy.net/>
- [9] B. M. Bowen, S. Hershkop, A. D. Keromytis, and S. J. Stolfo, "Baiting Inside Attackers Using Decoy Documents," in *Security and Privacy in Communication Networks 2009*, ser. SecureComm '09. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2009, pp. 51–70.
- [10] B. M. Bowen, V. P. Kemerlis, P. Prabhu, A. D. Keromytis, and S. J. Stolfo, "Automating the Injection of Believable Decoys to Detect Snooping," in *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Wireless Network Security*, ser. WiSec '10. Hoboken, New Jersey, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, March 2010, pp. 81–86.
- [11] CNCF, "Kubernetes API." [Online]. Available: <https://kubernetes.io/docs/reference/kubernetes-api/>
- [12] ControlPlane, "Kubernetes Operator Threat Matrix." [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/controlplaneio/operator-threat-matrix>
- [13] A. Cortesi, M. Hils, and T. Kriechbaumer, "Mitmproxy: A Free and Open Source Interactive HTTPS Proxy," mitmproxy. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/mitmproxy/mitmproxy>
- [14] DataDog, "HASH: HTTP Agnostic Software Honeypot," DataDog. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/DataDog/HASH>
- [15] C. De Faveri and A. Moreira, "Designing Adaptive Deception Strategies," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security Companion*, ser. QRS-C '16. Vienna, Austria: IEEE, Aug. 2016, pp. 77–84.
- [16] C. De Faveri, A. Moreira, and V. Amaral, "Goal-Driven Deception Tactics Design," in *2016 IEEE 27th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering*, ser. ISSRE '16. Ottawa, ON, Canada: IEEE, Oct. 2016, pp. 264–275.
- [17] Deutsche Telekom Security GmbH, "T-Pot," Deutsche Telekom. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/telekom-security/tpotce>
- [18] Y. Elkhatab and J. P. Poyato, "An Evaluation of Service Mesh Frameworks for Edge Systems," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Edge Systems, Analytics and Networking*, ser. EdgeSys '23. Rome, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2023, pp. 19–24.
- [19] W. Fan, Z. Du, D. Fernández, and V. A. Villagrà, "Enabling an Anatomic View to Investigate Honeypot Systems: A Survey," *IEEE Systems Journal*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 3906–3919, Dec. 2018.
- [20] K. J. Ferguson-Walter, M. M. Major, C. K. Johnson, C. J. Johnson, D. D. Scott, R. S. Gutzwiller, and T. Shade, "Cyber Expert Feedback: Experiences, Expectations, and Opinions about Cyber Deception," *Computers & Security*, vol. 130, p. 103268, July 2023.
- [21] K. J. Ferguson-Walter, M. M. Major, C. K. Johnson, and D. H. Muhleman, "Examining the Efficacy of Decoy-based and Psychological Cyber Deception," in *Proceedings of the 30th USENIX Security Symposium*, ser. USENIX Security '21. Online: USENIX Association, Aug. 2021, pp. 1127–1144. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/ferguson-walter>
- [22] K. J. Ferguson-Walter, T. Shade, A. Rogers, E. Niedbala, M. Trumbo, K. Nauer, K. Divis, A. Jones, A. Combs, and R. Abbott, "The Tularosa Study: An Experimental Design and Implementation to Quantify the Effectiveness of Cyber Deception," in *Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ser. HICSS '19. Maui, Hawaii: ScholarSpace, Jan. 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [23] D. Fraunholz, S. D. Anton, C. Lipps, D. Reti, D. Krohmer, F. Pohl, M. Tammen, and H. D. Schotten, "Demystifying Deception Technology: A Survey," April 2018.
- [24] D. Fraunholz, D. Reti, S. Duque Anton, and H. D. Schotten, "Cloxy: A Context-aware Deception-as-a-Service Reverse Proxy for Web Services," in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Workshop on Moving Target Defense*, ser. MTD '18. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, Jan. 2018, pp. 40–47.
- [25] D. Fraunholz and H. D. Schotten, "Defending Web Servers with Feints, Distraction and Obfuscation," in *2018 International Conference on Computing, Networking and Communications*, ser. ICNC '18. Maui, HI, USA: IEEE, March 2018, pp. 21–25.
- [26] D. Fraunholz, M. Zimmermann, and H. D. Schotten, "Towards Deployment Strategies for Deception Systems," *Advances in Science, Technology and Engineering Systems Journal*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 1272–1279, Aug. 2017.
- [27] D. Gavriliis, I. Chatzis, and E. Dermatas, "Flash Crowd Detection Using Decoy Hyperlinks," in *2007 IEEE International Conference on Networking, Sensing and Control*, ser. ICNSC '07. London, UK: IEEE, April 2007, pp. 466–470.
- [28] C. Gupta, "HoneyKube: Designing a Honeypot Using Microservices-Based Architecture," Master's thesis, University of Twente, NB Enschede, The Netherlands, Aug. 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://essay.utwente.nl/88323/>
- [29] C. Gupta, T. Van Ede, and A. Continella, "HoneyKube: Designing and Deploying a Microservices-based Web Honeypot," in *2023 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops*, ser. SecWeb '23. San Francisco, CA, USA: IEEE, May 2023, pp. 1–11.
- [30] X. Han, N. Kheir, and D. Balzarotti, "Evaluation of Deception-Based Web Attacks Detection," in *Proceedings of the 2017 Workshop on Moving Target Defense*, ser. MTD '17. Dallas, Texas, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2017, pp. 65–73.
- [31] —, "Deception Techniques in Computer Security: A Research Perspective," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 80:1–80:36, July 2018.
- [32] B. Ibrayam and R. Huß, *Kubernetes Patterns*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media, Inc., April 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.oreilly.com/library/view/kubernetes-patterns/9781492050278/>
- [33] M. Kahlhofer, S. Achleitner, S. Rass, and R. Mayrhofer, "Honeyquest: Rapidly Measuring the Enticement of Cyber Deception Techniques with Code-based Questionnaires," in *Proceedings of the 27th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, ser. RAID '24. Padua, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, Sept. 2024, pp. 317–336.
- [34] M. Kahlhofer and S. Rass, "Application Layer Cyber Deception without Developer Interaction," in *2024 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, ser. EuroS&PW '24. Vienna, Austria: IEEE, July 2024, pp. 416–429.

