Comparison of Intrusion Detection Systems for Use in Low-Powered Devices

A project report submitted

to

MANIPAL ACADEMY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

For Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the

Award of the Degree

of

Bachelor of Technology

in

Computer and Communication Engineering

by

Pratyay Amrit

Reg. No. 140953430

Under the guidance of

Ms. Ipsita Upasana Assistant Professor Department of I & CT Manipal Institute of Technology Manipal, India



I dedicate my thesis to my friends and family.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this project work entitled Comparison of Intrusion

Detection Systems for Use in Low-Powered Devices is original and has

been carried out by me in the Department of Information and Communication

Technology of Manipal Institute of Technology, Manipal, under the guidance

of Ms. Ipsita Upasana, Assistant Professor, Department of Information

and Communication Technology, M. I. T., Manipal. No part of this work has

been submitted for the award of a degree or diploma either to this University

or to any other Universities.

Place: Manipal

Date: 05-05-18

Pratyay Amrit

ii

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that this project entitled Comparison of Intrusion Detection Systems for Use in Low-Powered Devices is a bonafide project work done by Mr. Pratyay Amrit at Manipal Institute of Technology, Manipal, independently under my guidance and supervision for the award of the Degree of Bachelor of Technology in Computer and Communication Engineering.

Ms. Ipsita Upasana

Assistant Professor

Department of I & CT

Manipal Institute of Technology

Manipal, India

Dr.Balachandra

Professor & Head

Department of I & CT

Manipal Institute of Technology

Manipal, India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks to Ms. Ipsita Upasana, and all faculty members of the Department of Information & Communcation Technology for providing necessary guidance and feedback throughout the course of the project.

ABSTRACT

Intrusion Detection Systems have become an essential part of computer network security. It acts as a first-line defense from cyber-attacks by analyzing the various attributes of a data packet and identifying it as a malicious, or an ordinary one. Such systems have come a long way and in the present time, promise acceptable performance. However, the algorithms that run at the core of these systems are computationally expensive, making them fairly accurate, but almost unimplementable in very low powered devices, such as nodes of a WSAN, or in an IoT based setup. This work attempts to rank various machine learning and data mining techniques on the basis of their accuracy and time required to train and classify network data.

[Security and Privacy]: Intrusion/Anomaly Detection and Malware Mitigation–Intrusion detection systems

Contents

A	cknowledgements	iv
\mathbf{A}	bstract	v
Li	ist of Tables	viii
Li	ist of Figures	ix
\mathbf{A}	bbreviations	ix
N	otations	xi
1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Background	1
2	Chapter Title	4
	2.1 Section 1	4
3	Chapter Title	5
	3.1 ffffh	5
4	Chapter Title	6
	4.1 abvvv	6
5	Chapter Title	7
	5.1 ghf	7

6	Chapter Title	8
	6.1 vvvvv	8
7	Conclusion	9
	7.1 fff	9
$\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{J}}$	appendices	10
\mathbf{A}	Code (if required)	11
	A.1 Kerberos Protocol	11
	A.2 Kerberos Protocol with Freshness Concept	15
В	3 Trace Files	20
	B.1 Replay Attack	20
	B.2 Replay Attack overcome using Freshness Concept	23
Re	References	24
Pr	${f Croject Detail}$	24

List of Tables

B.1	Project Detail																							2	25
-----	----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	----

List of Figures

ABBREVIATIONS

IDS : Intrusion Detection System

UNSW-NB15 : University of New South Wales, Network Based 2015 Dataset

KDD'99 : Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining Competition 1999 Dataset

SIEM : System Information and Event Management

API : Application Programming Interface

NOTATIONS

 $\alpha~:~$ Smoothing factor for words

 $\beta~:~$ Smoothing factor for topics

Introduction

1.1 Background

An Intrusion Detection System (IDS) is an application that can be installed on a system or a network. The application may be a piece of software, or a device that can be plugged into the interface as a module. The IDS, once plugged into the system, scans for activity, and based on various features pertaining to the activity, classifies it as normal, or malicious. It must be noted that the IDS itself does not provide any access control, and is only responsible for the detection of an attack. As a result, IDSs must be bundled with other tools to prevent an attack. Typically, all detected malicious activity is reported to a Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) system, which combines reports from multiple sources and uses alarm filtering techniques to distinguish malicious activity from false alarms.

