

Design of a dynamic and self-adapting system, supported with artificial intelligence, machine learning and real-time intelligence for predictive cyber risk analytics

Corresponding author details: *Petar Radanliev, Post-Doctoral Research Associate, Department of Engineering Sciences, University of Oxford, England, UK.*

Petar Radanliev¹, David De Roure¹; Kevin Page¹; Max Van Kleek²; Rafael Mantilla Montalvo³; Omar Santos³; La'Treall Maddox³; Stacy Cannady³; Pete Burnap⁴, Eirini Anthi⁴, Carsten Maple⁵

¹Oxford e-Research Centre, 7 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3QG, Department of Engineering Sciences, University of Oxford, UK; ²Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, UK; ³Cisco Research Centre, Research Triangle Park, USA; ⁴School of Computer Science and Informatics, Cardiff University; MG Cyber Security Centre, University of Warwick

Funding: This work was funded by the UK EPSRC [with the PETRAS projects: RETCON and CRatE, grant number: EP/S035362/1] and by the Cisco Research Centre [grant number 1525381].

Acknowledgments: Eternal gratitude to the Fulbright Scholar Project.

Abstract

This paper surveys deep learning algorithms, IoT cyber security and risk models, and established mathematical formulas to identify the best approach for developing a dynamic and self-adapting system for predictive cyber risk analytics supported with Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning and real-time intelligence in edge computing. The paper presents a new mathematical approach for integrating concepts for cognition engine design, edge computing and Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning to automate anomaly detection. This engine instigates a step change by applying Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning embedded at the edge of IoT networks, to deliver safe and functional real-time intelligence for predictive cyber risk analytics. This will enhance capacities for risk analytics and assists in the creation of a comprehensive and systematic understanding of the opportunities and threats that arise when edge computing nodes are deployed, and when Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning technologies are migrated to the periphery of the internet and into local IoT networks.

Keywords: deep learning algorithms; IoT; cybersecurity; artificial intelligence; machine learning; real-time intelligence; edge computing.

Introduction

Recent studies on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning (AI/ML) perspectives on mobile edge computing [1] lack detail, but provide guidance on how data can be processed [2]–[9] in real-time, reducing edge-cloud delay [10] and inform on the topic of cognitive cyber security at the edge. This paper is focused on the topic of predicting cyber risk loss magnitude through dynamic analytics of cyber-attack threat event frequencies. Challenges that need to be addressed are mainly socio-technical, relating strongly to technology, regulation, economics, interventions, and directly relates to industries and their supply chains and control systems. For example, investigating the perceptions of risk and trustworthiness that emerge as a result of machine agency, which interact with regulation, standards and policy on the one hand and design and engineering on the other, spanning the physical and behavioural sciences. But the specific focus of this paper is on

integrating AI/ML in the data collection and analytics of risk through fog computing (i.e. use of edge devices) for forward-facing predictive outputs. We investigate a scenario where an organisation has implemented all the security recommendations (e.g. NIST), but the risk remains from uncertain and unpredictable attack vectors at the edge of the network.

For narrowing the topic to assessment of these new types of cyber security, the research adopts a red teaming methodology for detecting and reducing threats and simplify compliance with internal, industry and government regulations. A red teaming approach is firstly applied by challenging plans, policies, systems and assumptions and adopting an adversarial approach to IoT cyber risks. With this approach, IoT cyber risks can be divided in three levels, edge, fog and cloud. The fog computing is placed in the distribution network layer and provides sufficient computational resources, low latency and compute-intensive applications. The cloud computing level represent a shared pool of rapidly provisioned computing resources, for high computation and data storage. Hence, IoT cybersecurity deployment in the fog and cloud computing levels is not a big concern. The small computation capability at the edge devices makes IoT cyber risk more likely to occur at the edge computing level. Hence, this article is primarily focused on the edge computing level.

A red teaming approach is then applied to identify IoT systems that are mostly affected by a few types of network risk event. Those include: Eavesdropping Attacks, Denial of Service (DoS) and Distributed DoS (DDoS), Spoofing Attacks, and Man-in-the-Middle attacks (MITM). To describe briefly the relationship between these types of attacks, Eavesdropping Attacks is used for listening IoT communications without the transmission appearing abnormal, hence making it difficult to detect. After Eavesdropping Attacks has gained authorisation access, Spoofing Attacks are used to send spoofed traffic with a legitimate access to IoT network. The MITM is just an advanced Spoofing Attack where adversary is positioned between two IoT devices and independently intercepts data and communicates between endpoints, collecting sensitive information, dropping packets, and causing different security vulnerabilities. The DoS and DDoS floods the IoT devices network with traffic, this overloads the communication and exhausts the network, leading to IoT devices being unable to communicate. As simple as it is, this is the most common and most dangerous IoT attack. The small computation capability at the edge devices, make DDoS attacks really difficult to resolve. While new cyber security is constantly been developed (e.g. ISO 3000), the level of cyber-attack sophistication is also increasing [11] (e.g. the Mirai variants ‘VPN filter’ is delivered in multiple stages with modularised payload; ‘TORii’ uses its own encryption and evasion tactic). Considering these continuous changes, to assess the effectiveness of cybersecurity, we need cyber analytic approaches that can handle real time intelligence in the form of probabilistic data collected at the edge. But the effectiveness of cybersecurity should not only be measured by the protection of cyberspace, but also with the protection of assets that can be reached via cyberspace [12].

In brief, we investigate the role of AI/ML in cyber risk analytics with use of confidence intervals and time bound ranges at the edge. The objective of such an approach would be to protect data integrity, while securing predictive analytic outputs and integrating such solutions in these new types of edge computing cyber security. In edge computing, the IoT-augmented physical reality is open to adversarial behaviours that are yet uncharted and poorly understood, especially the socio-technical dimensions. This paper evaluates the impact of compromise in terms of its safety implications and resulting consequences on end system provision.

Research methodology

Quantitative risk impact estimation is needed for estimating cyber security and cyber risk [13], [14] at the edge [15]. Our argument is that without a dynamic real-time probabilistic risk data and cyber risk analytics enhanced with AI/ML, these estimations can be outdated and imprecise. Additionally, the use of red-teaming is a way of explicitly addressing attack as well as defence. We are concerned not just with securing a system, but to acknowledge that failure and compromise will occur and address how the system responds in these circumstances. This is an important methodological

principle which distinguishes out work within the cybersecurity domain. Recent literature confirms diverse cyber risks from IoT systems [16], including risks in IoT ecosystems [17] and IoT environments [18], such as risk from smart homes [19], [20], the Industrial IoT [21], and challenges in security metrics [22]. Cybersecurity solutions for specific IoT risks are also emerging at a fast rate, such as new models on opportunities and motivations for reducing cyber risk [23], adaptive intrusion detection [24], security economic by design [25], highlighting the privacy requirements [26] and strategies for achieving privacy [27]. But the usage of traditional risk assessments in new IoT technologies is strongly criticised [28]–[30]. Therefore, our methodology is based on mathematical principles and quantitative data. In recent publications on this topic [31]–[33], we discovered that the lack of probabilistic data leads to qualitative cyber risk assessment approaches, where the outcome represents a speculative assumption. Emerging quantitative models are effectively designed with ranges and confidence intervals based on expert opinions and not probabilistic data [34].

Survey of AI/ML algorithms

The AI/ML are essential for advancing beyond the limitations of Value-at-Risk (VaR) models [35], where Bayesian and frequentist methods are applied with and beyond VaR models [36]. This requires federated learning and blockchain based decentralised AI architecture where AI processing shifts from the cloud to the edge and the AI workflow is moved and data restricted to the device [37]. Current gaps in cyber risk analytics are in the areas of descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics [38]. Hence, a survey of AI/ML applications is presented in Table 1, to address the main questions emerging from this study on edge computing and descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive risk analytics.

