Live Traffic Analysis of TCP/IP Gateways †

Phillip A. Porras
porras@csl.sri.com
Computer Science Laboratory

SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Alfonso Valdes
avaldes@csl.sri.com
Electromagnetic and Remote Sensing Laboratory
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

December 12 1997

Abstract

We enumerate a variety of ways to extend both statistical and signature-based intrusion-detection analysis techniques to monitor network traffic. Specifically, we present techniques to analyze TCP/IP packet streams that flow through network gateways for signs of malicious activity, nonmalicious failures, and other exceptional events. The intent is to demonstrate, by example, the utility of introducing gateway surveillance mechanisms to monitor network traffic. We present this discussion of gateway surveillance mechanisms as complementary to the filtering mechanisms of a large enterprise network, and illustrate the usefulness of surveillance in directly enhancing the security and stability of network operations.

1 Introduction

Mechanisms for parsing and filtering hostile external network traffic [2, 4] that could reach internal network services have become widely accepted as prerequisites for limiting the exposure of internal network assets while maintaining interconnectivity with external networks. The encoding of filtering rules for packet- or transport-layer communication should be enforced at entry points between internal networks and external traffic. Developing filtering rules that strike an optimal balance between the restrictiveness necessary to suppress the entry of unwanted traffic, while allowing the necessary flows demanded for user functionality, can be a nontrivial exercise [3].

In addition to intelligent filtering, there have been various developments in recent years in passive surveillance mechanisms to monitor network traffic for signs of malicious or anomalous (e.g., potentially erroneous) activity. Such tools attempt to provide network administrators timely insight into noteworthy exceptional activity. Real-time monitoring promises an added dimension of control and insight into the flow of traffic between the internal network and its external environment. The insight gained through fielded network traffic monitors could also aid sites in enhancing the effectiveness of their firewall filtering rules.

However, traffic monitoring is not a free activity—especially live traffic monitoring. In presenting our discussion of network analysis techniques, we fully realize the costs they imply with respect to computational resources and human oversight. For example, obtaining the necessary input for surveillance involves the deployment of instrumentation to parse, filter, and format event streams derived from potentially high-volume packet transmissions. Complex event analysis, response logic, and human management of the analysis units also introduce costs. Clearly, the introduction of network surveillance mechanisms on top of already-deployed protective traffic filters is an expense that requires justification. In this paper, we outline the benefits of our techniques and seek to persuade the reader that the costs can be worthwhile.

*† The work presented in this paper is currently funded by the Information Technology Office of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, under contract number F30602-96-C-0294.

2 Toward Generalized Network Surveillance

The techniques presented in this paper are extensions of earlier work by SRI in developing analytical methods for detecting anomalous or known intrusive activity [1, 5, 12, 13]. Our earlier intrusion-detection efforts in developing IDES (Intrusion Detection Expert System) and later NIDES (Next-Generation Intrusion Detection Expert System) were oriented toward the surveillance of user-session and host-layer activity. This previous focus on session activity within host boundaries is understandable given that the primary input to intrusion-detection tools, audit data, is produced by mechanisms that tend to be locally administered within a single host or domain. However, as the importance of network security has grown, so too has the need to expand intrusion-detection technology to address network infrastructure and services. In our current research effort, EMERALD (Event Monitoring Enabling Responses to Anomalous Live Disturbances), we explore the extension of our intrusion-detection methods to the analysis of network activity.

Network monitoring, in the context of fault detection and diagnosis for computer network and telecommunication environments, has been studied extensively by the network management and alarm correlation community [8, 11, 15, 16]. The high-volume distributed event correlation technology promoted in some projects provides an excellent foundation for building truly scalable network-aware surveillance technology for misuse. However, these efforts focus primarily on the health and status (fault detection and/or diagnosis) or performance of the target network, and do not cover the detection of intentionally abusive traffic. Indeed, some simplifications in the fault analysis and diagnosis community (e.g., assumptions of stateless correlation, which precludes event ordering; simplistic time-out metrics for resetting the tracking of problems; ignoring individuals/sources responsible for exceptional activity) do not translate well to a malicious environment for detecting intrusions.

Earlier work in the intrusion-detection community attempting to address the issue of network surveillance includes the Network Security Monitor (NSM), developed at UC Davis [6], and the Network Anomaly Detection and Intrusion Reporter (NADIR) [7], developed at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). Both performed broadcast LAN packet monitoring to analyze traffic patterns for known hostile or anomalous activity. [1] Further research by UC Davis in the Distributed Intrusion Detection System (DIDS) [23] and later Graph-based Intrusion Detection System (GRIDS) [24] projects has attempted to extend intrusion monitoring capabilities beyond LAN analysis, to provide multi-LAN and very large-scale network coverage.

This paper takes a pragmatic look at the issue of packet and/or datagram analysis based on statistical anomaly detection and signature-analysis techniques. This work is being performed in the context of SRI's latest intrusion-detection effort, EMERALD, a distributed scalable tool suite for tracking malicious activity through and across large networks [20]. EMERALD introduces a building-block approach to network surveillance, attack isolation, and automated response. The approach employs highly distributed, independently tunable, surveillance and response monitors that are deployable polymorphically at various abstract layers in a large network. These monitors demonstrate a streamlined intrusion-detection design that combines signature analysis with statistical profiling to provide localized real-time protection of the most widely used network services and components on the Internet.

