15-744: Computer Networking

L-22 Security and DoS

Overview

- Security holes in IP stack

- Denial of service

- Capabilities

- Traceback

Basic IP

- End hosts create IP packets and routers process them purely based on destination address alone (not quite in reality)
- Problem – End host may lie about other fields and not affect delivery
  - Source address – host may trick destination into believing that packet is from trusted source
    - Many applications use IP address as a simple authentication method
    - Solution – reverse path forwarding checks, better authentication
  - Fragmentation – can consume memory resources or otherwise trick destination/firewalls
    - Solution – disallow fragments

Routing

- Source routing
  - Destinations are expected to reverse source route for replies
  - Problem – Can force packets to be routed through convenient monitoring point
    - Solution – Disallow source routing – doesn't work well anyway!

Routing

- Routing protocol
  - Malicious hosts may advertise routes into network
  - Problem – Bogus routes may enable host to monitor traffic or deny service to others
    - Solutions
      - Use policy mechanisms to only accept routes from or to certain networks/entities
      - In link state routing, can use something like source routing to force packets onto valid route
      - Routing registries and certificates

ICMP

- Reports errors and other conditions from network to end hosts
- End hosts take actions to respond to error
- Problem
  - An entity can easily forge a variety of ICMP error messages
    - Redirect – informs end-hosts that it should be using different first hop route
    - Fragmentation – can confuse path MTU discovery
    - Destination unreachable – can cause transport connections to be dropped

TCP

- Each TCP connection has an agreed upon/ negotiated set of associated state
  - Starting sequence numbers, port numbers
  - Knowing these parameters is sometimes used to provide some sense of security
- Problem
  - Easy to guess these values
    - Listening ports #'s are well known and connecting port #'s are typically allocated sequentially
    - Starting sequence number are chosen in predictable way
  - Solution – make sequence number selection more random

Sequence Number Guessing Attack

Attacker → Victim: SYN(ISN_x), SRC=Trusted Host

Victim → Trusted Host: SYN(ISN_s), ACK(ISN_x)

Attacker → Victim: ACK($ISN_{guess\ of\ s}$), SRC=Trusted Host

Attacker → Victim: ACK($ISN_{guess\ of\ s}$), SRC=T, data = "rm -r /"

- Attacker must also make sure that Trusted Host does not respond to SYNACK
- Can repeat until guess is accurate

TCP

- TCP senders assume that receivers behave in certain ways (e.g. when they send acks, etc.)
  - Congestion control is typically done on a "packet" basis while the rest of TCP is based on bytes
- Problem – misbehaving receiver can trick sender into ignoring congestion control
  - Ack every byte in packet!
  - Send extra duplicate acks
  - Ack before the data is received (needs some application level retransmission – e.g. HTTP 1.1 range requests)
  - Solutions
    - Make congestion control byte oriented
    - Add nonces to packets – acks return nonce to truly indicate reception

9

DNS

- Users/hosts typically trust the host-address mapping provided by DNS
- Problems
  - Zone transfers can provide useful list of target hosts
  - Interception of requests or comprise of DNS servers can result in bogus responses
  - Solution – authenticated requests/responses

10

Overview

- Security holes in IP stack

- Denial of service

- Capabilities

- Traceback

11

## Denial of Service: What is it?

- Crash victim (exploit software flaws)
- Attempt to exhaust victim's resources
  - Network: Bandwidth
  - Host
    - Kernel: TCP connection state tables, etc.
    - Application: CPU, memory, etc.
  - Often high-rate attacks, but not always

| Attacker | | Victim |

12

TCP Reminder: 3-Way Handshake

C   S

SYN$_C$

SYN$_S$, ACK$_C$ Create TCB

Wait

ACK$_S$

Connected

Example DoS: TCP SYN Floods

- Each arriving SYN stores state at the server
  - TCP Control Block (TCB)
  - ~ 280 bytes
    - FlowID, timer info, Sequence number, flow control status, out-of-band data, MSS, other options
- Attack:
  - Send TCP SYN packets with bogus src addr
  - Half-open TCB entries exist until timeout
  - Kernel limits on # of TCBs

- Resources exhausted ⇒ requests rejected

14

Preventing SYN floods

- Principle 1: Minimize state before auth
  - (3 way handshake == auth)?
- Compressed TCP state
  - Very tiny state representation for half-open conns
  - Don't create the full TCB
- A few bytes per connection == can store 100,000s of half-open connections

15

SYN Cookies

- Idea: Keep no state until auth.
  - In response to SYN send back self-validating token to source that source must attach to ACK
- SYN → SYN/ACK+token → ACK+token
  - Validates that the receiver's IP is valid
- How to do in SYN? sequence #s!
  - top 5 bits: time counter
  - next 3: Encode the MSS
  - bottom 24: F(client IP, port, server IP, port, t)?
- Downside to this encoding: Loses options.