AI/ML Technique:	Application:	References:
Deep learning - ANN	<i>Network architecture</i>	[39]–[42]
Anomaly detection, unsupervised learning, classification.	<i>Network planning / load balancing</i>	[43], [44]
Regression		[45]
Classification – Bayesian networks	<i>Fault and failure detection / management</i>	[46], [47]
Classification/Clustering - Autoencoders		[48]
Algorithms: supervised, unsupervised and reinforcement learning	<i>Network Management and Operations</i>	[49], [50]
ANN (RNN) and random forest		[51]
Regression - ANN		[52]
Classification - Naive Bayes (NB)		[53], [54]
Classification algorithms: K nearest neighbours, SVM		[55]–[57]
GDNN		[58], [59]
ANN		[60]

Dynamic game - Nash Folk Theorem	<i>Network Security and Breach Detection</i>	[61]
Game theory and NB classifier		[62], [63]
Deep learning algorithms		[64], [65]
Algorithms: supervised, unsupervised and reinforcement learning		[66]

Table 1: AI/ML algorithm application for descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive risk analytics in edge computing

Table 1 confirms that by integrating AI/ML in the risk analytics, we can devise a new approach for cognitive data analytics, creating a stronger resilience of systems through cognition in their physical, digital and social dimensions. This approach resolves around understanding how and when compromises happen, to enable systems to adapt and continue to operate safely and securely when they have been compromised. Cognition through AI/ML and how cognitive real time intelligence would enable systems to recover and become more robust is evaluated in more detail below. The survey in Table 1 is informed by but avoids overlapping with a series of working papers and project reports on IoT cyber risk [67]–[82], IoT risk assessment [83]–[86] and IoT at the edge [87], [88] found in pre-prints online. This research is specifically focused on AI/ML in IoT risk analytics [15], and it benefits from this established research knowledge. But with a focus on the topic of securing the edge through AI/ML real time analytics to build stronger transformative and impactful understanding on the topic.

Majority of the current Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) are based on ML algorithms and the CNN (Convolutional Neural Network) + LSTM (Long Short Term Memory) appear to perform better than other Deep Learning (subsets of ML) models [39]. Such arguments are difficult to generalise when tested with a single dataset. Deep Neural Network (DNN) has been applied with distributed deep learning to collect network-based and host-based intrusion detection systems (NBID and HBID) [40]. This is a very comprehensive study, where a multilayer perceptron (MLP) model is adopted. However, in a related research, the MLP (type of artificial neural network - ANN) was found to be the least accurate deep learning model [39].

Network Based Intrusion Detection Systems (NIDS) that use statistical measures or computer thresholds have been related to security research since the early days of computer architecture [40]. But are ineffective for current cyber risk analytics of connected and highly complex ICT systems, because they present high rates of false negatives (failure to detect) and false positives (false alerts). Distributed attack detection at fog level was proven to be more scalable than centralised cloud for IoT [41]. If the attack vectors are known, then up to 99.999% accuracy can be reached by type of attack with bidirectional long short-term memory (LSTM) units introduced to recurrent neural network (RNN) [42]. Similarly, a Siamese Network Classification Framework (SNCF) can alleviate imbalance in risk prediction and present more reliable results when compared with other algorithms [60]. With SNCF two different types of risk data sets can be used, (1) public data set (less features and more samples), (2) real data set (more features and less samples). The first set could verify solving the imbalance problem, and the second could eliminate reliance on the characteristics of feature engineering. Such experimental SNCF results have shown good cyber risk prediction performance [60] and Software Defined Networking Technology (SDN) has been effective in detecting and monitoring network security when integrated with Machine Learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) to create SDN-based NIDS [46]. The main risk concern with SDN and Network Functions Virtualisation (NFV) is the centralised nature which creates a single point of failure [43]. To resolve this, three layered nodes (Edge-IDS, Fog-IDS, and Cloud-IDS) has been proposed for NIDS system in SDN-based cloud IoT networks [50]. Cloud environments enable IoT device virtualisation resulting with virtual IoT objects that can be accessed and controlled remotely through a dynamic virtual network [44].

A power load forecasting [45], can be based on the generalised regression neural network with decreasing step fruit fly optimisation algorithm. Similarly, logistic regression and multicriteria decision making in IoT fog computing can be used for resource allocation [47]. The main concern we have about the development of such algorithms is that deployment of 5G can separate real-time intelligence and security between IoT, IoE or even IoNT [48]. Hence, intelligence and cognition techniques would differ in application areas and architecture. One of the possible issues is that ML platforms (such as TensorFlow, Gaia, Petuum, Apache Spark, and GraphLab), are designed for offline data analytics and training data are collected, partitioned, and learned offline to construct machines for data analytics [49]. While some of the recently proposed detection systems for edge computing are operating in real time, e.g. LiReD [51]. Edge nodes can host and process the data to limit latency, and recently enhanced models can handle the earlier problems with missing values [52], while improving the detection accuracy [53] and decision making with early warning systems [54]. The classification accuracy can also be improved with edge filtering [55], position confidentiality [56] and dynamic data classification [57], to avoid system overload when tasks increase suddenly, by diverting and allocating complex tasks to devices with stronger computing power.

Multi-Access Edge Computing based on reinforcement learning, enhances the performance of such ‘offloading’ in polynomial time complexity - worst-case running time [58]. While integration of Deep Reinforcement Learning and Federated Learning with mobile edge systems, optimises mobile edge computing, caching, and communication, and makes edge systems more intelligent [59]. Optimising and balancing resource constrains in edge computing has been investigated with ‘dynamic game’ [61] and ‘game theory’ [62] strategies. Such optimisation is primarily theoretical, but highly relevant for red teaming of edge computing risks. Two models ‘Cournot’ and ‘Stackelberg’ are proposed for making real-time optimisation of traffic flow [63]. These models need to be tested with real-time data to be verified, but the theoretical contribution is quite significant, e.g. applying the ‘Prisoners Dilemma’ on optimising decisions.

Deep learning models recorded highest accuracy as 97.16% detection of DDoS attacks [39], and the multi-layered structure, makes them very adoptable to edge computing. Hence, deep learning has been applied for optimising performance while protecting user privacy in uploading data, [64]. But the computing and memory requirements, along with the high power consumption, make them difficult to use in edge computing [65]. Further research is needed to identify how deep learning can be applied in practice, with real-time data. Possibly reinforcement learning, supervised/unsupervised learning, and deep reinforcement learning [66], would provide some insights into how this can be achieved.

Elements of artificial intelligence and machine learning in cognition engine design

Cyber risk analytics at present is reactive and assessments are based on risk/loss events that already occurred. AI/ML in forward-looking predictive analytics enable threat intelligence prediction and faster attack detection. The main advantage of AI in risk analytics is the fast processing and analysis of big data where parsing, filtering and visualisation is done in near real time. Machine learning uses mathematical and statistical methods and algorithms that learn, build and improve models from data. This enables design of a cognition engine in the form of automated predictive cyber intelligent software agents that identify, assess and record cyber-attacks. After this, natural language processing (NLP) can be applied to perform behaviour analytics and create baseline profiles of normal behaviour and then monitor for abnormalities while continuously learning from the profile’s behaviour patterns. Facilitating a consistent and repeatable detection of threat indicators and predictions about new persistent risks that are undetected. AI/ML learn from multiple patterns (e.g. threat intelligence feed, device event logs, vulnerability information, contextual data) to determine predictive risk insights. Predictive risk analytics for advance notice of risk exposure and potential loss can be performed through monitoring the risk lifecycle activities, e.g. the reactive activities that

capture losses and near miss events. From reactive activities we can quantify the impact of losses and develop baseline indicators to compare mathematical results.