- [35] A. Karimi, "Galah: An LLM-powered Web Honey-pot." [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/0x4D31/galah>
- [36] A. Kedrowsitsch, D. D. Yao, G. Wang, and K. Cameron, "A First Look: Using Linux Containers for Deceptive Honey-pots," in *Proceedings of the 2017 Workshop on Automated Decision Making for Active Cyber Defense*, ser. SafeConfig '17. Dallas, Texas, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Nov. 2017, pp. 15–22.
- [37] P. Kern, "Injecting Shared Libraries with LD_PRELOAD for Cyber Deception," Master's thesis, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria, Jan. 2024.
- [38] K. Kourtis and A. Papagiannis, "File Monitoring with eBPF and Tetragon (Part 1)," March 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://isovalent.com/blog/post/file-monitoring-with-ebpf-and-tetragon-part-1/>
- [39] H. Li, Y. Guo, P. Sun, Y. Wang, and S. Huo, "An Optimal Defensive Deception Framework for the Container-based Cloud with Deep Reinforcement Learning," *IET Information Security*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 178–192, 2022.
- [40] W. Li, Y. Lemieux, J. Gao, Z. Zhao, and Y. Han, "Service Mesh: Challenges, State of the Art, and Future Research Opportunities," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Service-Oriented System Engineering*, ser. SOSE '19. San Francisco, CA, USA: IEEE, April 2019, pp. 122–1225.
- [41] S. Machmeier, "Honey-pot Implementation in a Cloud Environment," Jan. 2023.
- [42] F. McKee and D. Noever, "Chatbots in a Honey-pot World," Jan. 2023.
- [43] N. Memari, S. J. B. Hashim, and K. B. Samsudin, "Towards Virtual Honey-net Based on LXC Virtualization," in *2014 IEEE REGION 10 SYMPOSIUM*, ser. TENSYP '14. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: IEEE, April 2014, pp. 496–501.
- [44] M. Nawrocki, M. Wählich, T. C. Schmidt, C. Keil, and J. Schönfelder, "A Survey on Honey-pot Software and Data Analysis," Aug. 2016.
- [45] D. D. Nguyen, D. Liebowitz, S. Nepal, and S. S. Kanhere, "HoneyCode: Automating Deceptive Software Repositories with Deep Generative Models," in *Proceedings of the 54th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ser. HICSS '21. Kauai, Hawaii, USA: ScholarSpace, Jan. 2021, pp. 6945–6954.
- [46] A. Osman, P. Bruckner, H. Salah, F. H. P. Fitzek, T. Strufe, and M. Fischer, "Sandnet: Towards High Quality of Deception in Container-Based Microservice Architectures," in *ICC 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Communications*, ser. ICC '19. Shanghai, China: IEEE, May 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [47] J. Pawlick, E. Colbert, and Q. Zhu, "A Game-theoretic Taxonomy and Survey of Defensive Deception for Cybersecurity and Privacy," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 82:1–82:28, Aug. 2019.
- [48] A. R. Petrunić, "Honeytokens as Active Defense," in *2015 38th International Convention on Information and Communication Technology, Electronics and Microelectronics*, ser. MIPRO '15. Opatija, Croatia: IEEE, May 2015, pp. 1313–1317.
- [49] P. Pichler, "Beesting." [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/patrickpichler/beesting>
- [50] —, "Beesting: Can't Touch This," Linz, Austria, Jan. 2025. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/patrickpichler/beesting_talk
- [51] C. Pohl, A. Zugenmaier, M. Meier, and H.-J. Hof, "B.Hive: A Zero Configuration Forms Honey-pot for Productive Web Applications," in *ICT Systems Security and Privacy Protection*, ser. IFIP SEC '15. Hamburg, Germany: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 267–280.
- [52] V. S. D. Priya and S. S. Chakkaravarthy, "Containerized Cloud-based Honey-pot Deception for Tracking Attackers," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 1437, Jan. 2023.
- [53] N. Provos, "A Virtual Honey-pot Framework," in *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Security Symposium*, ser. USENIX Security '04. San Diego, CA, USA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2004, pp. 1–14. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/legacy/publications/library/proceedings/sec04/tech/provos.html>