16

Bandwidth Floods

- 1990s: Brute force from a few machines
  - Pretty easy to stop: Filter the sources
  - Until they spoof their src addr!
- Late 90s, early 00s: Traffic Amplifiers
  - Spoofed source addrs (next)?
- Modern era: Botnets
  - Use a worm to compromise 1000s+ of machines
  - Often don't need to bother with spoofing

Reflector Attacks

- Spoof source address
- Send query to service
- Response goes to victim
- If response >> query, "amplifies" attack
- Hides real attack source from victim
- Amplifiers:
  - DNS responses (50 byte query → 400 byte resp)?
  - ICMP to broadcast addr (1 pkt → 50 pkts) ("smurf")

Inferring DoS Activity: Backscatter

IP address spoofing creates random *backscatter*.

SYN packets
D:V B:V C:V
SYN+ACK backscatter
B:V

Attacker
B
Victim
V
C
D

→ Attack
→ Backscatter

Bandwidth DOS Attacks - Solutions

- Ingress filtering – examine packets to identify bogus source addresses
- Link testing – have routers either explicitly identify which hops are involved in attack or use controlled flooding and a network map to perturb attack traffic
- Logging – log packets at key routers and post-process to identify attacker's path
- ICMP traceback – sample occasional packets and copy path info into special ICMP messages
- Capabilities
- IP traceback + filtering

Spoofing 1: Ingress/Egress Filtering

Drop all packets with source address other than 204.69.207.0/24

204.69.207.0/24

Internet

- RFC 2827: Routers install filters to drop packets from networks that are not downstream
- Feasible at edges; harder at "core"

22

Spoofing 2: RPF Checks

Accept packet from interface only if forwarding table entry for source IP address matches ingress interface

Strict Mode uRPF Enabled

10.0.18.3 from wrong interface

"A" Routing Table
```
Destination      Next Hop
10.0.1.0/24      Int. 1
10.0.18.0/24     Int. 2
```

- Unicast Reverse Path Forwarding
  - Cisco: "ip verify unicast reverse-path"
- Requires symmetric routing

Slide Credit: Feamster   23

Secure Overlay Services

Source point

Beacon

Secret servlet

Overlay Access Point

Overlay Nodes

target

Filtered region

- Authenticate client communication
- Longer/slower route
- Closed network

Keromytis, Misra, Rubenstein, 02   24

Overview

- Security holes in IP stack

- Denial of service

- Capabilities

- Traceback

25

Capabilities

- Filters: prevent the bad stuff
- Capabilities: must have permission to talk
- Sender must first ask dst for permission
  - If OK, dst gives capabilitiy to src
  - capability proves to routers that traffic is OK
- Good feature: stateless at routers

26

Unforgeable Capabilities

- It is required that a set of capabilities be not easily forgeable or usable if stolen from another party

- Each router computes a cryptographic hash when it forwards a request packet

- The destination receives a list of pre-capabilities with fixed source and destination IP, hence preventing spoofed attacks

Pre-capability (routers)

| timestamp (8 bits)	hash(src IP, dest IP, time, secret) (56 bits)

TVA (Capability)

PreCapability (Pi)=

hash(srcIP, destIP, time, secret)

Alice

RTS

Pre1

Pre1, Pre2

CNN

- RTS rate limited
  - 1-5% of bandwidth
- Pi Queue at Router
  - Most recent Pi

29

Fine-Grained Capabilities

- False authorizations even in small number can cause a denial of service until the capability expires
- An improved mechanism would be for the destination to decide the amount of data (N) and also the time (T) along with the list of pre-capabilities

Capability (hosts)

timestamp (8 bits)	hash(pre-capability, N, T) (56 bits)

7

TVA (Capability)

Capability =

timestamp || Hash (N, T, PreCap)

- *N bytes, T seconds*
- Stateless receiver
  - Does not store *N, T*

Alice

Cap1, Cap2

Cap1, Cap2

Cap1, Cap2

CNN

Bounded Router State

- The router state could be exhausted as it would be counting the number of bytes sent
- Router state is only maintained for flows that send faster than N/T
  - When new packets arrive, new state is created and a byte counter is initialized along with a time-to-live field that is decremented/ incremented

Balancing Authorized Traffic

- It is quite possible for a compromised insider to allow packet floods from outside

- A fair-queuing policy is implemented and the bandwidth is decreased as the network becomes busier

- To limit the number of queues, a bounded policy is used which only queues those flows that send faster than N/T

- Other senders are limited by FIFO service

Short, Slow or Asymmetric Flows

- Even for short or slow connections, since most byte belong to long flows the aggregate efficiency is not affected

- No added latency are involved in exchanging handshakes

- All connections between a pair of hosts can use single capability

- TVA experiences reduced efficiency only when all the flows near the host are short; this can be countered by increasing the bandwidth

Overview

- Security holes in IP stack

- Denial of service

- Capabilities

- Traceback

Filters & Pushback

- Assumption: Can identify anomalous traffic?
  - Add "filters" that drop this traffic
  - Access control lists in routers
    - e.g. deny ip from dave.cmu.edu to victim.com tcp port 80
- Pushback: Push filters further into network towards the source
  - Need to know where to push the filters (traceback)?
  - Need authentication of filters...
  - Tough problems. Filters usually deployed near victim.