Mathematical formulae

To develop predictive risk analytic methodology for estimating the loss of cyber risk, we apply the aggregate loss method to compound a Poisson discrete probability distribution. The L_c = aggregate loss distribution consisting of the compound sum of N = frequency (intensity) and Z_i = severity (loss) distribution and is described as: $L_c = \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i$, where $L_c = 0$, if $N = 0$

Considering the (un)availability of probabilistic data, the N , Z_i , and the consequent Z_j where ($i \neq j$) are considered independent. This cumulative function defines a frequency distribution for aggregate loss as nonlinear summation. The function can be improved by considering the frequency distribution as Poisson variable, where for a given time interval $[0, t_c]$, the inter-arrival time = S_i of two ‘risks’ within the interval follows an exponential distribution with parameter λ_c . This function can be described as:

$$P(N(t) = n) = \frac{\exp(-\lambda_c t_c)(\lambda_c t_c)^n}{n!}$$

$$Y_i = S_i - S_{i-1} \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda_c), F(Y < y) = 1 - \exp\{-\lambda_c y\}$$

The known issues with (un)availability of sufficient probabilistic data [31] can be mitigated by enhancing the precision of the sample size in the inter-arrival time, where the insufficient (few years) data can be considered as lognormal (Galton) distribution where $t_c = 365$ (representing 365 days). In a more specific dataset scenarios, the distribution will vary depending on the probabilistic data. We postulate that the $t_c = 365$ has a fixed loss per day = b , where M_x = total loss days for an IoT device IoT_x and the device is operational at time t and the total loss per $t_c = b \times M_x$. Considering that IoT device can stop functioning (or be killed by grey-hat attack) at any point in t_c , then M_x represents a continuous random variable of the future (potential) loss from an IoT device infected for time x and $1(\cdot)$, with a given discount rate = r calculated as $v = (1 + r)^{-1}$, then considering the probability of IoT device stops (or be killed) and the discount factor, the present potential loss P_x can be determined as: $P_x = v \times 1_{(T_x > 1)} \times (b \times M_x)$

This formula calculates the risk of loss depending on the IoT device surviving the entire 365 days, or stops (or be killed) during the 365 days. The second postulate is that the risk of loss is eliminated when the device is killed. The actuarial equivalent of this can be explained as the present values of the expected losses described as loading = δ and expected revenue (that was lost) = π_x are equal to: $\pi_x = (1 + \delta) \times E(P_x)$

In time, when more extensive data from IoT devices becomes available, more precise δ can result with lowering the expected loss = α and a more precise expected present value of the loss = $E(P_x^1)$ can be estimated as: $E(P_x^1) = \alpha \times E(P_x)$, and expected revenue (that was lost) as: $P_x^1 = (1 + \delta) \times E(P_x^1)$. The continuous random variable of the future (potential) loss M_x can be divided on the number of attacks (frequency) = N_x and the and severity (loss) = Z_i per breach in a given t_c can be denoted as $R_{x,i}$ and N_x would reflect a Poisson distribution with time-varying intensity θ_x , and $R_{x,0}$ and $R_{x,1} = Y_{x,1} + 1$ where $Y_{x,1}$ follows time-varying intensity = λ_x . The M_x in a given t_c for an IoT device IoT_x can be estimated as: $M_x = \sum_{i=0}^{N_x} R_{x,i}$. With a compound Poisson process, the probable present potential loss P_x

with a given M_x in a given t_c for an IoT device IoT_x , can be calculated with:

$$P(M_x = n) = \begin{cases} \exp(-\theta_x), n = 0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{j(\lambda_x)^{n-j} (\theta_x)^j \exp - (j\lambda_x + \theta_x)}{j! (n-j)!}, \\ n \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

The above equation is designed for IoT risk assessment, but it can easily be adopted for different types of cyber risks. For example, we could calculate IoT cyber risk from AI as κ for a given IoT device IoT_x with $\kappa \times \pi_x^1$, where in the first instance, the total loss L_κ would include M_x and L_c . This can be expressed as: $L_\kappa = \sum_{j=1}^k M_x + L_c$ and evaluated with risk proxies from shortfall probability, Value at Risk and Conditional Tail Expectation. The shortfall probability can be calculated as: $Prob(\text{Shortfall}) = Prob(\kappa \times \pi_x^1 \leq L_\kappa)$, where expected shortfall is $E(\text{Shortfall}) = E(\max(\kappa \times \pi_x^1 - L_\kappa, 0))$. With r (described earlier), and the threshold $= \rho$, Value at Risk can be calculated as: $VAR(\rho) = \inf\{L_\kappa^* | F_{L_\kappa}(L_\kappa^*) < 1 - \rho\%$, and the $CTE(\rho) = E(L_\kappa | L_\kappa \geq VaR(\rho))$. With the VaR and CTE risk proxies, we can calculate the risk margin ratio $= \delta(L)$ with the Solvency 2 Directive percentile method: $\delta(L) = \frac{\rho(L) - E(L)}{E(L)}$ where $\rho(L)$ represents VaR and CTE risk measures, and $E(L)$ the best estimate. If this is considered with an assumption that losses would be larger than ransoms: α of losses $\leq \alpha$ of ransoms. Then the power-law distribution can be calculated with the equation: $P(x) = \alpha X^{-\alpha}$, where the variance analysis of α parameter is $1 < \alpha < 2$, with infinite mean and average even when $2 < \alpha < 3$.

Cognitive design

Connecting the lost exposure of cyber risk from human-computer interaction (frequency), in different information knowledge management systems (magnitude), with artificial intelligence, can provide predictive feedback sensors for primary and secondary loss (vulnerabilities). These feedback sensors represent dynamic real time data mechanisms that assist and enable better understanding of the vulnerabilities - prior to cyber-attacks. The reliability of cyber risk analytics could increase significantly if decisionmakers have a dynamic and self-adopting AI enhanced feedback sensors to assess, predict, analyse and address the economic risks of cyber-attacks.

The survey (in Table 1) identified all relevant AI algorithms, and the mathematical formulae (results in Table 2) articulates some of the possible solutions for the role of these algorithms in designing dynamic automated predictive feedback cognitive system, supported with real-time intelligence.

Cyber risk analytic approaches with dynamic real-time and AI/ML self-adapting enhanced technologies that enable predictive risk analytics are identified in Table 1. While the design of a predictive cyber risk analytics is based on confidence intervals and time bound ranges in Table 2. In doing this work we are acutely aware that adding automation and further coupling to a distributed system also brings new opportunities for cascading effects and exposing new attack surfaces. These concerns are fundamental in the areas with increased automation of processes which have classically required human interaction.

