Resource-Bounded Intruders in Denial of Service Attacks

Abraão Aires Urquiza Musab A. Alturki Tajana Ban Kirigin Max Kanovich Vivek Nigam Andre Scedrov Carolyn Talcott

> CSF 2019 – Hoboken, NJ June 25-28, 2019

Denial of Service attacks are a serious security concern:

 No service is protected against DoS attacks: flooding attacks can be performed by attackers with large amounts of resources;

 Some DoS attacks do not require large amounts of resources: asymmetric DoS attacks, amplification attacks, slow DoS attacks including SlowDroid attacks where a web

server can be taken down by a single mobile phone

Such slow attacks are hard to identify due to low volumes of traffic.

Intruders minimize their effort and **exploit protocols** used by the target service.

Such slow attacks are hard to identify due to low volumes of traffic.

Intruders minimize their effort and **exploit protocols** used by the target service.

Intruders also exploit various types of resources:

- Imited number of workers web-servers possess (Slowloris);
- limited amount of TCAM memory of switches (SDN TCAM exhaustion attacks);
- server's processing power (TLS renegotiation DoS attacks);
- network bandwidth (SIP forking amplification attacks on VoIP);

<u>۲</u>

- **Dolev-Yao intruder** with **unlimited resources** can trivially render any service unavailable.
- It is useful in practice and more challenging for formal verification to determine whether a service is vulnerable to intruders with **limited resources**, *i.e.*, **Resource-Bounded Intruders**,

- **Dolev-Yao intruder** with **unlimited resources** can trivially render any service unavailable.
- It is useful in practice and more challenging for formal verification to determine whether a service is vulnerable to intruders with **limited resources**, *i.e.*, **Resource-Bounded Intruders**, *e.g.*,:
 - Bounded Traffic Intruder Model intruder can send only a number of messages at a given rate, *e.g.*, messages per second.
 - Bounded Processing Intruder Model according to his processing power, intruder can carry out only a bounded number of actions in a given time window.
 - Bounded Memory Intruder Models intruder uses only a bounded amount of memory.

 We refine the notion of a DoS attack taking into account the duration of the attack.

- We refine the notion of a DoS attack taking into account the duration of the attack.
- We introduce Protocol Resource Theories that involve resource management and timeouts.

- We refine the notion of a DoS attack taking into account the duration of the attack.
- We introduce Protocol Resource Theories that involve resource management and timeouts.
- We formalize Resource-Bounded intruders
 - similar to the standard Dolev-Yao intruder
 - able to create fresh values, compose messages, encrypt and decrypt messages with available keys, etc.;
 - amended with resource and time features
 - an intruder can only consume at most some specified amount of resources in any given time window.

- We refine the notion of a DoS attack taking into account the duration of the attack.
- We introduce Protocol Resource Theories that involve resource management and timeouts.
- We formalize Resource-Bounded intruders
 - similar to the standard Dolev-Yao intruder
 - able to create fresh values, compose messages, encrypt and decrypt messages with available keys, etc.;
 - amended with resource and time features
 - an intruder can only consume at most some specified amount of resources in any given time window.
- We obtain complexity results for the related verification problems.

- We refine the notion of a DoS attack taking into account the duration of the attack.
- We introduce Protocol Resource Theories that involve resource management and timeouts.
- We formalize Resource-Bounded intruders
 - similar to the standard Dolev-Yao intruder
 - able to create fresh values, compose messages, encrypt and decrypt messages with available keys, etc.;
 - amended with resource and time features
 - an intruder can only consume at most some specified amount of resources in any given time window.
- We obtain complexity results for the related verification problems.
- We automate the search for DoS attacks using Maude.

Timestamped Fact - An atomic FOL formula F with an associated real number t, F@t. Time@t specifies the global time.

Configuration - A multiset of facts with exactly one occurrence of the fact *Time*.

Timestamped Fact - An atomic FOL formula F with an associated real number t, F@t. Time@t specifies the global time.

Configuration - A multiset of facts with exactly one occurrence of the fact *Time*.

Timestamps of facts may denote:

creation/availability:

 $N_S(A, C, m)$ @t denotes that message m was sent by agent A on transmission medium C at moment t; E@t denotes empty memory slot available from the moment t;

validity/expiring:

 T_i @t denotes that the protocol state S_i times out at moment t.

Timestamped Fact - An atomic FOL formula F with an associated real number t, F@t. Time@t specifies the global time.

Configuration - A multiset of facts with exactly one occurrence of the fact *Time*.