Among the general types of analysis targets that EMERALD monitors are network gateways. We describe several analysis techniques that EMERALD implements, and discuss their use in analyzing malicious, faulty, and other exceptional network activity. EMERALD's surveillance modules will monitor entry points that separate external network traffic from an enterprise network and its constituent local domains.[2] We present these surveillance techniques as complementary to the filtering mechanisms of a large enterprise network, and illustrate their utility in directly enhancing the security and stability of network operations.

We first consider the candidate event streams that pass through network entry points. Critical to the effective monitoring of operations is the careful selection and organization of these event streams such that an analysis based on a selected event stream will provide meaningful insight into the target activity. We identify effective analytical techniques for processing the event stream given specific analysis objectives. Sections 4 and 5 explore how both statistical anomaly detection and signature analysis can be applied to identify activity worthy of review and possible response. All such

[1] Recent product examples, such as ASIM and Net Ranger, that follow the passive packet monitoring approach have since gained wide deployment in some Department of Defense network facilities.

[2] We use the terms *enterprise* and *intranet* interchangeably; both exist ultimately as cooperative communities of independently administered domains, communicating together with supportive network infrastructure such as firewalls, routers, and bridges.

claims are supported by examples. More broadly, in Section 6 we discuss the correlation of analysis results produced by surveillance components deployed independently throughout the entry points of our protected intranet. We discuss how events of limited significance to a local surveillance monitor may be aggregated with results from other strategically deployed monitors to provide insight into more wide-scale problems or threats against the intranet. Section 7 discusses the issue of response.

3 Event Stream Selection

The success or failure of event analysis should be quantitatively measured for qualities such as accuracy and performance: both are assessable through testing. A more difficult but equally important metric to assess is completeness. With regard to network surveillance, inaccuracy is reflected in the number of legitimate transactions flagged as abnormal or malicious (false positives), incompleteness is reflected in the number of harmful transactions that escape detection (false negatives), and performance is measured by the rate at which transactions can be processed. All three measurements of success or failure directly depend on the quality of the event stream upon which the analysis is based. Here, we consider the objective of providing real-time surveillance of TCP/IP-based networks for malicious or exceptional network traffic. In particular, our network surveillance mechanisms can be integrated onto, or interconnected with, network gateways that filter traffic between a protected intranet and external networks.

IP traffic represents an interesting candidate event stream for analysis. Individually, packets represent parsable activity records, where key data within the header and data segment can be statistically analyzed and/or heuristically parsed for response-worthy activity. However, the sheer volume of potential packets dictates careful assessment of ways to optimally organize packets into streams for efficient parsing. Thorough filtering of events and event fields such that the target activity is concisely isolated, should be applied early in the processing stage to reduce resource utilization.

With respect to TCP/IP gateway traffic monitoring, we have investigated a variety of ways to categorize and isolate groups of packets from an arbitrary packet stream. Individual packet streams can be filtered based on different isolation criteria, such as

- *Discarded traffic:* packets not allowed through the gateway because they violate filtering rules.[3]
- *Pass-through traffic:* packets allowed into the internal network from external sources.
- *Protocol-specific traffic:* packets pertaining to a common protocol as designated in the packet header. One example is the stream of all ICMP packets that reach the gateway.
- *Unassigned port traffic:* packets targeting ports to which the administrator has not assigned any network service and that also remain unblocked by the firewall.
- *Transport management messages:* packets involving transport-layer connection establishment, control, and termination (e.g., TCP SYN, RESET, ACK, <`window resize`>).
- *Source-address monitoring:* packets whose source addresses match well-known external sites (e.g., connections from satellite offices) or have raised suspicion from other monitoring efforts.
- *Destination-address monitoring:* all packets whose destination addresses match a given internal host or workstation.
- *Application-layer monitoring:* packets targeting a particular network service or application. This stream isolation may translate to parsing packet headers for IP/port matches (assuming an established binding between port and service) and rebuilding datagrams.

In the following sections we discuss how such traffic streams can be statistically and heuristically analyzed to provide insight into malicious and erroneous external traffic. Alternative sources of event data are also available from the report logs produced by the various gateways, firewalls, routers, and proxy-servers (e.g., router syslogs can in fact be used to collect packet information from several products). We explore how statistical and signature analysis techniques can be employed to monitor various elements within TCP/IP event streams that flow through network gateways. We present specific techniques for detecting external entities that attempt to subvert or bypass internal network services. Techniques are suggested for detecting attacks against the underlying network infrastructure, including attacks using corruption or forgery of legitimate traffic in an attempt to negatively affect routing services, application-layer services, or other network controls. We suggest

[3] Of particular added value in assessing this traffic would be some indication of why a given packet was rejected. A generic solution for deriving this *disposition* information without dependencies on the firewall or router is difficult. Such information would be a useful enhancement to packet-rejection handlers.

how to extend our surveillance techniques to recognize network faults and other exceptional activity. We also discuss issues of distributed result correlation.

4 Traffic Analysis with Statistical Anomaly Detection

SRI has been involved in statistical anomaly-detection research for over a decade [1, 5, 10]. Our previous work focused on the profiling of user activity through audit-trail analysis. Within the EMERALD project, we are extending the underlying statistical algorithms to profile various aspects of network traffic in search of response- or alert-worthy anomalies.

The statistical subsystem tracks subject activity via one or more variables called *measures*. The statistical algorithms employ four classes of measures: categorical, continuous, intensity, and event distribution. *Categorical* measures are those that assume values from a categorical set, such as originating host identity, destination host, and port number. *Continuous* measures are those for which observed values are numeric or ordinal, such as number of bytes transferred. Derived measures also track the intensity of activity (that is, the rate of events per unit time) and the "meta-distribution" of the measures affected by recent events. These derived measure types are referred to as *intensity* and *event distribution*.