Dynamic and Self-Adapting Predictive Data Analytics with the Mathematical Formulae

A range of data sources was used to apply data analytics with the new mathematical formulae. The Comprehensive Threat Intelligence was used to collect data from vulnerability reports and zero-day reports [89]. The Chronology of Data Breaches [90] was used to gather larger sample size from thousands of records collected over the last 10 years (2010-2020). The SonicWall cyber threat report was used to collect probabilistic data on trends of IoT attacks [91]. The aggregate cyber risk from a large sample population is not the ideal measure for calculating the cyber risk of a small and/or medium sized enterprise. Hence, we divided the large sample into subsamples that follow a

Poisson distribution with smaller total risk λ_c , where $\lambda_c = \lambda_{c1} + \dots + \lambda_{cm}$ and $\lambda_{ci}, i = 1, \dots, m$ represented as the individual risk of a subsample. Finally, the total cyber risk of the adjusted proportion parameter p is equal to $\lambda_c = p\lambda_c$. We estimate risk exposure of total IoT cyber risk p_1 and the IoT cyber risk from non-recorded devices as p_2 where $p = p_1 \times (m \times p_2^{-1})$; $m =$ independent sample size. If we assume that $m = 10,000$ and $p = 0.00002$. The $p = 0.00002$ derived from the findings that IoT devices are attacked within 5 minutes of being connected to the internet [11], while over 50% of the cyber risk professionals do not keep inventory of IoT devices installed [92], hence there are potentially over 50% more IoT devices exposed to attacks. This is calculated as 365 (days in a year) $\times 24$ (hours per day) $\times 60$ (minutes per hour) $- 50\%$ (the cyber-attacks on not recorded IoT devices)¹ where ten times $p =$ ‘high (amber)’ risk, twenty times $p =$ ‘severe (red)’ risk. This reflects on findings that IoT will increase at a rate of 152,200 devices per minute by 2025 [93] $\times 525,600$ (minutes in 365 days) $= 80$ billion new IoT devices connected annually. This will increase the overall IoT cyber risk level. The twenty times assumption is based on the SonicWall report [91] stating that IoT malware attacks increased by 215.7% from 10.3m in 2017 to 32.7m in 2018 and the trend continued in 2019². The twenty times assumption represents .99 in Table 1. The corresponding .95 and .90 derive from the .99 calculation. We can also realistically assume that ‘guarded (green)’ level of cyber maturity would lower the $\alpha = .90$, then we can calculate the shortfall probability, expected shortfall, VaR and CTE for different cyber risk levels and tail risk under different assumptions in Table 1.

Risk calculation metrics	Cyber risk	IoT cyber risk			
		Guarded (Green)	Elevated (Yellow)	High (Amber)	Severe (Red)
$E(P_\chi^1)$	9,225,798	8,302,872	8,323,645	8,495,883	8,826,248.5
$Prob(\kappa \times \pi_\chi^1 \leq L_\kappa)$	0.362%	0.390%	0.717%	2.952%	4.359%
$E(\max(\kappa \times \pi_\chi^1 - L_\kappa, 0))$	776	783	31,660	281,340	807,491
$VAR(.90)$	9,659,815	8,696,453.5	8,706,061	8,797,711.5	8,947,727
$VAR(.95)$	9,785,002.5	8,807,375.5	8,823,096.5	9,020,017.5	9,510,794.5
$VAR(.99)$	10,020,820.5	9,031,839.5	9,092,977.5	11,314,474.5	14,126,426.5
$CTE(.90)$	9,823,671.5	8,844,958.5	9,021,798	10,482,011.5	13,461,685
$CTE(.95)$	9,930,712	8,942,115.5	9,283,971	12,076,385	17,770,438
$CTE(.99)$	10,139,834	9,137,848.5	10,729,379.5	22,130,721.5	45,991,022

Table 2: Dynamic and self-adapting predictive cyber risk analytics based on different levels of cyber risk intelligence

$E(P_\chi^1) =$ Expected present value of the loss;

$Prob(\kappa \times \pi_\chi^1 \leq L_\kappa) =$ Prob(Shortfall) or Shortfall probability;

$E(\max(\kappa \times \pi_\chi^1 - L_\kappa, 0)) =$

E (Shortfall) or Shortfall of expected present value of the loss;

$VAR(\rho) =$ Value at Risk;

$CTE(\rho) =$ Conditional Tail Expectation

Note: Assuming $N = 1000$, $b = 1000$, $r = 0.03$, $\alpha = 0.9$, $\delta = 0.1$ in the IoT cyber risk calculation and number of repetitions = 100,000

While existing cyber risk assessment models are based on individual risk calculation metrics, the approach presented in the mathematical formulae and demonstrated in Table 1, is based on multiple numerical risk metrics. The quantitative approach of the mathematical formulae, when integrated

¹ $365 \times 24 \times 60 \times .5 = 262,800 \div 5 = 52,560 \div 262,800 = 0.2 \div 10,000$

² SonicWall report [91] captured real-world data from more than one million sensors in over 215 countries with over 140,000 malware samples collected daily.

with Excel Macros, presents risk categorisations (Table 1) that are supported with real time intelligence. This presents a dynamic and self-adopting predictive cyber risk analytics approach, that is compliant with the existing NIST ‘traffic lights’ risk categorisations. The quantitative approach also correlates the NIST standards with the FAIR Institute efforts for quantitative cyber risk analytics. The mathematical formulae is similar to the FAIR-U approach [13], but instead of relying on a specific risk metric, its reliant on multiple numerical risk metrics. For comparison, the mathematical formulae uses different tail risk measurement and compares the impact of cyber risk under different risk categories. The ‘high (amber)’ and ‘severe (red)’ risk categories derive numerical representation of how rare and extreme events (black swan events) can increase the cyber risk impact. The impact of risk in VaR (.90) and CTE (.90) is not significant, but the risk margin ration increases significantly when compared to VaR (.99) and CTE (.99). This provides a quantitative perspective of impact from ‘black swan’ events, and enables more informative decision making on implementation of low cost and low security vs higher cost and higher security IoT systems, while putting ‘black swan’ events in IoT risk perspective. Worth noting that although IoT devices today are attacked within 5 minutes of being connected to the internet [11], computers connected to internet even back in 2007 were attacked on average every 39 seconds [94]. Given that computers even in 2007 had much more computing power than most IoT devices today, we can anticipate a continuous increase in attack frequency on IoT devices. Although such assumptions given the lack of data can only be described as super forecasting, the estimated average attack detection and mitigation in terms of the 5 min from connection to attack timeframe, can be described with different ML algorithms. Comparing the average attack detection and mitigation time in Figure 1. with multiple algorithms [50], including Distributed Edge-based Defence (DED), Centralised Fog-based Defence (CFD), Centralised Fog and Cloud-based Defence (CFCD) and SeArch architecture.




Figure 1: The average attack detection and mitigation on IoT connected devices

The average attack detection and mitigation time Figure 1, shows that although some of the NIDS described earlier, can detect IoT attacks within the 5 min average attack time from the moment of connection, none of the NIDS shown in Figure 1 can mitigate IoT attacks instantly. Therefore, understanding the risks before they occur is of a significant relevance to preventing severe impact from IoT attacks.

Discussion

The novelty of the proposed research is in the relationship between AI/ML and securing the edge. With this study, we focused on delivering a higher Technology Readiness Level (TRL) by testing and verifying the formulae for risk analytics with industry actors in the field of AI/ML. The output of the research exhibits how an integration for dynamic real-time cyber risk analytics would work in industry settings. In addition, the research covers intersections between technology, regulation, economics, and interventions. This creates value across risk and engineering disciplines and resolves a contemporary problem that is relevant to the industry in general. Calculating the impact of cyber risk at the edge, with cyber risk analytics supported by AI/ML, contributes to cybersecurity of devices and networks at the edge. Therefore, the research relates to key government and industry priorities and end user needs.

This research addresses the need for improving our capacity for a comprehensive and systematic understanding of the opportunities and threats that arise when AI/ML technologies are migrated to the periphery of the internet and into local IoT networks. The research methodology approach was developed upon past experiences in terms of the (un)availability of data. Many similar models have been introduced and never used because reliable data could not be found. Furthermore, in terms of the (un)availability of data, lessons can be learned from previous research on data strategies [95]. The volume of data generated creates diverse challenges for developing data strategies in a variety of verticals (ex. AI/ML, ethics, business requirements). Simultaneously, designing a cyber security architecture for complex coupled systems, while understanding the economic impact, demands data strategy optimisation and decision making on collecting and assessment of probabilistic data when edge computing nodes are deployed, presents a socio-technical research problem.