Formalizing time requirements:

- Configurations may have time constraints attached:

e.g., $Time@T, \mathsf{T}^{\mathcal{A}_k}_i(\mathcal{S}, \vec{X})@T_1 \mid T_1 \geqslant T+1$

denoting that protocol state S_i will time out in 1 time unit.

Time Constraints - comparisons of time variables:

 $T > T' \pm D$ and $T = T' \pm D$

where T and T' are time variables, and D is a natural number.

Model: Multiset Rewriting with Real Time

Formalization involves **explicit real time** and **time requirements**, *i.e.*, comparisons of time variables.

Tick Rule - Advances global time by any positive **real** number ε : $Time@T \longrightarrow Time@(T + \varepsilon)$

Instantaneous Rule - Changes the state, but not the global time:

Time Constraints: $T > T' \pm D$ and $T = T' \pm D$ $Time @T, W, F_1 @T'_1, \dots, F_n @T'_n | C \rightarrow$ $\exists \vec{x}.Time @T, W, Q_1 @(T + D_1), \dots, Q_m @(T + D_m)$ where D_1, \dots, D_m, D_m are natural numbers and \vec{x} are nonces.

Execution time of actions - rules may have explicit **duration**, specified by timestamps of created facts.

Formalization also involves resource management and requirements.

Services allocate their available resources to each client request for some period of time.

Resources are consumed and recovered during protocol execution:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Time} @\ T, \mathsf{S}_i(S, S_{id}, r_i, \vec{X}_i) @\ T_1, \mathsf{R}(S, R + r_j - r_i + r_{min}^S) @\ T_2, \\ &\mathsf{N}(m_i) @\ T_3, \mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W} \ | \ T_1 \ge T, T_2 \le T, T_3 \le T \longrightarrow \\ &\text{Time} @\ T, \mathsf{S}_j(S, S_{id}, r_j, \vec{x}_j) @\ (T + t_j), \mathsf{R}(S, R + r_{min}^S) @\ T, \mathcal{W}_2, \mathcal{W} \end{aligned}$$

Special facts, variables and constants are used in the model:

R(s, r)@t - service s has r resources available at moment t;



 r_{ini}^{S} initial service resources for the service S.

Formalization also involves resource management and requirements.

- Service availability rules specify:
 - service is **denied** when resources reach the minimum:

 $Time@T, R(S, r_{min}^{S})@T, Av(S)@T_{2} \longrightarrow Time@T, R(S, r_{min}^{S})@T, Den(S)@T$

- service is available if the resources are greater than the minimum:

$$Time@T, R(S, r_{min}^{S} + R + 1)@T, Den(S)@T_{2} \longrightarrow Time@T, R(S, r_{min}^{S} + R + 1)@T, Av(S)@T$$

Av(s)@t - service *s* is available from moment *t*; Den(s)@t - service *s* is unavailable from moment *t*. Very short service interruptions may be tolerated in practice.

Hence, the notion of a DoS attack is refined by a duration parameter:

A DoS attack on a service is successful if the service's resources are exhausted for some **duration**, *mdur*.

 $Time@T, Den(S)@T_1 \mid T \ge T_1 + mdur_S$

For simplicity we model only one resource and use natural numbers to represent resources.

Verification: We look for traces representing DoS attacks!

Formalization of the verification scenario:

- Protocol resource theories representing used services A_i
- natural numbers *mdur_i*, specifying the minimal duration that the resources of the service A_i have to be consumed to represent a successful DoS attack on that service;
- Intruder theories \mathcal{I}_j

- **Dolev-Yao intruder** with unlimited resources not suitable for DoS verification, leads to many false positives.
- **Resource-Bounded Intruders** more refined intruder model, -amended with resource and time features:
 - Intruder has a bounded total amount of resources:
 r^{id}_{max} total amount of resources of an intruder id;
 - Intruder can only consume a bounded amount of resources in any given time window;
 - Intruder obeys physical laws related to time:
 - obeys network transmission time restrictions;
 - intruder's actions take time to be performed.

Actions of Resource-Bounded Intruders have the attached cost,

e.g., sending a message to the network:

SND: $Time@T, M(I, X)@T_1, R(I, Z + r_R)@T_2 | T \ge T_1 \longrightarrow$ $Time@T, N(X)@(T + \delta_L), R(I, Z)@T, Rec(I, r_R)@(T + \delta_R)$

- sending message X takes intruder $I \delta_L$ time units;
- it consumes r_R resources;
- these resources can only be recovered after δ_R time units.

R(id, r)@t - intruder *id* has *r* resources available at moment *t*; Rec(id, r)@t - intruder *id* can recover *r* resources at moment *t*.

Model: Multiset Rewriting with Real Time

Verification: We look for traces representing DoS attacks!