The system we have developed maintains and updates a description of a subject's behavior with respect to these measure types in a compact, efficiently updated *profile*. The profile is subdivided into short- and long-term elements. The short-term profile accumulates values between updates, and exponentially ages values for comparison to the long-term profile. As a consequence of the aging mechanism, the short-term profile characterizes the recent activity of the subject, where "recent" is determined by the dynamically configurable aging parameters used. At update time (typically, a time of low system activity), the update function folds the short-term values observed since the last update into the long-term profile, and the short-term profile is cleared. The long-term profile is itself slowly aged to adapt to changes in subject activity. Anomaly scoring compares related attributes in the short-term profile against the long-term profile. As all evaluations are done against empirical distributions, no assumptions of parametric distributions are made, and multi-modal and categorical distributions are accommodated. Furthermore, the algorithms we have developed require no *a priori* knowledge of intrusive or exceptional activity. A more detailed mathematical description of these algorithms is given in [9, 26].

Our earlier work considered the subject class of users of a computer system and the corresponding event stream the system audit trail generated by user activity. Within the EMERALD project, we generalize these concepts so that components and software such as network gateways, proxies, and network services can themselves be made subject classes. The generated event streams are obtained from log files, packet analysis, and—where required—special-purpose instrumentation made for services of interest (e.g., FTP, HTTP, or SMTP). As appropriate, an event stream may be analyzed as a single subject, or as multiple subjects, and the same network activity can be analyzed in several ways. For example, an event stream of dropped packets permits analyses that track the reason each packet was rejected. Under such a scenario, the firewall rejecting the packet is the subject, and the measures of interest are the reason the packet was dropped (a categorical measure), and the rate of dropped packets in the recent past (one or more intensity measures tuned to time intervals of seconds to minutes). Alternatively, these dropped packets may be parsed in finer detail, supporting other analyses where the subject is, for example, the identity of the originating host.

EMERALD can also choose to separately define satellite offices and "rest of world" as different subjects for the same event stream. That is, we expect distinctions from the satellite office's use of services and access to assets to deviate widely from sessions originating from external nonaffiliated sites. Through satellite session profiling, EMERALD can monitor traffic for signs of unusual activity. In the case of the FTP service, for example, each user who gives a login name is a subject, and "anonymous" is a subject as well. Another example of a subject is the network gateway itself, in which case there is only one subject. All subjects for the same event stream (that is, all subjects within a subject class) have the same measures defined in their profiles, but the internal profile values are different.

As we migrate our statistical algorithms that had previously focused on user audit trails with users as subjects, we generalize our ability to build more abstract profiles for varied types of activity captured within our generalized notion of an event stream. In the context of statistically analyzing TCP/IP traffic streams, profiling can be derived from a variety of traffic perspectives, including profiles of

- Protocol-specific transactions (e.g., all ICMP exchanges)
- Sessions between specific internal hosts and/or spe-

cific external sites

- Application-layer-specific sessions (e.g., anonymous FTP sessions profiled individually and/or collectively)
- Discarded traffic, measuring attributes such as volume and disposition of rejections
- Connection requests, errors, and unfiltered transmission rates and disposition

Event records are generated either as a result of activity or at periodic intervals. In our case, activity records are based on the content of IP packets or transport-layer datagrams. Our event filters also construct interval summary records, which contain accumulated network traffic statistics (at a minimum, number of packets and number of kilobytes transferred). These records are constructed at the end of each interval (e.g., once per N seconds).

EMERALD's statistical algorithm adjusts its short-term profile for the measure values observed on the event record. The distribution of recently observed values is evaluated against the long-term profile, and a distance between the two is obtained. The difference is compared to a historically adaptive, subject-specific deviation. The empirical distribution of this deviation is transformed to obtain a score for the event. Anomalous events are those whose scores exceed a historically adaptive, subject-specific score threshold based on the empirical score distribution. This nonparametric approach handles all measure types and makes no assumptions on the modality of the distribution for continuous measures.

The following sections provide example scenarios of exceptional network activity that can be measured by an EMERALD statistical engine deployed to network gateways.

4.1 Categorical Measures in Network Traffic

Categorical measures assume values from a discrete, nonordered set of possibilities. Examples of categorical measures include

- Source/destination address: One expects, for example, accesses from satellite offices to originate from a set of known host identities.
- Command issued: While any single command may not in itself be anomalous, some intrusion scenarios (such as "doorknob rattling") give rise to an unusual mix of commands in the short-term profile.
- Protocol: As with commands, a single request of a given protocol may not be anomalous, but an unusual mix of protocol requests, reflected in the short-term profile, may indicate an intrusion.
- Errors and privilege violations: We track the return code from a command as a categorical measure; we expect the distribution to reflect only a small percent of abnormal returns (the actual rate is learned in the long-term profile). While some rate of errors is normal, a high number of exceptions in the recent past is abnormal. This is reflected both in unusual frequencies for abnormal categories, detected here, and unusual count of abnormal returns, tracked as a continuous measure as described in Section 4.2.
- Malformed service requests: Categorical measures can track the occurrence of various forms of bad requests or malformed packets directed to a specific network service.
- Malformed packet disposition: Packets are dropped by a packet filter for a variety of reasons, many of which are innocuous (for example, badly formed packet header). Unusual patterns of packet rejection or error messages could lead to insight into problems in neighboring systems or more serious attempts by external sites to probe internal assets.
- File handles: Certain subjects (for example, anonymous FTP users) are restricted as to which files they can access. Attempts to access other files or to write read-only files appear anomalous Such events are often detectable by signature analysis as well.