The research is also strongly related to personal perceptions of risk because of collecting probabilistic data at the edge interact with data regulations, standards and policies. These data perceptions, regulations and policies are strongly considered in our approach for integrating AI/ML in cyber risk data analytics at the edge. A cybersecurity architecture for impact assessment with AI/ML cyber risk analytics must meet public acceptability, security standards, and legal scrutiny. With consideration of the above, the research integrated areas such as economic impact modelling, policy and governance recommendations with computer science, to develop and design architectures for AI/ML in cyber risk data analytics. The research contributes to knowledge by integrating economic impact assessment with AI/ML and cyber risk analytics models that have not been previously integrated for securing the edge, and thus promote the field of developing a dynamic and self-adopting AI enhanced data analytics methodology to assess, predict, analyse and address the economic risks of cyber-attacks.

Conclusion

With the integration of AI/ML in risk analytics at the periphery, and with the integration of IoT systems, it is only a question of time when AI/ML will start collecting and analysing risk data from IoT systems. With the rapid expansion of IoT systems at the periphery, the accompanying cyber risk will inevitably increase and the reliance on existing cyber risk metrics cannot be taken for granted when different and novel threat level emerges. This research concludes that impact assessment approaches need to be reconsidered and redesigned to include dynamic and self-adopting predictive cyber risk analytics. The conclusion builds upon the existing approach for categorising (pooling) risk, but presents a quantitative version of the NIST ‘traffic lights’ system (in Table 2), enhanced with multiple risk calculation metrics that calculate the shortfall probability, expected shortfall, VaR and CTE for different cyber risk levels and tail risk under different assumptions.

This new approach also benefits cyber risk prevention, because cybersecurity solutions create different costs and cybersecurity prevention cost would differ depending on the cost, benefits and risk evaluation. The new mathematical formulae present a better understanding of the cost and risk

evaluation with multiple risk calculation metrics for different cyber risk levels and tail risk under different assumptions. The value of cyber risk real-time data from supply chains and control systems can be explained in economic terms, where the level of cybersecurity is based on the co-ordination of sufficient protection of the communications networks.

This study enhances the Technology Readiness Level by presenting a mathematical formula for the future cyber risk developments that are reshaping not only the business ecosystems, but also the data analytics of supply and control systems. However, the AI/ML infrastructure in the communications network and the relevant cyber security technology must evolve in an ethical manner that humans can understand, while maintaining maximum trust and privacy of the users. The mathematical formulae presented are built upon the existing efforts of the NIST ‘traffic lights’ system and the FAIR-U Tool, maintaining maximum trust and privacy of the users though ‘pooling’ of risk data into calculation metrics, while anonymising data from individual IoT devices.

Secondly, the co-ordination of supply and control systems cyber protection though AI/ML must be reliable to prevent abuse from insider threats, organised crime, terror organisations or state-sponsored aggressors, but also from the AI itself (e.g. AI pretending to be human). The mathematical formulae in this article relies on multiple risk calculation metrics, while existing cyber risk assessment approached are designed with individual risk calculation metrics. The integration of multiple risk metrics presents a more robust protection from abuse of individual data intelligence streams.

Thirdly, AI/ML in cyber risk data analytics integrated in the supply and control systems needs to be designed so that it encourages the private sector to take steps to improve the management of confidential and proprietary information (i.e. customer or financial data), intellectual property and PII (Personally Identifiable Information). The dynamic and self-adapting predictive cyber risk analytics as presented in the article, is based on different levels of cyber risk intelligence that are ‘pooled’ into numbers and not presented as individual risk events. Hence, it allows private sector to anonymise the risk data, and after applying the mathematical model, the data is presented into anonymous risk categories.

AI/ML in cyber risk data analytics integrated in the supply chains and control systems would present innovative and cost-effective ways to protect such data. In addition, the AI/ML analysis of the threat event frequency, with a dynamic and self-adopting AI enhanced methodology, would empower the design of a cognition engine mechanisms for predicting the loss magnitude through the control, analysis, distribution and management of probabilistic data. The development of this cognitive engine and its application, would undoubtedly bring multiple benefits and would enable deeper understanding of the impact of cyber risk at the edge. Nonetheless, IoT networks represent complex coupled systems [96], that can be described as cyber-physical social machines [97] and social machines [98] should be observed in practice [99]. Given that IoT is considered as critical enabler [100] of value creation [101], the findings of this study would probably be best verified when observed in practice.

References

- [1] Chen, Zhuang., He, Qian., Liu, Lei., Lan, Dapeng., Chung, Hwei Ming., and Mao, Zhifei, “An artificial intelligence perspective on mobile edge computing,” in *Proceedings - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Smart Internet of Things, SmartIoT 2019*, 2019, pp. 100–106.
- [2] Tortora, Cristina., McNicholas, Paul D., and Palumbo, Francesco, “A Probabilistic Distance Clustering Algorithm Using Gaussian and Student-t Multivariate Density Distributions,” *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1–22, Mar. 2020.
- [3] Rahman, Mohammad S., and Haffari, Gholamreza, “A Statistically Efficient and Scalable Method for Exploratory Analysis of High-Dimensional Data,” *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1–17, Mar. 2020.

- [4] Latvala, Sampsa., Sethi, Mohit., and Aura, Tuomas, "Evaluation of Out-of-Band Channels for IoT Security," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Jan. 2020.
- [5] Gabillon, Alban., Gallier, Romane., and Bruno, Emmanuel, "Access Controls for IoT Networks," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Jan. 2020.
- [6] Gyongyosi, Laszlo., and Imre, Sandor, "Secret Key Rate Adaption for Multicarrier Continuous-Variable Quantum Key Distribution," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Jan. 2020.
- [7] Kar, Udit Narayana., and Sanyal, Debarshi Kumar, "A Critical Review of 3GPP Standardization of Device-to-Device Communication in Cellular Networks," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–18, Jan. 2020.
- [8] Rajakumaran, Gayathri., Venkataraman, Neelamarayanan., and Mukkamala, Raghava Rao, "Denial of Service Attack Prediction Using Gradient Descent Algorithm," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–8, Jan. 2020.
- [9] Hernandez, Netzahualcoyotl., Lundström, Jens., Favela, Jesus., McChesney, Ian., and Arnrich, Bert, "Literature Review on Transfer Learning for Human Activity Recognition Using Mobile and Wearable Devices with Environmental Technology," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1–16, Mar. 2020.
- [10] Abdel Magid, Salma., Petrini, Francesco., and Dezfouli, Behnam, "Image classification on IoT edge devices: profiling and modeling," *Cluster Comput.*, pp. 1–19, Aug. 2019.
- [11] NetScouts, "Dawn of the TerrorBIT Era NETSCOUT Threat Intelligence Report-Powered by ATLAS Findings from Second Half 2018," 2018.
- [12] Davis, Matovu., Gilbert, Mugeni., Simon, Karume., Stephen, Mutua., and Gilibrays Ocen, Gilbert, "State of cyber security: the Ugandan perspective," *Int. J. Sci. Eng. Res.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 713–724, 2019.
- [13] FAIR, "FAIR Risk Analytics Platform Management," *FAIR-U Model*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.fairinstitute.org/fair-u>. [Accessed: 26-Dec-2017].
- [14] Ruan, Keyun, "Introducing cybernomics: A unifying economic framework for measuring cyber risk," *Comput. Secur.*, vol. 65, pp. 77–89, 2017.
- [15] CRatE, "Petras - Impact of Cyber Risk at the Edge: Cyber Risk Analytics and Artificial Intelligence (CRatE)," *EPSRC*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://petras-iot.org/project/impact-of-cyber-risk-at-the-edge-cyber-risk-analytics-and-artificial-intelligence-crate/>. [Accessed: 17-Feb-2020].
- [16] Maple, Carsten, "Security and privacy in the internet of things," *J. Cyber Policy*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 155–184, May 2017.
- [17] Tanczer, L.M., Steenmans, I., Elsdén, M., Blackstock, J., and Carr, M., "Emerging risks in the IoT ecosystem: Who's afraid of the big bad smart fridge?," in *Living in the Internet of Things: Cybersecurity of the IoT*, 2018, p. 33 (9 pp.).
- [18] Breza, Michael., Tomic, Ivana., and McCann, Julie, "Failures from the Environment, a Report on the First FAILSAFE workshop," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 40–45, May 2018.
- [19] Ghirardello, K., Maple, C., Ng, D., and Kearney, P., "Cyber security of smart homes: development of a reference architecture for attack surface analysis," in *Living in the Internet of Things: Cybersecurity of the IoT - 2018*, 2018, pp. 45 (10 pp.)-45 (10 pp.).
- [20] Anthi, Eirini., Williams, Lowri., Slowinska, Malgorzata., Theodorakopoulos, George., and Burnap, Pete, "A Supervised Intrusion Detection System for Smart Home IoT Devices,"