A **trace** of MSR rules \mathcal{T} is a sequence of configurations $\mathcal{S}_0 \longrightarrow_{r_1} \mathcal{S}_1 \longrightarrow_{r_2} \cdots \longrightarrow_{r_n} \mathcal{S}_n$, such that for all i, \mathcal{S}_{i+1} is obtained by applying $r_{i+1} \in \mathcal{T}$ to \mathcal{S}_i .

We are interested in traces that reach some goal.

Goal is a set $\mathcal{GS} = \{ \langle S_1, C_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle S_n, C_n \rangle \}$ where each C_j is a set of time constraints and S_j is a multiset of timestamped facts.

A configuration S is a **goal configuration** if for some *i* there is a grounding substitution, σ , such that $S_i \sigma \subseteq S$ and $C_i \sigma$ is true.

We consider traces that do not contain critical configurations, *i.e.*, non-critical traces.

Critical Configuration Specification is a set $CS = \{ \langle S_1, C_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle S_n, C_n \rangle \}$ where each C_j is a set of time constraints and S_j is a multiset of timestamped facts.

A configuration S is a **critical configuration** if for some *i* there is a grounding substitution, σ , such that $S_i \sigma \subseteq S$ and $C_i \sigma$ is true.

Non-Critical Reachability Problem:

Given a goal \mathcal{GS} , a critical configuration specification \mathcal{CS} and an initial configuration \mathcal{S}_0 , is there a non-critical trace \mathcal{P} of MSR rules \mathcal{T} that leads from \mathcal{S}_0 to a goal configuration?

Non-Critical Reachability Problem in MSR systems is **undecidable** in general, but is **decidable** for systems containing only balanced rules, assuming an upper-bound on the size of facts, *i.e.*, on the total number of symbols in each fact.

MSR		Non-Critical Reachability		
Balanced	untimed	PSPACE-complete		
	discrete time	PSPACE-complete		
	dense time	PSPACE-complete [new]		
Not necessarily balanced		Undecidable		

A rule is **balanced** if the number of facts appearing in its pre-condition and its post-condition is the same. Several challenges in **timed MSR with dense time**, particularly related to the notion of non-critical traces:

- Showing that a trace of a dense time MSR is non-critical involves not only the configurations it contains, but also an infinite number of configurations obtained by decomposing *Tick* rules, in order to faithfully capture the continuity of time.
- Technical results involve abstractions, circle-configurations, and the auxiliary notion of immediate successor configurations, related to satisfiability of relevant time constraints.

Protocol Verification: We look for traces representing DoS attacks!

DoS Problem:

Given a verification scenario, can resource-bounded intruders deny some service *s_i* for the duration *mdur_i*?

Protocol Verification: We look for traces representing DoS attacks!

DoS Problem:

Given a verification scenario, can resource-bounded intruders deny some service *s_i* for the duration *mdur_i*?

DoS problem is an instance of the non-critical reachability problem!

Theorem (DoS problem)

The DoS problem is undecidable in general.

Theorem (Balanced DoS problem)

Assuming a bound on the size of facts, the DoS problem for balanced verification scenarios is **PSPACE-complete**.

Protocol Verification: We look for traces representing DoS attacks!

DoS Problem:

Given a verification scenario, can resource-bounded intruders deny some service s_i for the duration $mdur_i$?

DoS problem is an instance of the non-critical reachability problem!

- initial configuration specifies available resources of each service and each intruder, initial knowledge etc.
- goal: Time@T, $Den(S)@T_1 | T \ge T_1 + mdur_S$
- critical configurations related to services

Protocol Critical Configuration Specification ensures protocol execution respects timeouts and resource bounds:

► Timeout CS: ({Time@T, S_i(s, S_{id}, R_i, x_i)@T₁}, {T₁ < T}) configurations denoting protocol sessions for which the timeout has passed are critical;

Protocols states may have timeouts:

- $S_i(s, S_{id}, r_i, \vec{x_i})$ @t protocol state S_i times out at moment t
- once a timeout is reached, protocol session ends.