The statistical component builds empirical distributions of the category values encountered, even if the list of possible values is open-ended, and has mechanisms for "aging out" categories whose long-term probabilities drop below a threshold.

The following is an example of categorical measures used in the surveillance of proxies for services such as SMTP or FTP. Consider a typical data-exchange sequence between an external client and an internal server within the protected network. Anonymous FTP is restricted to certain files and directories; the names of these are categories for measures pertaining to file/directory reads and (if permitted) writes. Attempted accesses to unusual directories appear anomalous. Monitors dedicated to ports include a categorical measure whose values are the protocol used. Invalid requests often lead to an access violation error; the type

of error associated with a request is another example of a categorical measure, and the count or rate of errors in the recent past is tracked as continuous measures, as described in Section 4.2.

4.2 Continuous Measures in Network Traffic

Continuous measures assume values from a continuous or ordinal set. Examples include inter-event time (difference in time stamps between consecutive events from the same stream), counting measures such as the number of errors of a particular type observed in the recent past, and network traffic measures (number of packets and number of kilobytes). The statistical subsystem treats continuous measures by first allocating bins appropriate to the range of values of the underlying measure, and then tracking the frequency of observation of each value range. In this way, multi-modal distributions are accommodated and much of the computational machinery used for categorical measures is shared.

Continuous measures are useful not only for intrusion detection, but also support the monitoring of health and status of the network from the perspective of connectivity and throughput. An instantaneous measure of traffic volume maintained by a gateway monitor can detect a sudden and unexpected loss in the data rate of received packets, when this volume falls outside historical norms for the gateway. This sudden drop is specific both to the gateway (the subject, in this case) and to the time of day (e.g., the average sustained traffic rate for a major network artery is much different at 11:00 a.m. than at midnight).

In our example discussion of an FTP service in Section 4.1, attempts to access unallowed directories or files result in errors. The recently observed rate of such errors is continuously compared with the rate observed over similar time spans for other FTP sessions. Some low rate of error due to misspellings or innocent attempts is to be expected, and this would be reflected in the historical profile for these measures. An excess beyond historical norms indicates anomalous activity.

Continuous measures can also work in conjunction with categorical measures to detect excessive data transfers or file uploads, or excessive mail relaying, as well as excessive service-layer errors by external clients. Categorical and continuous measures have proven to be the most useful for anomaly detection in a variety of contexts.

We next describe the two derived measure types, *intensity* and *event distribution*, which detect anomalies related to recent traffic volume and the mix of measures affected by this traffic.

4.3 Measuring Network Traffic Intensity

Intensity measures distinguish whether a given volume of traffic appears consistent with historical observations. These measures reflect the intensity of the event stream (number of events per unit time) over time intervals that are tunable. Typically, we have defined three intensity measures per profile, which, with respect to user activity monitoring, were scaled at intervals of 60 seconds, 600 seconds, and 1 hour. Applied to raw event streams, intensity measures are particularly suited for detecting flooding attacks, while also providing insight into other anomalies.

EMERALD uses volume analyses to help detect the introduction of malicious traffic, such as traffic intended to cause service denials or perform intelligence gathering, where such traffic may not necessarily be violating filtering policies. A sharp increase in the overall volume of discarded packets, as well as analysis of the disposition of the discarded packets (as discussed in Section 4.1), can provide insight into unintentionally malformed packets resulting from poor line quality or internal errors in neighboring hosts. High volumes of discarded packets can also indicate more maliciously intended transmissions such as scanning of UPD ports or IP address scanning via ICMP echoes. Excessive numbers of mail expansion requests (`EXPN`) may indicate intelligence gathering, perhaps by spammers. These and other application-layer forms of doorknob rattling can be detected by an EMERALD statistical engine when filtering is not desired.

Alternatively, a sharp increase in events viewed across longer durations may provide insight into a consistent effort to limit or prevent successful traffic flow. Intensity measures of transport-layer connection requests, such as a volume analysis of SYN-RST messages, could indicate the occurrence of a SYN-attack [17] against port availability (or possibly for port scanning). Variants of this could include intensity measures of TCP/FIN messages [14], considered a more stealthy form of port scanning.

Monitoring overall traffic volume and bursty events by using both intensity and continuous measures provides some interesting advantages over other monitoring approaches, such as user-definable heuristic rules that specify fixed thresholds. In particular, the intensity of events over a duration is relative in the sense that the term "high volume" may reasonably be considered dif-

ferent at midnight than at 11:00 a.m. The notion of high bursts of events might similarly be unique to the role of the target system in the intranet (e.g., web server host versus a user workstation). Rule developers would need to carefully define thresholds based on many factors unique to the target system. On the other hand, the statistical algorithms would, over time, build a target-specific profile that could evaluate event intensity for the given system over a variety of time slices such as the time of day (e.g., business hours versus afterhours) and/or day of the week (e.g., weekday versus weekend).

4.4 Event Distribution Measures

The event-distribution measure is a meta-measure that monitors which other measures in the profile are affected by each event. For example, an *ls* command in an FTP session affects the directory measure, but does not affect measures related to file transfer. This measure is not interesting for all event streams. For example, all network-traffic event records affect the same measures (number of packets and kilobytes) defined for that event stream, so the event distribution does not change.