- [54] S. Rass and S. König, "Password Security as a Game of Entropies," *Entropy*, vol. 20, no. 5, p. 312, May 2018.
- [55] S. Rass, S. König, and S. Schauer, "On the Cost of Game Playing: How to Control the Expenses in Mixed Strategies," in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Decision and Game Theory for Security*, ser. GameSec '17. Vienna, Austria: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 494–505.
- [56] D. Reti, T. Angeli, and H. D. Schotten, "Honey Infiltrator: Injecting Honeytoken Using Netfilter," in *2023 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, ser. EuroS&PW '23. Delft, Netherlands: IEEE, July 2023, pp. 465–469.
- [57] D. Reti and N. Becker, "Escape the Fake: Introducing Simulated Container-Escapes for Honey-pots," April 2021.
- [58] D. Reti, N. Becker, T. Angeli, A. Chattopadhyay, D. Schneider, S. Vollmer, and H. D. Schotten, "Act as a Honeytoken Generator! An Investigation into Honeytoken Generation with Large Language Models," in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Workshop on Adaptive and Autonomous Cyber Defense*, ser. AACD '24. Salt Lake City, UT, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Dec. 2024, pp. 1–12.
- [59] D. Reti, K. Elzer, and H. Schotten, "SCANTRAP: Protecting Content Management Systems from Vulnerability Scanners with Cyber Deception and Obfuscation," in *9th International Conference on Information Systems Security and Privacy*, ser. ICISPP '23. Lisbon, Portugal: SciTePress, Feb. 2023, pp. 485–492.
- [60] L. Rice, *What Is eBPF?* Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media, Inc., April 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://isovalent.com/books/ebpf/>
- [61] M. Sahin, C. Hébert, and R. Cabrera Lozoya, "An Approach to Generate Realistic HTTP Parameters for Application Layer Deception," in *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*, ser. ACNS '22. Rome, Italy: Springer International Publishing, 2022, pp. 337–355.
- [62] M. Sahin, C. Hébert, and A. S. De Oliveira, "Lessons Learned from SunDEW: A Self Defense Environment for Web Applications," in *Proceedings 2020 Workshop on Measurements, Attacks, and Defenses for the Web*, ser. MADWeb '20. San Diego, CA, USA: Internet Society, Feb. 2020, pp. 1–12.
- [63] M. Sahin, T. Ünlü, C. Hébert, L. A. Shepherd, N. Coull, and C. M. Lean, "Measuring Developers' Web Security Awareness from Attack and Defense Perspectives," in *2022 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops*, ser. SPW '22. San Francisco, CA, USA: IEEE, May 2022, pp. 31–43.
- [64] D. Santoro, M. Zambianco, C. Facchinetti, and D. Siracusa, "Demo: Cloud-native Cyber Deception with Decepto," in *2024 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, ser. ISCC '24. Paris, France: IEEE, June 2024, pp. 1–3.
- [65] U. Sen, "Baitroute." [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/utkusen/baitroute>
- [66] M. Sladić, V. Valeros, C. Catania, and S. Garcia, "LLM in the Shell: Generative Honey-pots," in *2024 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, ser. EuroS&PW '24. Vienna, Austria: IEEE, July 2024, pp. 430–435.
- [67] D. Soldani, P. Nahi, H. Bour, S. Jafarizadeh, M. F. Soliman, L. Di Giovanna, F. Monaco, G. Ognibene, and F. Risso, "eBPF: A New Approach to Cloud-Native Observability, Networking and Security for Current (5G) and Future Mobile Networks (6G and Beyond)," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 57 174–57 202, 2023.
- [68] N. Spahn, N. Hanke, T. Holz, C. Kruegel, and G. Vigna, "Container Orchestration Honey-pot: Observing Attacks in the Wild," in *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, ser. RAID '23. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2023, pp. 381–396.
- [69] L. Spitzner, "Honey-pots: Catching the Insider Threat," in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, ser. ACSAC '03. Las Vegas, NV, USA: IEEE, Dec. 2003, pp. 170–179.
- [70] —, "Honeytokens: The Other Honey-pot," July 2003. [Online]. Available: <https://www.symantec.com/connect/articles/honeytokens-other-honey-pot>

