

Using AI/ML for Network-optimized DDoS Mitigation

Based on a DDoS botnet study in 2022-2023

Jérôme Meyer (Nokia)

Tirana

7 June 2023



Then and now... #1: Botnets have taken over the (DDoS) world

2002 - 2022

- Majority of DDoS is spoofed (IP header modification, IPHM)
- Originates from ~50 EU / AP hosting providers
- Abuses misconfigured NTP / DNS servers

2023

- We looked at (thousands of) attacks in 2022-2023







2022 - 2023 Nokia Botnet Study

(XOX)

Deepfield

Deepfield Secure Genome

Crawl every IPv4 and active IPv6 from datacenters around the world for known botnet CVE, IoT devices, servers and services



Nokia Deepfield Defender

Commercial DDoS security solution deployed in major ISP and Cloud providers around the world. Real-time telemetry from backbone routers and mitigation devices / scrubbers





2022 - 2023 Nokia Botnet Study

Global DDoS Threat Alliance



Nokia collaboration with CSP / Nokia customers around the world sharing near real-time data on botnets, worms, DDoS attacks and other critical security threats







Then and now... #1: Botnets have taken over the (DDoS) world

Today (now):

- Botnets generate most of all DDoS bytes
- Botnets represent 90% of complex attacks
- Botnets circumvent traditional anti-DDoS systems



The graph shows Nokia data about botnet-originated DDoS traffic as a percentage of all attack traffic over the last year.

Data source: GDTA-participating service and cloud providers globally, using the Nokia commercial DDoS defense solution.





DDoS bots: What are they, and where do they live? #2: The threats are growing exponentially, too

Where are these bots?

- Enterprises: IoT and cloud are now everywhere
 - Surveillance / Digital Video Recorders / Network Video Recorders
 - Point of Sale, Heating/Ventilation/AC, remote monitoring and data collection (water meters, parking meters)
 - Medical imaging

What are these bots?

- Most bot devices are compromised CPE (e.g., Mikrotik router), followed by 30-40 brands of DVR
- Botnets tend to attack in "packs" (similar devices and topologies)
- Cloud is *not* the largest source (by number of devices), but one of fastest growing in terms of bandwidth (bps) and packet intensity (pps) capacity

It may/will get worse:



unclassified proprietary networks with any range.
Source: InT Analytics Research 2027. We welcome resublishing of images but ask for source citation with a link to the original nost and company websits

Source: https://iot-analytics.com/number-connected-iot-devices

- 99% of enterprise IoT and properly patched, firewalled and secure,
- but....
- 1% of many billion devices is significant.



How big is the problem?

#3: Thousands of botnets, hundreds of thousands of bot devices

Today, based on Nokia data (and others), botnet DDoS represents:

- 500k 1M active IoT hosts
- 50 100 Tbps aggregate capacity
- 1 2 Tbps peaks

How many bots and botnets?

- Majority attacks < 5,000 devices and deliver effective attacks on many servers/applications
- There are large networks with > 60k devices
- Geo-political attacks included previously unknown botnet devices





Some facts:

#4: Yet we're still in the early stages of botnet-driven DDoS impact

Last 20 years of Internet history

- Most (consumer/SMB) access via cable/DSL
- Asymmetric access 90 Mbps/10 Mbps (down/up)

Botnet threat is still limited

- Botnet bps matches industry averages
- 70% of all botnets < 50 Mbps today

But...

So far, **botnets are limited by today's upstream bandwidth** — while the race to gigabit speeds and symmetrical bandwidth is already well underway.





Why botnet attacks are such a problem? "The call is coming from inside the house"

Traditional ISP / CSP security model assumed:

- Protect external edges of the network from inbound attacks,
 - Especially problematic in Eastern EU / Asian countries
- Protect against spoofed or amplified traffic
 - Active countermeasures (e.g., SYN cookie, HTTP redirect)
 - Shaping DNS, NTP, LDAP

The reality in 2023:

- Majority of botnet problem is North America / Europe
- Largest threat for many ISP is from their own customers



Source: Nokia Deepfield



How can we address this?

Traffic baselines!

.miting!



How can we (really) address this? #1 Anomaly detection

For >95% of DDoS, it's no longer about looking at what's inside the packet; instead, it's about who/what is sending the packet.