On the other hand, event-distribution measures are useful in correlative analysis achieved via the "Monitor of Monitors" approach. Here, each monitor contributes to an aggregate event stream for the domain of the correlation monitor. These events are generated only when the individual monitor decides that the recent behavior is anomalous (though perhaps not sufficiently anomalous by itself to trigger a declaration). Measures recorded include time stamp, monitor identifier, subject identifier, and measure identities of the most outlying measures. Overall intensity of this event stream may be indicative of a correlated attack. The distribution of which monitors and which measures are anomalous is likely to be different with an intrusion or malfunction than with the normal "innocent exception." (See Section 6 for a further discussion on result correlation.)

4.5 Statistical Session Analysis

Statistical anomaly detection via the methods described above enables EMERALD to answer questions such as how the current anonymous FTP session compares to the historical profile of all previous anonymous FTP sessions. Mail exchange could be similarly monitored for atypical exchanges (e.g., excessive mail relays).

Continuing with the example of FTP, we assign FTP-related events to a subject (the login user or "anonymous"). As several sessions may be interleaved, we maintain separate short-term profiles for each, but may score against a common long-term profile (for example, short-term profiles are maintained for each "anonymous" FTP session, but each is scored against the historical profile of "anonymous" FTP sessions). The aging mechanism in the statistics module allows it to monitor events either as the events occur or at the end of the session. We have chosen the former approach (analyze events as they happen), as it potentially detects anomalous activity in a session before that session is concluded.

5 Signature-based Network Traffic Analysis

Signature analysis is a process whereby an event stream is mapped against abstract representations of event sequences known to indicate the target activity of interest. Signature engines are essentially expert systems whose rules fire as event records are parsed that appear to indicate suspicious, if not illegal, activity. Signature rules may recognize single events that by themselves represent significant danger to the system, or they may be chained together to recognize sequences of events that represent an entire penetration scenario.

However, simplistic event-to-rule binding alone does not necessarily provide enough indication to ensure accurate detection of the target activity. Signature analyses must also distinguish whether an event sequence being witnessed is actually transitioning the system into the anticipated compromised state. In addition, determining whether a given event sequence is indicative of an attack may be a function of the preconditions under which the event sequence is performed. Example coding schemes for representing operating system penetrations through audit trail analysis are [12, 18, 19].

Using basic signature-analysis concepts, EMERALD can support a variety of analyses involving packet and transport datagrams as event streams. For example, address spoofing, tunneling, source routing [21], SATAN [27] attack detection, and abuse of ICMP messages (`Redirect` and `Destination Unreachable` messages in particular) [4] could all be encoded and detected by signature engines that guard network gateways. The heuristics for analyzing headers and application datagrams for some of these abuses are not far from what is already captured by some filtering tools. In fact, it is somewhat difficult to justify the expense of passively monitoring the traffic stream for such activity when one could turn such knowledge into filtering rules.[4]

[4] On the other hand, one may also suggest a certain utility in simply having real-time mechanisms to detect, report, and hier-

Regardless, there still remain several examples that help justify the expense of employing signature analyses to monitor network traffic. In particular, there are points where the appearance of certain types of legitimate traffic introduces questions regarding the motives of the traffic source. Distinguishing benign requests from illicit ones may be fairly difficult, and such questions are ultimately site-specific. For example, EMERALD surveillance modules can encode thresholds to monitor activity such as the number of fingers, pings, or failed login requests to accounts such as guest, demo, visitor, anonymous FTP, or employees who have departed the company. Threshold analysis is a rudimentary, inexpensive technique that records the occurrence of specific events and, as the name implies, detects when the number of occurrences of that event surpasses a reasonable count.

In addition, we are developing heuristics to support the processing of application-layer transactions derived from packet monitoring. EMERALD's signature analysis module can sweep the data portion of packets in search of a variety of transactions that indicate suspicious, if not malicious, intentions by the external client. While traffic filtering rules may allow external traffic through to an internally available network service, signature analysis offers an ability to model and detect transaction requests or request parameters, alone or in combination, that are indicative of attempts to maliciously subvert or abuse the internal service. EMERALD's signature engine, for example, is capable of real-time parsing of FTP traffic through the firewall or router for unwanted transfers of configuration or specific system data, or anonymous requests to access non-public portions of the directory structure. Similarly, EMERALD can analyze anonymous FTP sessions to ensure that the file retrievals and uploads/modifications are limited to specific directories. Additionally, EMERALD's signature analysis capability is being extended to session analyses of complex and dangerous, but highly useful, services like HTTP or Gopher.

Another interesting application of signature analysis is the scanning of traffic directed at high-numbered unused ports (i.e., ports to which the administrator has not assigned a network service). Here, datagram parsing can be used to study network traffic after some threshold volume of traffic, directed at an unused port, has been exceeded. A signature module can employ a knowledge base of known telltale datagrams that are indicative of well-known network-service protocol traffic (e.g., FTP, Telnet, SMTP, HTTP). The signature module then determines whether the unknown port traffic matches any known datagram sets. Such comparisons could lead to the discovery of network services that have been installed without an administrator's knowledge.

archically correlate attempts by external sources to forward undesirable packets through a gateway.

6 Composable Surveillance of Network Traffic

The focus of surveillance need not be limited to the analysis of traffic streams through a single gateway. An extremely useful extension of anomaly detection and signature analyses is to support the hierarchical correlation of analysis results produced by multiple distributed gateway surveillance modules. Within the EMERALD framework, we are developing meta-surveillance modules that analyze the anomaly and signature reports produced by individual traffic monitors dispersed to the various entry points of external traffic into local network domains.