- [71] Splunk, “DECEIVE: DECEption with Evaluative Integrated Validation Engine,” Splunk. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/splunk/DECEIVE>
- [72] D. Storey, “Catching Flies With Honey Tokens,” *Network Security*, vol. 2009, no. 11, pp. 15–18, Nov. 2009.
- [73] T. Taylor, F. Araujo, A. Kohlbrenner, and M. P. Stoecklin, “Hidden in Plain Sight: Filesystem View Separation for Data Integrity and Deception,” in *Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*, ser. DIMVA '18. Saclay, France: Springer International Publishing, June 2018, pp. 256–278.
- [74] The containerd Authors, “NRI: Node Resource Interface,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/containerd/nri>
- [75] The Envoy Project Authors, “Envoy,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://www.envoyproxy.io/>
- [76] The Falco Authors, “Falco,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://falco.org/>
- [77] The Go Authors, “Regex package.” [Online]. Available: <https://pkg.go.dev/regexp>
- [78] The Istio Authors, “Istio.” [Online]. Available: <https://istio.io/>
- [79] The Kubernetes Storm Center Authors, “Kubernetes Storm Center.” [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/k8sstormcenter>
- [80] The Kyverno Authors, “Kyverno,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://kyverno.io/>
- [81] The Linkerd Authors, “Linkerd,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://linkerd.io/>
- [82] The Open Policy Agent Authors, “Open Policy Agent,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://www.openpolicyagent.org/>
- [83] The Operator Framework Authors, “Operator Framework,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://operatorframework.io/>
- [84] The Tetragon Authors, “Tetragon,” The Linux Foundation. [Online]. Available: <https://tetragon.io/>
- [85] W. Tounsi, “Cyber Deception, the Ultimate Piece of a Defensive Strategy - Proof of Concept,” in *2022 6th Cyber Security in Networking Conference*, ser. CSNet '22. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: IEEE, Oct. 2022, pp. 1–5.
- [86] J. Voris, J. Jermyn, N. Boggs, and S. Stolfo, “Fox in the Trap: Thwarting Masqueraders via Automated Decoy Document Deployment,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth European Workshop on System Security*, ser. EuroSec '15. Bordeaux, France: Association for Computing Machinery, April 2015, pp. 1–7.
- [87] J. Yuill, M. Zappe, D. Denning, and F. Feer, “Honeyfiles: Deceptive Files for Intrusion Detection,” in *Proceedings from the Fifth Annual IEEE SMC Information Assurance Workshop*, ser. IAW '04. West Point, NY, USA: IEEE, June 2004, pp. 116–122.
- [88] M. Zambianco, C. Facchinetti, R. Doriguzzi-Corin, and D. Siracusa, “Resource-Aware Cyber Deception for Microservice-Based Applications,” *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 4211–4224, Nov. 2024.
- [89] L. Zhang and Vrizlynn. L. L. Thing, “Three Decades of Deception Techniques in Active Cyber Defense - Retrospect and Outlook,” *Computers & Security*, vol. 106, p. 102288, July 2021.
- [90] M. Zhu, A. H. Anwar, Z. Wan, J.-H. Cho, C. A. Kamhoua, and M. P. Singh, “A Survey of Defensive Deception: Approaches Using Game Theory and Machine Learning,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 2460–2493, 2021.
- [91] X. Zhu, G. She, B. Xue, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, X. K. Zou, X. Duan, P. He, A. Krishnamurthy, M. Lentz, D. Zhuo, and R. Mahajan, “Dissecting Overheads of Service Mesh Sidecars,” in *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, ser. SoCC '23. Santa Cruz, CA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2023, pp. 142–157.