Many attempts have been made to classify various kinds of IDSs. According to [1], on the basis of method of detection, two types of IDSs have been identified:

• Knowledge Based: Knowledge Based IDSs accumulate knowledge about attacks and look for similar data to detect an attack. Since these IDSs

look for very specific signatures, they provide very accurate detection of common attacks. However, in a case where an attack has a signature that has never been seen before, this kind of system fails. This type of IDS is also called **misuse detection** IDS.

• Behavior Based: Behavior Based IDSs work with the assumption that attacks can be detected if the behavior of the system or the users deviate from the normal expected pattern. Many sources are combined to gather enough data to teach a system what normal behavior looks like and to create a model. The IDS then compares the current activity with this model and reports if it detects an anomaly. These IDSs are also called anomaly detection IDSs. Since these IDSs are based on predictive models, they tend to have lower accuracy, and higher false alarm rate when compared to a knowledge based IDS. However, they are effective against novel attacks as any kind of attack is detected as an anomaly, or a deviation from the norm.

A third type of IDS is also often seen in literature, called the hybrid detection IDS. This is a combination of the two types. Typically, an activity is first passed through a knowledge based system. If the first filter claims the activity to be an attack, the system terminates and the activity is reported. If the activity passes the first filter, it is passed through a behavior based system, where even if the signature could not be found in the dictionary of attacks, an anomaly is detected and the activity is reported. The signature of this activity is then recorded in the knowledge based system for future reference. An activity is not reported as malicious only if it passes both of the filters. Although the process of identification is often sped up compared to the other two types of IDSs, the accuracy is bottle-necked by the behavior based system used. Running such a system with a poor behavior based system also possess the risk of saving false signatures in the initial filter. If an activity passes

through the first filter, and the second filter raises a false alarm, the signature of the (in reality) normal activity is recorded as malicious, and is reported in subsequent instances of similar activities.

Thus, choosing the right behavior based model becomes an important part of building an IDS. Knowledge based systems are not future proof, and it is often too late for a system or a network to be affected by an attacker even once, regardless of how well the IDS reports subsequent activities of the same. Hybrid systems may provide quick classification, but are bottle-necked by the high false positive rate of the behavior based model used.

Chapter Title

2.1 Section 1

Definition 1 vvvvv

Definition 2 ttttttt

Chapter Title

3.1 ffffh

Chapter Title

4.1 abvvv

Chapter Title

5.1 ghf

Chapter Title

6.1 vvvvv

Conclusion

7.1 fff

Appendices

Appendix A

Code (if required)