 $Time@T, R(s, R)@T_1, S_i(s, S_{id}, r_i, \vec{x_i})@T \longrightarrow Time@T, R(s, r_i + R)@T$

Protocol Critical Configuration Specification ensures protocol execution respects timeouts and resource bounds:

- ► Timeout CS: ({Time@T, S_i(s, S_{id}, R_i, x_i)@T₁}, {T₁ < T}) configurations denoting protocol sessions for which the timeout has passed are critical;
- ▶ Denied CS: ({R(s, r^s_{min})@T₁, Av(s)@T₂}, {T₁ ≤ T₂} configurations are critical if a service is considered available at a time its resources have been exhausted:

Protocol Critical Configuration Specification ensures protocol execution respects timeouts and resource bounds:

- ► Timeout CS: ({Time@T, S_i(s, S_{id}, R_i, x_i)@T₁}, {T₁ < T}) configurations denoting protocol sessions for which the timeout has passed are critical;
- ▶ Denied CS: ({R(s, r^s_{min})@T₁, Av(s)@T₂}, {T₁ ≤ T₂} configurations are critical if a service is considered available at a time its resources have been exhausted:
- Available CS:

 $\langle \{\mathsf{R}(s, r_{min}^{s} + R + 1) @ T_1, \mathsf{Den}(s) @ T_2 \}, \{T_1 \leq T_2\} \rangle$ service should not be considered denied at anytime when sufficient resources are available. We extend our model to take into account countermeasures.

Countermeasures based on timeouts,

e.g., ReqTimeOut for mitigating the Slowloris attack.

• Trigger a timeout whenever a condition on the traffic is satisfied:

 $Time@T, R(s, R)@T_1, S_i(s, S_{id}, r_i, \vec{x_i})@T_2, TimeCM(s, S_{id})@T \longrightarrow Time@T, R(s, r_i + R)@T$

Critical configuration: $\langle \{Time@T, TimeCM(s, S_{id})@T_1\}, \{T_1 < T\} \rangle$

- The connection *S_{id}* of service *s* is closed;
- The service's resources r_i are made available.

 We implemented the framework using Rewriting Modulo SMT in Maude.

- We implemented the framework using Rewriting Modulo SMT in Maude.
- It uses symbolic search with the following symbols:
 - Time Symbols, that is, instead of instantiating time variable, we use time symbols that are constrained by a set of constraints. We use an SMT solver to check for the satisfiability of this set.
 - Intruder and Service Resource Symbols: Instead of using concrete values for intruder and service resources, we use intruder resource symbols and service resource symbols;
 - Protocol Instance Symbols: Instead of creating one protocol session, we allow the intruder to create several instances of a protocol session representing a burst from the intruder.

We carried out bounding model checking with the following bounds:

- **•** Bound on the Number of Parallel Symbolic Protocols (pxs).
- **•** Bound on the Number of Messages at a Time (pxs).

	No Bounding		Bounded ${\rm msgs}_1$		Bounded pxs		Bounded msgs_1 and pxs	
Attack	States	Time (s)	States	Time (s)	States	Time (s)	States	Time (s)
SL [1] SL [2] SL [3] STCAM [2] STCAM [3] STCAM [4]	18 409 - 17 387 -	0.4 13 - 0.3 12.5 -	16 277 - 15 266 -	0.4 11.2 - 0.3 9.7 -	8 27 228 16 361 12783	0.1 0.4 4.7 0.3 10.3 561	7 17 56 14 243 6322	0.1 0.4 2.6 0.2 9.2 474

- We refine the notion of a DoS attack taking into account the duration of the attack.
- We propose a framework for analyzing the security of systems against DoS attacks:
 - reasoning about service's resources;
 - reasoning about intruder's resources;
 - reasoning about service timeouts;
- We obtain complexity results for the DoS problem and a general non-critical reachability problem for real time MSR;
- We automate the verification using Rewriting Modulo SMT.

- Capture a larger class of security problems that are closely related to DoS attacks.
- Use statistical model checking to investigate effectiveness of intruder strategies and attack defenses.
- Investigate how different resource-bounded intruder models can be compared.

Thank you!

Showing that a trace of a dense time MSR is non-critical involves not only the configurations it contains, but also an infinite number of configurations obtained by decomposing *Tick* rules in order to faithfully capture the continuity of time.

Definition (Non-Critical Traces)

Let \mathcal{R} be a set of timed MSR rules and \mathcal{CS} a critical configuration specification. A trace \mathcal{P} of \mathcal{R} rules is non-critical if it contains no critical configuration and if no critical configuration is reachable along any trace obtained by matching any subtrace of \mathcal{P} on the left below with the one on the right:

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{S}_i \longrightarrow_{\mathit{Tick_{\varepsilon}}} \mathcal{S}_{i+1} & \mathcal{S}_i \longrightarrow_{\mathit{Tick_{\varepsilon_1}}} \mathcal{S}' \longrightarrow_{\mathit{Tick_{\varepsilon_2}}} \mathcal{S}_{i+1} \\ \text{where } \varepsilon_1 \text{ and } \varepsilon_2 \text{ are arbitrary non-negative real numbers, such } \\ \text{that, } \varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \text{ holds.} \end{array}$