IEEE Internet Things J., vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 9042–9053, Oct. 2019.

- [21] Boyes, Hugh., Hallaq, Bil., Cunningham, Joe., and Watson, Tim, “The industrial internet of things (IIoT): An analysis framework,” *Comput. Ind.*, vol. 101, pp. 1–12, Oct. 2018.
- [22] Agyepong, Enoch., Cherdantseva, Yulia., Reinecke, Philipp., and Burnap, Pete, “Challenges and performance metrics for security operations center analysts: a systematic review,” *J. Cyber Secur. Technol.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–28, Dec. 2019.
- [23] Safa, Nader Sohrabi., Maple, Carsten., Watson, Tim., and Von Solms, Rossouw, “Motivation and opportunity based model to reduce information security insider threats in organisations,” *J. Inf. Secur. Appl.*, vol. 40, pp. 247–257, Jun. 2018.
- [24] Anthi, E., Williams, L., and Burnap, P., “Pulse: an adaptive intrusion detection for the internet of things,” in *Living in the Internet of Things: Cybersecurity of the IoT*, 2018, p. 35 (4 pp.).
- [25] Craggs, Barnaby., and Rashid, Awais, “Smart Cyber-Physical Systems: Beyond Usable Security to Security Ergonomics by Design,” in *2017 IEEE/ACM 3rd International Workshop on Software Engineering for Smart Cyber-Physical Systems (SEsCPS)*, 2017, pp. 22–25.
- [26] Anthonysamy, Pauline., Rashid, Awais., and Chitchyan, Ruzanna, “Privacy Requirements: Present & Future,” in *2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Society Track (ICSE-SEIS)*, 2017, pp. 13–22.
- [27] Van Kleek, Max., Binns, Reuben., Zhao, Jun., Slack, Adam., Lee, Sauyon., Ottewell, Dean., and Shadbolt, Nigel, “X-Ray Refine,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '18*, 2018, pp. 1–13.
- [28] Nurse, Jason RC., Radanliev, Petar., Creese, Sadie., and De Roure, David, “Realities of Risk: ‘If you can’t understand it, you can’t properly assess it!’: The reality of assessing security risks in Internet of Things systems,” in *Living in the Internet of Things: Cybersecurity of the IoT - 2018*, 2018, pp. 1–9.
- [29] Nurse, J., Creese, Sadie., and De Roure, David, “Security Risk Assessment in Internet of Things Systems,” *IT Prof.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 20–26, 2017.
- [30] Akinrolabu, Olusola., Nurse, Jason R.C., Martin, Andrew., and New, Steve, “Cyber risk assessment in cloud provider environments: Current models and future needs,” *Computers and Security*, vol. 87. Elsevier Ltd, p. 101600, 01-Nov-2019.
- [31] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Nicolescu, Razvan., Huth, Michael., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., Cannady, Stacy., and Burnap, Peter, “Future developments in cyber risk assessment for the internet of things,” *Comput. Ind.*, vol. 102, pp. 14–22, Nov. 2018.
- [32] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Cannady, Stacy., Mantilla Montalvo, Rafael., Nicolescu, Razvan., and Huth, Michael, “Economic impact of IoT cyber risk - analysing past and present to predict the future developments in IoT risk analysis and IoT cyber insurance,” in *Living in the Internet of Things: Cybersecurity of the IoT - 2018*, 2018, no. CP740, p. 3 (9 pp.).
- [33] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Nurse, Jason R.C., Nicolescu, Razvan., Huth, Michael., Cannady, Stacy., and Mantilla Montalvo, Rafael, “Integration of Cyber Security Frameworks, Models and Approaches for Building Design Principles for the Internet-of-things in Industry 4.0,” in *Living in the Internet of Things: Cybersecurity of the IoT*, 2018, p. 41 (6 pp.).
- [34] Buith, Jacques, “Cyber Value at Risk in the Netherlands,” 2016.
- [35] FAIR, “What is a Cyber Value-at-Risk Model?,” 2017. [Online]. Available:

<http://www.fairinstitute.org/blog/what-is-a-cyber-value-at-risk-model>. [Accessed: 26-Dec-2017].

- [36] Malhotra, Yogesh, “Cognitive Computing for Anticipatory Risk Analytics in Intelligence, Surveillance, & Reconnaissance (ISR): Model Risk Management in Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning (Presentation Slides),” *SSRN Electron. J.*, Feb. 2018.
- [37] Porambage, Pawani., Kumar, Tanesh., Liyanage, Madhusanka., Partala, Juha., Lovén, Lauri., Ylianttila, Mika., and Seppänen, Tapio, “Sec-EdgeAI: AI for Edge Security Vs Security for Edge AI BrainICU-Measuring brain function during intensive care View project ECG-based emotion recognition View project Sec-EdgeAI: AI for Edge Security Vs Security for Edge AI,” 2019.
- [38] Barker, Kash., Lambert, James H., Zobel, Christopher W., Tapia, Andrea H., Ramirez-Marquez, Jose E., Albert, Laura., Nicholson, Charles D., and Caragea, Cornelia, “Defining resilience analytics for interdependent cyber-physical-social networks,” *Sustain. Resilient Infrastruct.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 59–67, Apr. 2017.
- [39] Roopak, Monika., Yun Tian, Gui., and Chambers, Jonathon, “Deep learning models for cyber security in IoT networks,” in *2019 IEEE 9th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference, CCWC 2019*, 2019, pp. 452–457.
- [40] Vinayakumar, R., Alazab, Mamoun., Soman, K. P., Poornachandran, Prabakaran., Al-Nemrat, Ameer., and Venkatraman, Sitalakshmi, “Deep Learning Approach for Intelligent Intrusion Detection System,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 41525–41550, 2019.
- [41] Diro, Abebe Abeshu., and Chilamkurti, Naveen, “Distributed attack detection scheme using deep learning approach for Internet of Things,” *Futur. Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 82, pp. 761–768, May 2018.
- [42] Berman, Daniel., Buczak, Anna., Chavis, Jeffrey., and Corbett, Cherita, “A Survey of Deep Learning Methods for Cyber Security,” *Information*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 122, Apr. 2019.
- [43] Gebremariam, Anteneh A., Usman, Muhammad., and Qaraq, Marwa, “Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in the Area of SDN and NFV: A Survey,” in *16th International Multi-Conference on Systems, Signals and Devices, SSD 2019*, 2019, pp. 545–549.
- [44] Ullah, Israr., Ahmad, Shakeel., Mehmood, Faisal., and Kim, DoHyeun, “Cloud Based IoT Network Virtualization for Supporting Dynamic Connectivity among Connected Devices,” *Electronics*, vol. 8, no. 7, p. 742, Jun. 2019.
- [45] Hu, Rui., Wen, Shiping., Zeng, Zhigang., and Huang, Tingwen, “A short-term power load forecasting model based on the generalized regression neural network with decreasing step fruit fly optimization algorithm,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 221, pp. 24–31, Jan. 2017.
- [46] Sultana, Nasrin., Chilamkurti, Naveen., Peng, Wei., and Alhadad, Rabei, “Survey on SDN based network intrusion detection system using machine learning approaches,” *Peer-to-Peer Netw. Appl.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 493–501, Mar. 2019.
- [47] Bashir, Hayat., Lee, Seonah., and Kim, Kyong Hoon, “Resource allocation through logistic regression and multicriteria decision making method in IoT fog computing,” *Trans. Emerg. Telecommun. Technol.*, Dec. 2019.
- [48] Al-Turjman, Fadi, “Intelligence and security in big 5G-oriented IoNT: An overview,” *Futur. Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 102, pp. 357–368, Jan. 2020.
- [49] Cui, Qimei., Gong, Zhenzhen., Ni, Wei., Hou, Yanzhao., Chen, Xiang., Tao, Xiaofeng., and Zhang, Ping, “Stochastic Online Learning for Mobile Edge Computing: Learning from Changes,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 63–69, Mar. 2019.