A.1 Kerberos Protocol

```
MODULE main
VAR
--Creating agents which are to type agtype
agA : agtype;
agB : agtype;
agS : agtype;
agI : agtype;
Iactive: boolean;
--Assigning initial to values to all variables
ASSIGN
init(agA.state):=wait;
init(agB.state):=wait;
init(agS.state):=wait;
init(agI.state):=wait;
init(agA.count):=0;
init(agB.count):=0;
init(agS.count):=0;
init(agI.count):=0;
init(agA.authenticated):=FALSE;
init(agB.authenticated):=FALSE;
init(agI.authenticated):=FALSE;
init(agS.authenticated):=TRUE;
```

```
--Transitions for the variable indicating presence or absence of intruder
next(Iactive):=
!Iactive:{0,1};
Iactive & agI.state=receive4beta:{0,1};
1: Iactive;
esac;
--Transitions for agent A's state
next(agA.state):=
case
agA.state=wait: send1;
agS.state=send2 & agA.state=send1: receive2;
agA.state=receive2: send3alpha;
\verb|agB.state=send4alpha| & \verb|agA.state=send3alpha|: receive4alpha|;
agA.state=receive4alpha: wait;
1:agA.state;
esac;
--Transitions for agent B's state
next(agB.state):=
case
agA.state=send3alpha & agB.state=wait: receive3alpha;
agI.state=send3beta & agB.state=wait & Iactive: receive3beta;
agI.state=send3beta & agB.state=send4alpha & Iactive: receive3beta;
agB.state=receive3alpha:send4alpha;
agB.state=receive3beta:send4beta;
agB.state=send4alpha:wait;
1:agB.state;
esac;
--Transitions for Server S's state
next(agS.state):=
case
agA.state=send1 & agS.state=wait: receive1;
agS.state=receive1:send2;
agS.state=send2:wait;
1:agS.state;
esac;
```

```
--Transitions for the Intruder's state
next(agI.state):=
agI.state=wait & agA.state=send3alpha & agB.state=wait & Iactive: receive3beta;
agI.state=receive3beta & Iactive: send3beta;
agI.state=send3beta & agB.state=send4beta & Iactive : receive4beta;
agI.state=receive4beta & Iactive: wait;
1:agI.state;
esac;
--Transitions for Agent A's counter
next(agA.count):=
case
agA.state=send1|agA.state=receive2: agA.count;
agA.state=send3alpha & agA.count<1:agA.count+1;</pre>
agA.count=1 & agA.state=receive2: 0;
1:agA.count;
esac;
--Transitions for Agent B's counter
next(agB.count):=
case
agB.state=receive3beta & agB.count<2|agB.state=receive3alpha & agB.count<2: agB.count+1;
agB.state=send4alpha |agB.state=send4beta:agB.count;
agB.count=1 & agA.state=receive4alpha & !Iactive:0;
agB.count=2 & agA.state=send3alpha|agB.count=1 & agA.state=send3alpha: 0;
1:agB.count;
esac;
--Transitions for Agent I's counter
next(agI.count):=
case
agI.state=receive3beta & agI.count<2 & Iactive:agI.count+1;</pre>
agI.state=send3beta & Iactive:agI.count;
agI.state=receive4beta & agI.count<2 & Iactive: agI.count+1;</pre>
agI.count=2: 0;
1:agI.count;
esac;
--Transitions for variable indicating agent A's authentication
```

```
next(agA.authenticated):=
case
agA.state=receive4alpha :TRUE;
1:agA.authenticated;
esac;
--Transitions for variable indicating agent B's authentication
next(agB.authenticated):=
case
agB.state=send4alpha |agB.state=send4beta :TRUE;
1:agB.authenticated;
esac:
--Transitions for variable indicating agent B's authentication which
--indicates that it has received the fourth message
next(agI.authenticated):=
agI.state=receive4beta :TRUE;
1:agI.authenticated;
esac;
--Agent S always is authenticated so transitions to the false state do not occur
next(agS.authenticated):=
case
1:agS.authenticated;
esac;
--Specifications which detect the presence of replay attack
--Agent B should not receive more messages than what agent A has sent it
--SPEC AG!(agA.count < agB.count);
--Agent I should never receive the fourth message
SPEC AG!(agI.state=receive4beta);
--Module for each agent's type which includes the agent's state variable,
--its counter and its authentication variable
MODULE agtype
```

```
VAR
state: {wait, send1, receive1, send2,receive2,
send3alpha, send3beta, receive3alpha, receive3beta,
send4alpha,send4beta, receive4alpha, receive4beta };
count:{0,1,2};
authenticated:boolean;
```