Appendix A.

Sample Cyber Deception Policies

This section presents DeceptionPolicy samples that can be readily deployed with Koney.

A.1. Samples for Traps in File Systems

Listing 7 shows a sample cyber deception policy for placing a honeypot in all workloads with the op/honeytoken=true label and a honeydocument in all workloads with the op/honeydocument=true label, but only in containers whose name starts with “app-”. Both files are deployed by executing shell commands in the container. The document is downloaded from a specified URL. File monitoring is done with Tetragon.

Listing 7. SAMPLE POLICY FOR PLACING HONEYFILES

```
# please refer to the latest api version at
# https://github.com/dynatrace-oss/koney
---
apiVersion: ...
kind: DeceptionPolicy
metadata:
  name: sample-honeyfiles
spec:
  strictValidation: true
  mutateExisting: true

  traps:
    - filesystemHoneytoken:
        path: /run/secrets/service_token
        content: very-secret-token
        readOnly: true

    match:
      any:
        - resources:
            containerSelector: "*"
            selector:
              matchLabels:
                op/honeytoken: true

    decoyDeployment:
      strategy: containerExec
    captorDeployment:
      strategy: tetragon

    - filesystemHoneydocument:
        path: /root/passwords.docx
        source: https://srv.test/honey.docx
        readOnly: false

    match:
      any:
        - resources:
            containerSelector: "app-*"
            selector:
              matchLabels:
                op/honeydocument: true

    decoyDeployment:
      strategy: containerExec
    captorDeployment:
      strategy: tetragon
```

Listing 8 shows a sample cyber deception policy for setting up a honeydirectory in all workloads with the op/honeydirectory=true label. The directory will contain two files, using the same specification as when placing honeypot tokens. All files will be mounted as a volume inside all containers. File monitoring is done with Tetragon. Only resources that are created after the deception policy was created will get this trap because mutateExisting is not set here.

Listing 8. POLICY FOR SETTING UP A HONEYDIRECTORY

```
# please refer to the latest api version at
# https://github.com/dynatrace-oss/koney
---
apiVersion: ...
kind: DeceptionPolicy
metadata:
  name: sample-honeydirectory
spec:
  strictValidation: true
  mutateExisting: false

  traps:
    - filesystemHoneydirectory:
        path: /tmp
        content:
          - filesystemHoneytoken:
              path: auth_token
              content: very-secret-token
          - filesystemHoneytoken:
              path: config.ini
              content: ENVIRONMENT=prod

    match:
      any:
        - resources:
            selector:
              matchLabels:
                op/honeydirectory: true

    decoyDeployment:
      strategy: volumeMount
    captorDeployment:
      strategy: tetragon
```

A.2. Samples for Traps in Web Application

Listing 9 shows a sample cyber deception policy for setting up a HTTP redirect to a honeypot in all workloads with the op/honeypot-redirect=true label. Communication on all ports and in all containers will be affected. The route is placed by utilizing Istio's reverse proxies. Monitoring is also done with Istio.