- [50] Nguyen, Tri Gia., Phan, Trung V., Nguyen, Binh T., So-In, Chakchai., Baig, Zubair Ahmed., and Sanguanpong, Surasak, “SeArch: A Collaborative and Intelligent NIDS Architecture for SDN-Based Cloud IoT Networks,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 107678–107694, 2019.
- [51] Park, Donghyun., Kim, Seulgi., An, Yelin., and Jung, Jae-Yoon, “LiReD: A Light-Weight Real-Time Fault Detection System for Edge Computing Using LSTM Recurrent Neural Networks,” *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 7, p. 2110, Jun. 2018.
- [52] Anagnostopoulos, Christos., and Hadjiefthymiades, Stathes, “A Spatio-Temporal Data Imputation Model for Supporting Analytics at the Edge,” in *Digital Transformation for a Sustainable Society in the 21st Century: 18th IFIP WG 6.11 Conference on E-Business, E-Services, and E-Society, I3E 2019, Trondheim, Norway, September 18-20, 2019, Proceedings*, 2019, vol. 11701, p. 138.
- [53] Yin, Hongsheng., Xue, Mengyang., Xiao, Yuteng., Xia, Kaijian., and Yu, Guofang, “Intrusion Detection Classification Model on an Improved k-Dependence Bayesian Network,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 157555–157563, 2019.
- [54] Syafrudin, Muhammad., Fitriyani, Norma., Alfian, Ganjar., and Rhee, Jongtae, “An Affordable Fast Early Warning System for Edge Computing in Assembly Line,” *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 84, Dec. 2018.
- [55] Guo, Yanhui., Cao, Han., Han, Siming., Sun, Yunchuan., and Bai, Yu, “Spectral-Spatial Hyperspectral Image Classification with K-Nearest Neighbor and Guided Filter,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 18582–18591, Mar. 2018.
- [56] Sangaiah, Arun Kumar., Medhane, Darshan Vishwasrao., Han, Tao., Hossain, M. Shamim., and Muhammad, Ghulam, “Enforcing Position-Based Confidentiality with Machine Learning Paradigm Through Mobile Edge Computing in Real-Time Industrial Informatics,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 4189–4196, Jul. 2019.
- [57] Zhang, Dayu., Bao, Weidong., Fang, Taosheng., Liang, Wenqian., Zhou, Wen., Ma, Li., Gao, Xiong., and Niu, Liyuan, “Edge task allocation scheme based on data classification,” in *Proceedings - 2019 5th International Conference on Big Data and Information Analytics, BigDIA 2019*, 2019, pp. 132–138.
- [58] Wang, Jin., Hu, Jia., Min, Geyong., Zhan, Wenhan., Ni, Qiang., and Georgalas, Nektarios, “Computation Offloading in Multi-Access Edge Computing Using a Deep Sequential Model Based on Reinforcement Learning,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 64–69, May 2019.
- [59] Wang, Xiaofei., Han, Yiwen., Wang, Chenyang., Zhao, Qiyang., Chen, Xu., and Chen, Min, “In-edge AI: Intelligentizing mobile edge computing, caching and communication by federated learning,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 156–165, Sep. 2019.
- [60] Sun, Degang., Wu, Zhengrong., Wang, Yan., Lv, Qiujian., and Hu, Bo, “Risk Prediction for Imbalanced Data in Cyber Security : A Siamese Network-based Deep Learning Classification Framework,” in *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, 2019, vol. 2019-July, pp. 1–8.
- [61] Abegunde, J., Xiao, H., and Spring, J, “A Dynamic Game with Adaptive Strategies for IEEE 802.15.4 and IoT,” in *2016 IEEE Trustcom/BigDataSE/ISPA*, 2016, pp. 473–480.
- [62] Moura, José., and Hutchison, David, “Game theory for multi-access edge computing: Survey, use cases, and future trends,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutorials*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 260–288, Jan. 2019.
- [63] Bui, Khac Hoai Nam., Jung, Jai E., and Camacho, David, “Game theoretic approach on Real-time decision making for IoT-based traffic light control,” in *Concurrency Computation* , 2017, vol. 29, no. 11, p. e4077.

- [64] Li, He., Ota, Kaoru., and Dong, Mianxiong, “Learning IoT in Edge: Deep Learning for the Internet of Things with Edge Computing,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 96–101, Jan. 2018.
- [65] Blanco-Filgueira, Beatriz., Garcia-Lesta, Daniel., Fernandez-Sanjurjo, Mauro., Brea, Victor Manuel., and Lopez, Paula, “Deep learning-based multiple object visual tracking on embedded system for IoT and mobile edge computing applications,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 5423–5431, Jun. 2019.
- [66] Cao, Bin., Zhang, Long., Li, Yun., Feng, Daquan., and Cao, Wei, “Intelligent Offloading in Multi-Access Edge Computing: A State-of-the-Art Review and Framework,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 57, no. 3. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., pp. 56–62, 01-Mar-2019.
- [67] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Nurse, Jason R.C., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., and Burnap, Peter, “Standardisation of cyber risk impact assessment for the Internet of Things (IoT),” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, Mar. 2019.
- [68] Radanliev, Petar., Charles De Roure, David., Nurse, Jason R C., Burnap, Peter., and Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla, “Methodology for designing decision support supply chain systems for visualising and mitigating cyber risk from IoT technologies,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [69] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, Dave., Nurse, Jason R C., Nicolescu, Razvan., Huth, Michael., Cannady, Stacy., and Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla, “Cyber Security Framework for the Internet-of-Things in Industry 4.0,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [70] Radanliev, Petar., DeRoure, David., Nurse, Jason R.C., Burnap, Pete., Anthi, Eirini., Ani, Uchenna., Santos, Omar., and Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla, “Definition of Cyber Strategy Transformation Roadmap for Standardisation of IoT Risk Impact Assessment with a Goal-Oriented Approach and the Internet of Things Micro Mart,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [71] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Maple, Carsten., Nurse, Jason R.C., Nicolescu, Razvan., and Ani, Uchenna, “Cyber Risk in IoT Systems,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [72] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Nurse, Jason R.C., Nicolescu, Razvan., Huth, Michael., Cannady, Stacy., and Mantilla Montalvo, Rafael, “New developments in Cyber Physical Systems, the Internet of Things and the Digital Economy – future developments in the Industrial Internet of Things and Industry 4.0,” Preprints, Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, Mar. 2019.
- [73] Radanliev, Petar., Roure, Dave De., Nurse, Jason R.C. C., Nicolescu, Razvan., Huth, Michael., Cannady, Stacy., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., ... Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla, “Cyber Risk impact Assessment - Assessing the Risk from the IoT to the Digital Economy,” Preprints, Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, Mar. 2019.
- [74] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David Charles., Nurse, Jason R.C., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., and Burnap, Pete, “The Industrial Internet-of-Things in the Industry 4.0 supply chains of

small and medium sized enterprises,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.