This concept is illustrated in Figure 1, which depicts an example enterprise network consisting of interconnected local network domains.[5] These local domains are independently administered, and could perhaps correspond to the division of computing assets among departments within commercial organizations or independent laboratories within research organizations. In this figure, connectivity with the external world is provided through one or more service providers (SP1 and SP2), which may provide a limited degree of filtering based on source address (to avoid address spoofing), as well as other primitive checks such as monitoring checksum.

Inside the perimeter of the enterprise, each local domain maintains its traffic filtering control (F-boxes) over its own subnetworks. These filters enforce domain-specific restriction over issues such as UDP port availability, as well as acceptable protocol traffic. EMERALD surveillance monitors are represented by the S-circles, and are deployed to the various entry points of the enterprise and domains.

EMERALD surveillance modules develop analysis results that are then directed up to an enterprise-layer monitor, which correlates the distributed results into a meta-event stream. The enterprise monitor is identical to the individual gateway monitors (i.e., they use the same code base), except that it is configured to correlate activity reports produced by the gateway monitors. The enterprise monitor employs both statistical anomaly detection and signature analyses to further analyze the results produced by the distributed gateway surveillance

[5] This is one example network filtering strategy that is useful for illustrating result correlation. Other strategies are possible.



Figure 1: **Example Network Deployment of Surveillance Monitors**

modules, searching for commonalities or trends in the distributed analysis results.

The following sections focus on aggregate analyses that may induce both local response and/or enterprise-wide response. We enumerate some of the possible ways that analysis results from the various surveillance modules can be correlated to provide insight into more global problems not visible from the narrow perspective of local entry-point monitoring.

6.1 Commonalities among Results

One issue of direct interest is whether there exist commonalities in analysis results across surveillance modules that are examining mutually exclusive event streams. For example, a scenario previously discussed was that of a statistical engine observing a drastic increase in the number of discarded packets at the entry point to a domain, perhaps even observing the majority cause for packet discards. Depending on the degree of increase, a local domain administrator could be persuaded to take actions to help alleviate or remove the cause of the failed packets. However, if on a given day all such domains throughout the enterprise similarly observed marked increases in discarded packet volume, the response could propagate from being a local concern to being an enterprise-wide issue. Similarly, commonalities across domains in excessive levels of protocol-specific errors or signature engines detecting unwanted activity across multiple domains could lead to enterprise-layer responses.

We might also choose to distinguish excessive types of certain traffic in an effort to check for intelligence gathering by outsiders who submit requests such as finger, echo, or mail alias expansion, to multiple domains in the enterprise (i.e., round-robin doorknob rattling). The objective of such a technique might be to avoid detection from both local network intensity and/or continuous measures by spreading out the probes to multiple independently monitored domains. Through aggregate analysis, we could maintain the enterprise-wide profile of probes of this type, and detect when an unusual number or mix of these probes occurs. While such probes may not appear excessive from the local domain perspective, the enterprise overall may observe a marked increase worthy of response.

In addition, we can add a layer of traffic-rate monitoring by profiling the overall volume of enterprise traffic expected throughout various slices of the day and week. Local monitors may use continuous measures to detect drastic declines in packet volumes that could indicate transmission loss or serious degradation. However, it is conceivable that the degradation from the local domain perspective, while significant, is not drastic enough to warrant active response. At the same time, we may find through results correlation that the aggregate of all domains producing reports of transmission rate degradation during the same time period could warrant attention at the enterprise layer. Thus, local domain activity below the severity of warranting a response could in

aggregation with other activity be found to warrant a response.

6.2 Sequential Trend Analysis

Of general use to meta-surveillance is the modeling of activity for sequential trends in the appearance of problematic traffic. For example, this could entail correlating the analyses of local monitors, looking for trends in the propagation of application-layer datagrams for error or ICMP packets. While local responses to error messages could be handled by the local domain administrators, reports of errors spreading across all domains might more effectively be addressed by those responsible for connections between the enterprise and the service provider.

Attacks repeated against the same network service across multiple domains can also be detected through enterprise-layer correlation. For example, multiple surveillance modules deployed to various local domains in the enterprise might begin to report, in series, suspicious activity observed within sessions employing the same network service. Such reports could lead to enterprise-layer responses or warnings to other domains that have not yet experienced or reported the session anomalies. In this sense, results correlation enables the detection of spreading attacks against a common service, which first raise alarms in one domain, and gradually spread domain by domain to affect operations across the enterprise.

We are studying the use of fault-relationship models [22], in which recognition of a problem in one network component (e.g., loss of connectivity or responsiveness) could propagate as different problems in neighboring hosts (e.g., buffer overflows or connection timeout due to overloads). Our enterprise monitor employs rule-based heuristics to capture such relationship models.

7 Response Handling

Once a problem is detected, the next challenge is to formulate an effective response. In many situations, the most effective response may be no response at all, in that every response imposes some cost in system performance or (worse) human time. The extent to which a decision unit contains logic to filter out uninteresting analysis results may mean the difference between effective monitoring units and unmanageable (soon to be disabled) monitoring units. For certain analysis results such as the detection of known hostile activity through signature analyses, the necessity for response invocation may be obvious. For other analysis results such as anomaly reports, response units may require greater sophistication in the invocation logic.