Listing 9. POLICY FOR SETTING UP A REDIRECT TO A HONEYPOT

```
# please refer to the latest api version at
# https://github.com/dynatrace-oss/koney
---
apiVersion: ...
kind: DeceptionPolicy
metadata:
  name: sample-honeypot-redirect
spec:
  strictValidation: true
  mutateExisting: true

  traps:
    - httpResponse:
        request:
          match: ^/admin$ # exact match
          method: GET # GET only
        response:
          status: 302 # temp redirect
          headers:
            Location: http://honeypot.test

    match:
      any:
        - resources:
            ports: null # all ports
            selector:
              matchLabels:
                op/honeypot-redirect: true

    decoyDeployment:
      strategy: istio
    captorDeployment:
      strategy: istio
```


Listing 10 shows a sample cyber deception policy for adding a new “Disallow” entry at the end of the “robots.txt” file, when delivered over HTTP, in all workloads with the `op/disallow-injection=true` label, and for setting up a fixed HTTP response in all workloads with the `op/aws-credentials=true` label. The fixed HTTP response will only affect communication on port 80 and 8080. The new route and the HTTP body modification is done by utilizing Istio’s reverse proxies. Monitoring is also done with Istio, but only for the fixed HTTP response, not for the “Disallow” entry.

Listing 10. POLICY FOR EXPOSING FAKE CREDENTIALS

```
# please refer to the latest api version at
# https://github.com/dynatrace-oss/koney
---
apiVersion: ...
kind: DeceptionPolicy
metadata:
  name: sample-aws-credentials
spec:
  strictValidation: true
  mutateExisting: true

  traps:
    - httpBodyMutation:
      request:
        match: ^/robots.txt$ # exact match
        method: GET # GET only
      response:
        matchHeaders:
          Content-Type: text/html # HTML only
        bodyMutations:
          - engine: regex
            match: >-
              (?s)(.*)
            replace: >-
              $1\nDisallow: /.aws/credentials

  match:
    any:
      - resources:
          selector:
            matchLabels:
              op/disallow-injection: true

  decoyDeployment:
    strategy: istio
  captorDeployment:
    strategy: null

  - httpResponse:
    request:
      match: /.aws/credentials$ # ends with
      method: GET # GET only
    response:
      status: 200
      headers:
        Content-Type: text/plain
      body: |
        [default]
        aws_access_key_id = ASLPVFCMPNXCFOX
        aws_secret_access_key = h8aQcFM64
        region = us-east-1

  match:
    any:
      - resources:
          ports:
            - 80
            - 8080
          selector:
            matchLabels:
              op/aws-credentials: true

  decoyDeployment:
    strategy: istio
  captorDeployment:
    strategy: istio
```

Listing 11 shows a sample cyber deception policy for adding headers to HTTP responses in all workloads with the `op/fake-banner=true` label. Communication on all ports and in all containers will be affected. The headers are added by utilizing Istio’s reverse proxies. No monitoring is deployed for this policy.

Listing 11. POLICY FOR ADDING HTTP HEADERS TO RESPONSES

```
# please refer to the latest api version at
# https://github.com/dynatrace-oss/koney
---
apiVersion: ...
kind: DeceptionPolicy
metadata:
  name: sample-fake-banner
spec:
  strictValidation: true
  mutateExisting: true

  traps:
    - httpHeaderMutation:
      request:
        match: "*" # match all
        method: GET # GET only
      response:
        setHeaders:
          Server: nginx/1.2.4
          X-ApiServer: honeypot.test

  match:
    any:
      - resources:
          ports: null # all ports
          selector:
            matchLabels:
              op/fake-banner: true

  decoyDeployment:
    strategy: istio
  captorDeployment:
    strategy: null
```