- [75] Radanliev, Petar, “Cyber Risk Management for the Internet of Things,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [76] Radanliev, P., Roure, D De., Nurse, JRC., and Nicolescu, R, “Cyber risk impact assessment–discussion on assessing the risk from the IoT to the digital economy,” *Univ. Oxford Comb. Work. Pap. Proj. reports Prep. PETRAS Natl. Cent. Excell. Cisco Res. Cent.*, 2019.
- [77] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David Charles., Nurse, Jason R.C., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., Burnap, Pete., Roure, David Charles De., Nurse, Jason R.C., ... Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., “Design principles for cyber risk impact assessment from Internet of Things (IoT),” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [78] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, Dave., Cannady, Stacy., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., Nicolescu, Razvan., and Huth, Michael, “Analysing IoT cyber risk for estimating IoT cyber insurance,” in *University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre*, 2019.
- [79] Radanliev, Petar, “CYBER RISK IMPACT ASSESSMENT,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [80] Radanliev, Petar, “Digital Supply Chains for Industry 4.0 Taxonomy of Approaches,” *Univ. Oxford Comb. Work. Pap. p*, no. April, 2019.
- [81] Radanliev, P., De Roure, D., Nicolescu, R., and Huth, M., “A reference architecture for integrating the Industrial Internet of Things in the Industry 4.0,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [82] Radanliev, Petar., De Roure, David., Nurse, Jason RC., Burnap, Pete., Anthi, Eirini., Ani, Uchenna., Maddox, Treall., ... Mantilla Montalvo, Rafael, “Cyber risk from IoT technologies in the supply chain-discussion on supply chains decision support system for the digital economy,” Oxford, University of Oxford combined working papers and project reports prepared for the PETRAS National Centre of Excellence and the Cisco Research Centre, 2019.
- [83] IAM, “Petras - Impact Assessment Model for the IoT (IAM),” *EPSRC*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://petras-iot.org/project/impact-assessment-model-for-the-iot-iam/>. [Accessed: 20-Feb-2020].
- [84] CRACS, “Petras - Cyber Risk Assessment for Coupled Systems (CRACS),” *EPSRC*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://petras-iot.org/project/cyber-risk-assessment-for-coupled-systems-cracs/>. [Accessed: 20-Feb-2020].
- [85] Radanliev, P., Nicolescu, R., De Roure, D., and Huth, M., “Harnessing Economic Value from the Internet of Things,” London, 2019.
- [86] “The PETRAS National Centre of Excellence – PETRAS,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://petras-iot.org/>. [Accessed: 26-Feb-2020].
- [87] Taylor, P., Allpress, S., Carr, M., Lupu, E., Norton, J., Smith, L., Blackstock, J., Boyes, H., Hudson-Smith, A., Brass, I., Chizari, H., Cooper, R., Coulton, P., Craggs, B., Davies, N., De Roure, D., Elsdon, M., Huth, M., Lindley, J., Maple, C., Mittelstadt, B., Nicolescu, R., Nurse, J., Procter, R., Radanliev, P., Rashid, A., Sgandurra, D., Skatova, A., Taddeo, M., Tanczer,

- L., Vieira-Steiner, R., Watson, J.D.M., Wachter, S., Wakenshaw, S., Carvalho, G., Thompson., and R.J., Westbury, P.S., “Internet of Things realising the potential of a trusted smart world,” London, 2018.
- [88] Nicolescu, Razvan., Huth, Michael., Radanliev, Petar., and De Roure, David, “State of The Art in IoT - Beyond Economic Value,” London, 2018.
- [89] Cisco, “Cisco Talos Intelligence Group,” *Comprehensive Threat Intelligence*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://talosintelligence.com/>. [Accessed: 07-Feb-2020].
- [90] Land, Meghan., Mok, Bryan., Roane, Emory., and Stephens, Paul, “Privacy Rights Clearinghouse,” *Chronology of Data Breaches*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://privacyrights.org/data-breaches>. [Accessed: 07-Feb-2020].
- [91] SonicWall, “Mid-Year Update: 2019 SonicWall Cyber Threat Report,” 2019.
- [92] SFG, “The Internet of Things (IoT): A New Era of Third-Party Risk - Shared Assessments,” 2017.
- [93] Rosen, Mike, “Driving the Digital Agenda Requires Strategic Architecture,” 2015.
- [94] Cukier, Michel, “Study: Hackers Attack Every 39 Seconds | A. James Clark School of Engineering, University of Maryland,” *University of Maryland*, 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://eng.umd.edu/news/story/study-hackers-attack-every-39-seconds>. [Accessed: 12-Feb-2020].
- [95] Radanliev, Petar., Roure, David C. De., R.C. Nurse, Jason., Montalvo, Rafael Mantilla., Cannady, Stacy., Santos, Omar., Madox, La'Treall., ... Maple, Carsten, “Future developments in standardisation of cyber risk in the Internet of Things (IoT),” *SN Appl. Sci.*, no. 2: 169, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- [96] De Roure, D., Page, K.R., Radanliev, P., and Van Kleek, M., “Complex coupling in cyber-physical systems and the threats of fake data,” in *Living in the Internet of Things (IoT 2019)*, 2019 page, 2019, p. 11 (6 pp.).
- [97] Madaan, Aastha., Nurse, Jason., de Roure, David., O’Hara, Kieron., Hall, Wendy., and Creese, Sadie, “A Storm in an IoT Cup: The Emergence of Cyber-Physical Social Machines,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, Sep. 2018.
- [98] De Roure, David., Hooper, Clare., Page, Kevin., Tarte, Ségolène., and Willcox, Pip, “Observing Social Machines Part 2,” in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Science Conference on WWW - WebSci '15*, 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [99] Shadbolt, Nigel., O’Hara, Kieron., De Roure, David., and Hall, Wendy, *The Theory and Practice of Social Machines*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [100] Lee, Boyeun., Cooper, Rachel., Hands, David., and Coulton, Paul, “Design Drivers: A critical enabler to meditate value over the NPD process within Internet of Things,” in *4d Conference Proceedings: Meanings of Design in the Next Era. Osaka : DML (Design Management Lab)*, Ritsumeikan University, 2019, pp. 96–107.
- [101] Lee, Boyeun., Cooper, Rachel., Hands, David., and Coulton, Paul, “Value creation for IoT: Challenges and opportunities within the design and development process,” in *Living in the Internet of Things (IoT 2019)*. IET, *Living in the Internet of Things 2019*, London, United Kingdom, 2019, pp. 1–8.