A.2 Kerberos Protocol with Freshness Concept

```
MODULE main
VAR
--Creating agents which are to type agtype
agA : agtype;
agB : agtype;
agS : agtype;
agI : agtype;
Iactive: boolean;
Fresh:0..20;
Time:0..20;
--Assigning initial to values to all variables
ASSIGN
init(agA.state):=wait;
init(agB.state):=wait;
init(agS.state):=wait;
init(agI.state):=wait;
init(agA.count):=0;
init(agB.count):=0;
init(agS.count):=0;
init(agI.count):=0;
init(agA.authenticated):=FALSE;
init(agB.authenticated):=FALSE;
init(agI.authenticated):=FALSE;
init(agS.authenticated):=TRUE;
init(Fresh):=0;
init(Time):=0;
```

```
--Transitions for the variable indicating presence or absence of intruder
next(Iactive):=
!Iactive:{0,1};
Iactive & agI.state=receive4beta:{0,1};
1: Iactive;
esac;
--Transitions for agent A's state
next(agA.state):=
case
agA.state=wait: send1;
agS.state=send2 & agA.state=send1: receive2;
agA.state=receive2: send3alpha;
\verb|agB.state=send4alpha| & \verb|agA.state=send3alpha|: receive4alpha|;
agA.state=receive4alpha: wait;
1:agA.state;
esac;
--Transitions for agent B's state
next(agB.state):=
case
agA.state=send3alpha & agB.state=wait & Fresh=0: receive3alpha;
agI.state=send3beta & agB.state=wait & Iactive & Fresh=0: receive3beta;
agI.state=send3beta & agB.state=send4alpha & Iactive & Fresh=0: receive3beta;
agB.state=receive3alpha:send4alpha;
agB.state=receive3beta:send4beta;
agB.state=send4alpha:wait;
1:agB.state;
esac;
--Transitions for Server S's state
next(agS.state):=
case
agA.state=send1 & agS.state=wait: receive1;
agS.state=receive1:send2;
agS.state=send2:wait;
1:agS.state;
esac;
```

```
--Transitions for the Intruder's state
next(agI.state):=
agI.state=wait & agA.state=send3alpha & agB.state=wait & Iactive: receive3beta;
agI.state=receive3beta & Iactive: send3beta;
agI.state=send3beta & agB.state=send4beta & Iactive : receive4beta;
agI.state=receive4beta & Iactive: wait;
agI.state=send3beta & Time>2: wait;
1:agI.state;
esac:
--Transitions for Agent A's counter
next(agA.count):=
case
agA.state=send1|agA.state=receive2: agA.count;
agA.state=send3alpha & agA.count<1:agA.count+1;</pre>
agA.count=1 & agA.state=receive2: 0;
1:agA.count;
esac;
--Transitions for Agent B's counter
next(agB.count):=
case
agB.state=receive3beta & agB.count<2|agB.state=receive3alpha & agB.count<1: agB.count+1;
agB.state=send4alpha|agB.state=send4beta:agB.count;
agB.count=1 & agA.state=receive4alpha & !Iactive:0;
\verb|agB.count=2 \& agA.state=send3alpha|agB.count=1 \& agA.state=send3alpha: 0;\\
1:agB.count;
esac;
--Transitions for Agent I's counter
next(agI.count):=
agI.state=receive3beta & agI.count<2 & Iactive:agI.count+1;</pre>
agI.state=send3beta & Iactive:agI.count;
agI.state=receive4beta & agI.count<2 & Iactive: agI.count+1;</pre>
agI.count=2: 0;
1:agI.count;
esac;
```

```
--Transitions for variable indicating agent A's authentication
next(agA.authenticated):=
agA.state=receive4alpha :TRUE;
1:agA.authenticated;
esac;
--Transitions for variable indicating agent B's authentication
next(agB.authenticated):=
case
agB.state=send4alpha|agB.state=send4beta :TRUE;
1:agB.authenticated;
esac;
--Transitions for variable indicating agent B's authentication which
--indicates that it has received the fourth message
next(agI.authenticated):=
case
agI.state=receive4beta :TRUE;
1:agI.authenticated;
esac;
--Agent S always is authenticated so transitions to the false state do not occur
next(agS.authenticated):=
case
1:agS.authenticated;
esac;
--Transitions for the freshness variable
next(Fresh):=
case
agA.state=send3alpha & agB.state=wait:0;
Fresh<20:Fresh+1;
1:0;
esac;
--Transitions for the Intruder's timer variable
next(Time):=
```

```
case
agI.state=receive3beta:0;
Time<20:Time+1;</pre>
1:0;
esac;
\operatorname{\mathtt{--Specifications}} which detect the presence of replay attack
--Agent B should not receive more messages than what agent A has sent it
SPEC AG!(agA.count < agB.count);</pre>
--Agent I should never receive the fourth message
SPEC AG!(agI.state=receive4beta);
--Module for each agent's type which includes the agent's state variable,
--its counter and its authentication variable
MODULE agtype
VAR
state:{wait, send1, receive1, send2,receive2,
send3alpha, send3beta, receive3alpha, receive3beta,
send4alpha, send4beta, receive4alpha, receive4beta};
count:{0,1,2};
authenticated:boolean;
```