Fundamental to effective response handling is the accurate identification of the source responsible for the problem. However, unlike audit-trail analysis where event-record fields such as the subject ID are produced by the OS kernel, attackers have direct control over the content and format of packet streams. Packet forgery is straightforward, and one must take care to avoid allowing attackers to manipulate response logic to harm legitimate user connectivity or cause service denials throughout the network. Some techniques have been proposed to help track network activity to the source [25].

Another issue is how to tailor a response that is appropriate given the severity of the problem, and that provides a singular effect to address the problem without harming the flow of legitimate network traffic. Countermeasures range from very passive responses, such as passive results dissemination, to highly aggressive actions, such as severing a communication channel. Within EMERALD, our response capabilities will employ the following general forms of response:

- **Passive results dissemination:** EMERALD monitors can make their analysis results available for administrative review. We are currently exploring techniques to facilitate passive dissemination of analysis results by using already-existing network protocols such as SNMP, including the translation of analysis results into an intrusion-detection management information base (MIB) structure. However, whereas it is extremely useful to integrate results dissemination into an already-existing infrastructure, we must balance this utility with the need to preserve the security and integrity of analysis results.

- **Assertive results dissemination:** Analysis results can be actively disseminated as administrative alerts. While the automatic dissemination of alerts may help to provide timely review of problems by administrators, this approach may be the most expensive form of response, in that it requires human oversight.[6]

- **Dynamic controls over logging configuration:** EMERALD monitors can perform limited

[6] Consider a network environment that on average supports 100,000 external transactions (the definition of transaction is analysis-target-specific) per day. Even if only 0.1% of the transactions were found worthy of administrative review, administrators would be asked to review 100 transactions a day.

control over the (re)configuration of logging facilities within network components (e.g., routers, firewalls, network services, audit daemons).

- **Integrity checking probes:** EMERALD monitors may invoke handlers that validate the integrity of network services or other assets. Integrity probes may be particularly useful for ensuring that privileged network services have not been subverted.[7]

- **Reverse probing:** EMERALD monitors may invoke probes in an attempt to gather as much counterintelligence about the source of suspicious traffic by using features such as *traceroute* or *finger*. However, care is required in performing such actions, as discussed in [4].

- **Active channel termination:** An EMERALD monitor can actively terminate a channel session if it detects specific known hostile activity. This is perhaps the most severe response, and care must be taken to ensure that attackers do not manipulate the surveillance monitor to deny legitimate access.

8 Conclusion

We have described event-analysis techniques developed in the intrusion-detection community, and discussed their application to monitoring TCP/IP packet streams. We present a variety of exceptional activity (both malicious and nonmalicious) to which these analysis techniques could be applied. Table 1 summarizes the analyzable exceptional network activity presented in this paper, and identifies which method (statistical anomaly detection, signature analysis, or hierarchical correlation) can be utilized to detect the activity.

These examples help to justify the expense of gateway surveillance monitors, even in the presence of sophisticated traffic-filtering mechanisms. Indeed, several of the example forms of "interesting traffic" listed in Table 1 are not easily, if at all, preventable using filtering mechanisms. In addition, our surveillance modules may even help to tune or point out mistakes in filtering rules that could lead to the accidental discarding of legitimate traffic. The surveillance modules may detect the occurrence of traffic that appears to be anomalous or abusive, regardless of whether the traffic is allowed to enter, or is prevented from entering the network. Furthermore, these techniques may extend to nonmalicious problem detection such as failures in neighboring systems.

[7] A significant number of network attacks target the subversion of privileged network service. CERT Advisories CA-97.16, CA-97.12, CA-97.05 give a few recent examples.

While this paper is intended to justify and illustrate the complementary nature of combining surveillance capabilities with filtering mechanisms, in future research we will explore the practical aspects of monitor deployment, including performance analysis and secure integration into supporting network infrastructure (e.g., network management). Perhaps even more than traditional audit-based intrusion-detection developers, network monitor developers must carefully assess the optimum ways to organize and isolate the relevant traffic from which their analyses are based. The added dimension of control and insight into network operations gained by well-integrated surveillance modules is well worth consideration.

References

[1] D. Anderson, T. Frivold, and A. Valdes. Next-generation intrusion-detection expert system (NIDES): Final technical report. Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, 16 November 1994.

[2] B. Chapman and E. Zwicky. *Building internet firewalls.* O'Reilly and Associates, Inc. Sebastopol, CA, 1995.

[3] D. Chapman. Network (in)security through IP packet filtering. In *Proceedings of the Third USENIX Unix Security Symposium*, Baltimore, MD, September 1992.

[4] W.R. Cheswick and S.M. Bellovin. *Firewalls and internet security: Repelling the wily hacker.* Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994.

[5] D.E. Denning. An intrusion-detection model. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 13(2), February 1987.

[6] L.T. Heberlein, G. Dias, K.N. Levitt, B. Mukherjee, J. Wood, and D. Wolber. A network security monitor. In *Proceedings of the 1990 Symposium on Research in Security and Privacy*, pages 296–303, Oakland, CA, May 1990. IEEE Computer Society.

[7] K. Jackson, D. DuBois, and C. Stallings. An expert system application for network intrusion detection. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Computer Security Group Conference*. Department of Energy, 1991.

[8] G. Jakobson and M.D. Weissman. Alarm correlation. *IEEE Network*, pages 52–59, November 1993.