The Need for Traceback

- Internet hosts are vulnerable
  - Many attacks consist of *very few packets*
  - Fraggle, Teardrop, ping-of-death, etc.
- Internet Protocol permits anonymity
  - Attackers can "spoof" source address
  - IP forwarding maintains no audit trails
- Need a separate *traceback* facility
  - For a given packet, find the path to *source*

Approaches to Traceback

- Path data can be noted in several places
  - In the packet itself [Savage et al.],
  - At the destination [I-Trace], or
  - In the network infrastructure
- Logging: a naïve in-network approach
  - Record each packet forwarding event
  - Can trace a single packet to a source router, ingress point, or subverted router(s)

IP Traceback

- Node append (record route) – high computation and space overhead
- Node sampling – each router marks its IP address with some probability p
  - P(receiving mark from router d hops away) $= p(1 - p)^{d-1}$
  - $p > 0.5$ prevents any attacker from inserting false router
  - Must infer distance by marking rate → relatively slow
  - Doesn't work well with multiple routers at same distance → I.e. multiple attackers

IP Traceback

- Edge sampling
  - Solve node sampling problems by encoding edges & distance from victim in messages
  - Start router sets "start" field with probability p and sets distance to 0
  - If distance is 0, router sets "end" field
  - All routers increment distance
  - As before, P(receiving mark from router d hops away) $= p(1 - p)^{d-1}$
- Multiple attackers can be identified since edge identifies splits in reverse path

Edge Sampling

- Major problem – need to add about 72bits (2 address + hop count) of info into packets
- Solution
  - Encode edge as xor of nodes → reduce 64 bits to 32 bits
  - Ship only 8bits at a time and 3bits to indicate offset → 32 bits to 11bits
  - Use only 5 bit for distance → 8bits to 5bits
  - Use IP fragment field to store 16 bits
    - Some backward compatibility issues
    - Fragmentation is rare so not a big problem

Log-Based Traceback

Challenges to Logging

- Attack path reconstruction is difficult
  - Packet may be transformed as it moves through the network
- Full packet storage is problematic
  - Memory requirements are prohibitive at high line speeds (OC-192 is ~10Mpkt/sec)
- Extensive packet logs are a privacy risk
  - Traffic repositories may aid eavesdroppers

44

Solution: Packet Digesting

- Record only invariant packet content
  - Mask dynamic fields (TTL, checksum, etc.)
  - Store information required to invert packet transformations at performing router
- Compute *packet digests* instead
  - Use hash function to compute small digest
  - Store probabilistically in Bloom filters
- Impossible to retrieve stored packets

45

Invariant Content

|			
Ver	HLen	TOS	Total Length
Identification		D F / M F	Fragment Offset
TTL	Protocol		Checksum
Source Address			
Destination Address			
Options			
First 8 bytes of Payload			
Remainder of Payload			

28 bytes

46

Bloom Filters

- Fixed structure size
  - Uses 2n bit array
  - Initialized to zeros
- Insertion is easy
  - Use n-bit digest as indices into bit array
  - Mitigate collisions by using multiple digests
- Variable capacity
  - Easy to adjust
  - Page when full

n bits

$H_1(P)$
$H_2(P)$
$H_3(P)$
$\vdots$
$H_k(P)$

2^n bits

1
1
1
1

48

11

Mistake Propagation is Limited

- Bloom filters may be mistaken
  - Mistake frequency can be controlled
  - Depends on capacity of full filters
- Neighboring routers won't be fooled
  - Vary hash functions used in Bloom filters
  - Each router select hashes independently
- Long chains of mistakes highly unlikely
  - Probability drops exponentially with length

49

Adjusting Graph Accuracy

- False positives rate depends on:
  - Length of the attack path
  - Complexity of network topology
  - Capacity of Bloom filters
- Bloom filter capacity is easy to adjust
  - Required filter capacity varies with router speed and number of neighbors
  - Appropriate capacity settings achieve linear error growth with path length

50

How long can digests last?

- Filters require 0.5% of link capacity
  - Four OC-3s require 47MB per minute
  - A single drive can store a whole day
- Access times are equally important
  - Current drives can write >3GB per minute
  - OC-192 needs SRAM access times
- Still viable tomorrow
  - 128 OC-192 links need <100GB per minute

52