Appendix B

Trace Files

B.1 Replay Attack

```
-- specification AG !(agA.count < agB.count) is false
-- as demonstrated by the following execution sequence
Trace Description: CTL Counterexample
Trace Type: Counterexample
-> State: 1.1 <-
  agA.state = wait
  agA.count = 0
  agA.authenticated = 0
 agB.state = wait
  agB.count = 0
  agB.authenticated = 0
  agS.state = wait
  agS.count = 0
  agS.authenticated = 1
  agI.state = wait
  agI.count = 0
  agI.authenticated = 0
  Iactive = 0
-> Input: 1.2 <-
-> State: 1.2 <-
  agA.state = send1
  agS.count = 2
-> Input: 1.3 <-
-> State: 1.3 <-
  agS.state = receive1
-> Input: 1.4 <-
-> State: 1.4 <-
```

```
agS.state = send2
-> Input: 1.5 <-
-> State: 1.5 <-
 agA.state = receive2
 agS.state = wait
-> Input: 1.6 <-
-> State: 1.6 <-
 agA.state = send3alpha
 Iactive = 1
-> Input: 1.7 <-
-> State: 1.7 <-
 agA.count = 1
 agB.state = receive3alpha
 agI.state = receive3beta
-> Input: 1.8 <-
-> State: 1.8 <-
 agB.state = send4alpha
 agB.count = 1
 agI.state = send3beta
 agI.count = 1
-> Input: 1.9 <-
-> State: 1.9 <-
 agA.state = receive4alpha
 agB.state = receive3beta
 agB.authenticated = 1
-> Input: 1.10 <-
-> State: 1.10 <-
 agA.state = wait
 agA.authenticated = 1
 agB.state = send4beta
 agB.count = 2
-- specification AG !(agI.state = receive4beta) is false
-- as demonstrated by the following execution sequence
Trace Description: CTL Counterexample
Trace Type: Counterexample
-> State: 2.1 <-
 agA.state = wait
 agA.count = 0
 agA.authenticated = 0
 agB.state = wait
 agB.count = 0
 agB.authenticated = 0
 agS.state = wait
 agS.count = 0
```

```
agS.authenticated = 1
 agI.state = wait
 agI.count = 0
 agI.authenticated = 0
 Iactive = 0
-> Input: 2.2 <-
-> State: 2.2 <-
 agA.state = send1
 agS.count = 2
-> Input: 2.3 <-
-> State: 2.3 <-
 agS.state = receive1
-> Input: 2.4 <-
-> State: 2.4 <-
 agS.state = send2
-> Input: 2.5 <-
-> State: 2.5 <-
 agA.state = receive2
 agS.state = wait
-> Input: 2.6 <-
-> State: 2.6 <-
 agA.state = send3alpha
 Iactive = 1
-> Input: 2.7 <-
-> State: 2.7 <-
 agA.count = 1
 agB.state = receive3alpha
 agI.state = receive3beta
-> Input: 2.8 <-
-> State: 2.8 <-
 agB.state = send4alpha
 agB.count = 1
 agI.state = send3beta
 agI.count = 1
-> Input: 2.9 <-
-> State: 2.9 <-
 agA.state = receive4alpha
 agB.state = receive3beta
 agB.authenticated = 1
-> Input: 2.10 <-
-> State: 2.10 <-
 agA.state = wait
 agA.authenticated = 1
```

agB.state = send4beta

```
agB.count = 2
-> Input: 2.11 <-
-> State: 2.11 <-
agA.state = send1
agI.state = receive4beta</pre>
```

B.2 Replay Attack overcome using Freshness Concept

```
-- specification AG !(agA.count < agB.count) is true
-- specification AG !(agI.state = receive4beta) is true
```

References

[1] H. Debar, M. Dacier, and A. Wespi, "A revised taxonomy for intrusion-detection systems," Annales Des Télécommunications, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 361–378, Jul 2000. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/ BF02994844

Table B.1: Project Detail

$Student\ Details$

Student Name	Your Name					
Registration Number	070911001	Section/Roll No.	A/01			
Email Address	baravkar.nikhil05@gmail.com	Phone No.(M)	9891000000			
Student Name	Your Name					
Registration Number	070911001	Section/Roll No.	A/01			
Email Address	yourname@yahoo.com	Phone No.(M)	9891000000			

$Project\ Details$

Project Title	Title of your project						
Project Duration	4-6 Months	Date of Reporting	14-01-2011				

$Organization\ Details$

Organization Name	Name of your organization
Full Postal Address	Whitefield, B'lore
Website Address	www.abc.com

$Supervisor\ Details$

Supervisor Full	Name						
Name							
Designation	Project Leader or Manager						
Full Contact Address	#1,Whitefield, B'lore						
with PIN Code							
Email Address	xyz@abc.in	Phone No.(M)	9767541234				

$Internal\ Guide\ Details$

Faculty Name	Name		
Full Contact Address Department of Information and Communica-			
with PIN Code	tion Technology, Manipal Institute of Technol-		
	ogy, Manipal-576104		
Email Address	abc@manipal.edu		