- bps/pps thresholds and baselines are insufficient and inadequate to track most of today's traffic (including flash crowd events)
- A big data-driven approach that correlates network traffic in real-time with broader Internet context (e.g., which type of device is behind a source IP address) is much more effective in reducing DDoS falsepositive

:43.170	arteria-net.com ddosbot rfys lighttpd
.10.50	unknown_web djs
)6.96	webcam ddosbot frontier.com
6.106	lighttpd ddasbot rijs uplus.co.kr
.59.182	ddosbot lightpd rfjs cobra kddi.com
7.82	ddosbot uplus.co.kr
105	webcam ddosbot uplus.co.kr
.70.226	openssh dropbear httpd uplus.co.kr teinetiogin ddosbot
208.22	lighttpd ddosbot rfjs sonynetwork.co.jp
;0.169	unknown_dns
182	alticefrance.com ddosbot
23	telekom.hu unknown_dns rilatron webcam ddosbot
35.252	arteria-net.com ddoobot ipsec
.16.55	vebcam softbank/p ddosbot
).197	ruijie ddosbot nginx viettel.com.vn
0.164	arteria-net.com ddoebot
3.31	ddosbot uplus.co.kr

Nokia data: Top sources of traffic in DNS amplification attack towards a consumer IP address (target). Data source: GDTA-participating service and cloud providers globally, using the Nokia commercial DDoS defense solution.



How can we (really) address this? Example Botnet against military network







How can we (really) address this? Example Botnet against military network

df["genome.src"].str.contains("edu")				Filter		Load all Flow		Show Detection ~	Show Genome Src \checkmark			
Time 🍦	TTL 🍦 Prot	o 🔶 TCPFlag 🖨	Peer 🔷 Src	IP	♦ SPort ♦		Dst IP	DPort	Detect	Src Genome	Bytes 🔻	Len 🍦
16:03:40	17			77.68	11965		90.92	443	57 botnet_quic	webcam mini_httpd ddosbot edu.ar	288598780	1,428
16:06:20	6	PA		2.138	59182		90.92	443	9 botnet	uc-httpd ddosbot webcam	269323200	1,440
16:04:20	17			77.68	11965		90.92	443	57 botnet_quic	webcam mini_httpd ddosbot	160427230	1,428
16:36:20	6	PA		77.68	54379		90.92	443	9 botnet	webcam mini_httpd ddosbot	74304000	1,440
16:38:10	6	PA		77.68	54379		90.92	443	9 botnet	webcam mini_httpd ddosbot	67406400	1,440
18:41:10	6	PA		0.84	54178		90.156	5001		edu 🔳	2304000	1,125
16:08:30	6	S		23.175	36118		90.219	80		nginx edu 🖷	712680	60



How can we (really) address this? xx.xx.77.68 is an NREN DDoS bot

Summary	History	JSON						
IP		77.68						
Tag	1111	ddosbot rebeam -	reducer mini_interd			Seen in multiple botnet DDoS attacks		
OS								
Third Party AP	21	-						
Static		-						
Routeviews		77.0/24	AS	nduar				
DNS								
Open Ports						$\min_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2} \rightarrow \frac$		
		83	Server	mini_httpd/1.21 18oct2014	→	vulnerable to CVE-2015-		
			Title	client		1548		
			Body SHA256	a168b1778effd032c40b3fe88ebaae82aa0ae068761da659de30279c892cd694				
			Favicon SHA256	a168b1778effd032c40b3fe88ebaae82aa0ae068761da659de30279c892cd694				
			Last	2023-05-18 04:00				
		8001	Last	2023-05-20 02:05				
		0000	Unknown	ZZ"U a				
		8002	Last	2023-05-20 13:05				





How can we (really) address this? #2 AI-based auto-mitigation

Once an attack is detected, a system can generate an automated response based on multiple parameters, which will create an optimized model for **that attack**, at **that time**, on **that network**.

For example:

- What's the attack vector mix?
- What mitigation devices are available on the network? At what scale and cost per bit?
- How can these devices be programmed?
- What's the botnet cluster launching that attack?

>95% of attacks can be mitigated on existing modern routers, thanks to progress on silicon performance, scale (e.g. 256k ACLs on Nokia FP4/FP5) and programmability (particularly NETCONF).





How can we (really) address this? #2 AI-based auto-mitigation



FP4

FP5



How can we (really) address this? #3 Adaptive mitigation and collaborative learning

Instead of being driven by FUD:

- Mitigation effectiveness can be measured against the body of real-world attacks
- Model can be **trained** on new attacks to optimize countermeasures
- False-negative/false-positive rates can be understood and optimized

This requires **active collaboration between service providers**, to share (anonymized) DDoS threat intelligence data in near-real-time.



Summary from a DDoS attack in April 2023 on an EU government host.

Data source: GDTA-participating service and cloud providers globally, using the Nokia commercial DDoS defense solution.

17



Summary

DDoS botnets are nascent but already generate most of the DDoS traffic today

- Exponential growth of consumer & enterprise IoT -
- ISP driving symmetrical 1Gbps connectivity further driving the "arms race" -
- Nation-state attacks with large botnet networks -

IoT botnets are everyone's problem

NRENs, ISPs, enterprises, vendors must take proactive IoT threat mitigation

AI/ML provides us tools to effectively address this threat

- Models can (and should) be trained on real-world data sets -
- More collaboration is essential to share current DDoS data -









Thank you Any questions?