Analysis Description	Stat. Categ. Meas.	Stat. Conti. Meas.	Stat. Inten. Meas.	Sign. Analy.	Hier Corr.
Protocol-specific anomalies such as excessive data transfers (FTP uploads, mail relays, other huge data transfers)	√	√	√		
Port/service misuse, including excessive errors or unknown command exchanges	√		√		
Discarded packet volume			√		
Discarded packet disposition (analysis of rejection patterns)	√	√			
Excessive transport-layer connection requests, including heavy syn-ack message usage	√		√		
Anonymous session comparisons against historical usage	√	√	√		
Satellite office profiling	√	√	√		
Sudden drops or floods in data rate (specific to system, time of day, day of week, and so forth)		√	√		
Address/port scanning and other general doorknob rattling			√		
Excessive drops in line quality compared to historical quality		√	√		
Detection of filterable events (e.g., ICMP message abuse, address spoofing, tunneling, source/port routing, SATAN signatures)				√	
Event thresholds for events reflecting site-specific concerns				√	
Detection of user-installed network services on unregistered ports				√	
Packet data sweeps for application-layer proxies, looking for troublesome data transfers or requests				√	
Aggregate analysis across the enterprise for round-robin doorknob rattling that attempts to defeat domain-layer intensity measures					√
Aggregate analysis of low-level degradation of service or throughput across the enterprise					√
Trend analysis for error propagation occurring across multiple domains					√
Spreading attacks that may indicate worm or fault interrelationships among network modules					√

Table 1: **Summary of Interesting Traffic Activity and Detection Techniques**

[9] H.S. Javitz and A. Valdes. The NIDES statistical component description and justification. Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, March 1994.

[10] H.S. Javitz, A. Valdes, D.E. Denning, and P.G. Neumann. Analytical techniques development for a statistical intrusion-detection system (SIDS) based on accounting records. Technical report, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, July 1986.

[11] S. Kliger, S. Yemini, Y. Yemini, D. Ohsie, and S. Stolfo. A coding approach to event correlation. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IFIP/IEEE), Santa Barbara, CA, May 1995*, pages 266–277. Chapman & Hall, London, England, 1995.

[12] T.F. Lunt, R. Jagannathan, R. Lee, A. Whitehurst, and S. Listgarten. Knowledge-based intrusion detection. In *Proceedings of the 1989 AI Systems in Government Conference*, March 1989.

[13] T.F. Lunt, A. Tamaru, F. Gilham, R. Jagannathan, C. Jalali, P.G. Neumann, H.S. Javitz, and A. Valdes. A real-time intrusion-detection expert system (IDES). Technical report, Computer Science Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, 28 February 1992.

[14] Uriel Maimon. Port scanning without the SYN flag. *Phrack Magazine*, vol. 7, issue 49.

[15] M. Mansouri-Samani and M. Sloman. Monitoring distributed systems. *IEEE Network*, pages 20–30, November 1993.

[16] K. Meyer, M. Erlinger, J. Betser, C. Sunshine, G. Goldszmidt, and Y. Yemini. Decentralizing control and intelligence in network management. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Integrated Network Management (IFIP/IEEE), Santa Barbara, CA, May 1995*, pages 4–16. Chapman & Hall, London, England, 1995.

[17] Robert T. Morris. A weakness in the 4.2bsd UNIX TCP/IP software. In *Computing Science Technical Report 117*. AT&T Bell Laboratories, Murray Hills, NJ, 25 February 1985.

[18] A. Mounji, B. Le Charlier, and D. Zampunieris. Distributed audit trail analysis. In *Proceedings of the ISOC 1995 Symposium on Network and Distributed System Security*, pages 102–112, February 1995.

[19] P.A. Porras. STAT: A State Transition Analysis Tool for intrusion detection. Master's thesis, Computer Science Department, University of California, Santa Barbara, July 1992.

[20] P.A. Porras and P.G. Neumann. EMERALD: Event monitoring enabling responses to anomalous live disturbances. In *National Information Systems Security Conference*, pages 353–365, Baltimore, MD, October 1997.

[21] J. Postel. Internet protocol, request for comment, RFC 791. Technical report, Information Sciences Institute, September 1981.

[22] L. Ricciulli and N. Shacham. Modeling correlated alarms in network management systems. In *Communication Networks and Distributed Systems Modeling and Simulation*, 1997.

[23] S.R. Snapp, J. Brentano, G.V. Dias, T.L Goan, L.T. Heberlein, C.-L. Ho, K.N. Levitt, B. Mukherjee, T. Grance, D.M. Teal, and D. Mansur. DIDS (Distributed Intrusion Detection System) – motivation, architecture, and an early prototype. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth National Computer Security Conference*, pages 167–176, Washington, D.C., 1–4 October 1991. NIST/NCSC.

[24] S. Staniford-Chen, S. Cheung, R. Crawford, M. Dilger, J. Frank, J. Hoagland, K. Levitt, C. Wee, R. Yip, and D. Zerkle. GrIDS—a graph based intrusion detection system for large networks. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth National Information Systems Security Conference*, pages 361–370 (Volume I), Washington. D.C., October 1996. NIST/NCSC.

[25] S. Staniford-Chen and L.T. Heberlein. Holding intruders accountable on the internet. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 1995.

[26] A. Valdes and D. Anderson. Statistical methods for computer usage anomaly detection using NIDES. *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Rough Sets and Soft Computing (RSSC 94), San Jose*, January 1995.

[27] W. Venema. Project SATAN: UNIX/internet security. In *Proceedings of the COMPSEC-95 Conference*, Elsevier, London, 1995.