



## CHECKLIST

# Checklist: Validating AI Anomaly Detection for Network Logs

A practical vendor-neutral checklist for evaluating whether AI-based anomaly detection is ready for production in network log environments.

## Checklist: Validating AI Anomaly Detection for Network Logs

Use this checklist to determine whether AI-based anomaly detection is a good fit for your logs, how to prepare the data, and what to verify before production use.

### 1) Define the detection goal

- ☐ Identify the exact behavior you want to surface:
- ☐ Beaconing
- ☐ Lateral movement
- ☐ Unusual egress destinations
- ☐ Service-to-service change
- ☐ Failed authentication bursts
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Choose a consistent observation unit:
- ☐ Host
- ☐ Service account
- ☐ Subnet
- ☐ Container



- ☐ Session
- ☐ Destination pair
- ☐ Define what counts as a meaningful anomaly for this use case.
- ☐ Confirm the output will be used for prioritization, not automatic compromise declaration.

---

## 2) Confirm the environment is suitable

- ☐ The environment produces enough log volume to establish a stable baseline.
- ☐ Normal behavior is repeatable enough to compare over time.
- ☐ Logs cover the activity you want to detect.
- ☐ The target use case is not dominated by constant maintenance, automation, or churn.
- ☐ You have a reasonable historical window to learn baseline patterns.
- ☐ The data is not so sparse that the model will mostly learn noise.

---

## 3) Review log quality before modeling

- ☐ Fields are consistently named across sources.
- ☐ Timestamps are accurate and normalized.
- ☐ Source, destination, protocol, and identity fields are present where expected.
- ☐ Missing values are understood and handled consistently.
- ☐ Duplicates, dropped events, and parsing errors are measured.
- ☐ Log transformations do not destroy important behavioral signals.
- ☐ Normalization and enrichment happen before anomaly scoring.

---

## 4) Choose behavior-based features

- ☐ Use aggregated features rather than only raw events.



- ☐ Include time-windowed counts and rates.
- ☐ Include source and destination metadata.
- ☐ Include byte and packet volume features.
- ☐ Include protocol and port distribution signals.
- ☐ Include failure and reset rates.
- ☐ Include authentication-related burst patterns if relevant.
- ☐ Include sequence-based changes, such as a new destination after a privilege change.
- ☐ Verify the selected features reflect behavior over time.

---

## 5) Design the time window strategy

- ☐ Select a rolling window size that fits the behavior speed:
  - ☐ 5 minutes
  - ☐ 15 minutes
  - ☐ 1 hour
  - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Test whether the chosen window captures both short bursts and sustained deviations.
- ☐ Confirm windows compare like with like.
- ☐ Avoid mixing unrelated entities in the same baseline.

---

## 6) Establish a baseline

- ☐ Decide whether the approach is statistical, clustering-based, isolation-based, reconstruction-based, or hybrid.
- ☐ Calibrate the baseline on normal historical behavior.
- ☐ Separate routine variation from meaningful deviation.
- ☐ Verify the baseline reflects the current environment, not an outdated one.
- ☐ Check whether the log distribution has shifted over time.
- ☐ Recalibrate if traffic patterns have changed significantly.



---

## 7) Validate explainability and analyst usability

- ☐ Each alert includes a novelty score.
- ☐ Each alert includes the main contributing features.
- ☐ Analysts can compare the event to recent history.
- ☐ The model output is understandable without specialized data science tooling.
- ☐ The triage process explains why the window was flagged.
- ☐ The result can be defended during incident review.

---

## 8) Add operational context before alerting

- ☐ Asset criticality is available to the decision layer.
- ☐ Known maintenance windows are accounted for.
- ☐ Allowlisted automation is excluded or downweighted.
- ☐ Business-approved anomalies do not page the team unnecessarily.
- ☐ Detection output is routed through rules or policy before alerting.
- ☐ Decisioning is separated from scoring.

---

## 9) Test for false positives and false negatives

- ☐ Review a representative sample of flagged windows.
- ☐ Measure how often alerts are operationally useful.
- ☐ Check whether static thresholds would have performed better for some cases.
- ☐ Identify legitimate bursts that were incorrectly scored as suspicious.
- ☐ Identify stealthy changes the model missed.
- ☐ Validate on known benign and known suspicious patterns where possible.



---

## 10) Check production readiness

- ☐ A tuning process exists for thresholds and features.
- ☐ Recalibration cadence is defined.
- ☐ Monitoring for data drift is in place.
- ☐ Alert volume is within analyst capacity.
- ☐ Escalation criteria are documented.
- ☐ Logging and scoring failures are observable.
- ☐ Rollback or fallback behavior is defined.
- ☐ There is a plan to broaden or narrow scope after initial rollout.

---

## 11) Confirm scope is appropriately narrow

- ☐ Start with one high-value use case before expanding.
- ☐ Prefer stable, repeatable traffic patterns first.
- ☐ Avoid broad coverage if the environment changes too frequently.
- ☐ Expand only after the first deployment is producing actionable results.

---

## 12) Decide whether to proceed

Mark the deployment as ready only if all of the following are true:

- ☐ The logs are complete enough for the intended use case.
- ☐ The environment has a stable enough baseline.
- ☐ The model produces explainable outputs.
- ☐ The alert volume is manageable.
- ☐ Operational context is applied before paging analysts.
- ☐ The team has a plan to monitor drift and retrain or recalibrate.



---

## Quick go/no-go summary

Go if:

- You have enough historical data
- The behavior is repeatable
- The features are well engineered
- Analysts can understand why alerts fired
- Context filtering reduces noise

No-go or not yet if:

- Logs are sparse or inconsistent
- Normal behavior changes constantly
- The model cannot explain itself
- False positives would overwhelm the team
- The use case is too broad for a first rollout

---

## Suggested first deployment targets

- ☐ VPN authentication anomalies
- ☐ Internal lateral movement patterns
- ☐ Unusual egress destinations
- ☐ Service-to-service communication changes
- ☐ Failed login bursts from a single host

---

## Notes

- AI is best used as a prioritization layer.
- A high anomaly score means unusual, not automatically malicious.



- The best production outcome combines normalization, rolling-window features, anomaly scoring, and contextual decisioning.

---

## Worksheet:

- Primary use case: \_\_\_\_\_
- Entity type: \_\_\_\_\_
- Window size: \_\_\_\_\_
- Baseline period: \_\_\_\_\_
- Top features: \_\_\_\_\_
- Context filters: \_\_\_\_\_
- Alert owner: \_\_\_\_\_
- Review cadence: \_\_\_\_\_