

## TSPU: Russia's Decentralized Censorship System

Diwen Xue  
University of Michigan

Benjamin Mixon-Baca  
ASU/Breakpointing Bad

ValdikSS  
Independent

Anna Ahlove  
University of Michigan

Beau Kujath  
ASU/Breakpointing Bad

Jedidiah R. Crandall  
ASU/Breakpointing Bad

Roya Ensafi  
University of Michigan

### ABSTRACT

Russia's Sovereign RuNet was designed to build a Russian national firewall. Previous anecdotes and isolated events in the past two years reflected centrally coordinated censorship behaviors across multiple ISPs, suggesting the deployment of "special equipment" in networks, colloquially known as "TSPU". Despite the TSPU comprising a critical part of the technical stack of RuNet, very little is known about its design, its capabilities, or the extent of its deployment.

In this paper, we develop novel techniques and run in-country and remote measurements to discover the *how*, *what*, and *where* of TSPU's interference with users' Internet traffic. We identify different types of blocking mechanisms triggered by SNL, IP, and QUIC, and we find the TSPU to be in-path and stateful, and possesses unique state-management characteristics. Using fragmentation be-

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Since 2011 and tech In May 2020, a com-oper known a vides th and unl privately establish the rest threats [ Prev TSPU, It its conte



is legal is [17], g tele- pually is pro- strally nds of al was i from reigen of the / with hreats

## Network Responses to Russia's Invasion of Ukraine in 2022: A Cautionary Tale for Internet Freedom

Reethika Ramesh<sup>\*</sup>, Ram Sundara Raman<sup>\*</sup>, Apurva Virkud<sup>†</sup>, Alexandra Dirksen<sup>‡</sup>, Armin Huremagic<sup>‡</sup>, David Fifield<sup>‡</sup>, Dirk Rodenburg<sup>‡</sup>, Rod Hynes<sup>‡</sup>, Doug Madory<sup>‡</sup>, Roya Ensafi<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>University of Michigan <sup>‡</sup>TU Braunschweig <sup>‡</sup>Psiphon <sup>‡</sup>Kentik

### Abstract

Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 was followed by sanctions and restrictions: by Russia against its citizens, by Russia against the world, and by foreign actors against Russia. Reports suggested a torrent of increased censorship, geoblocking, and network events affecting Internet freedom.

This paper is an investigation into the network changes that occurred in the weeks following this escalation of hostili-



was i ness of in to cc ens the u both nav side

ns, busi- the state : 's desire increase and limit eased in ing made ities out-k access

## Throttling Twitter: An Emerging Censorship Technique in Russia

Diwen Xue  
University of Michigan

Reethika Ramesh  
University of Michigan

ValdikSS  
Independent

Leonid Evdokimov  
Independent

Andrey Viktorov  
Independent

Arham Jain  
University of Michigan

Eric Wustrow  
University of Colorado Boulder

Simone Basso  
OONI

Roya Ensafi  
University of Michigan

### ABSTRACT

In March 2021, the Russian government started to throttle Twitter on a national level, marking the first ever use of large-scale, targeted throttling for censorship purposes. The slowdown was intended to pressure Twitter to comply with content removal requests from the Russian government.

In this paper, we take a first look at this emerging censorship technique. We work with local activists in Russia to detect and measure the throttling and reverse engineer the throttler from in-country vantage points. We find that the throttling is triggered by Twitter domains in the TLS SNI extension, and the throttling limits both upstream and downstream traffic to a value between 130 kbps and 150 kbps by dropping packets that exceed this rate. We also find that the throttling devices appear to be located close to end-users, and that the throttling behaviors are consistent across different ISPs suggesting that they are centrally coordinated. Notably, this deployment marks a departure from Russia's previously

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Traditional Internet censorship relies on targeted blocking of content traffic, such as DNS, IP, and QUIC, and the use of deep packet inspection (DPI) to detect and block specific content. We observe in co-serv offer user cens cong In



work key- n ex- com- ad- been rship, s to a This It for rn to work vitter

## Decentralized Control: A Case Study of Russia

Reethika Ramesh<sup>\*</sup>, Ram Sundara Raman<sup>\*</sup>, Matthew Bernhard<sup>\*</sup>, Victor Ongkowijaya<sup>\*</sup>, Leonid Evdokimov<sup>†‡</sup>, Anne Edmundson<sup>†</sup>, Steven Sprecher<sup>\*</sup>, Muhammad Ikram<sup>‡</sup>, Roya Ensafi<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>University of Michigan, {reethika, ramaks, matber, victorwj, swsprec, ensafi}@umich.edu

<sup>†</sup>Macquarie University, <sup>‡</sup>Independent, <sup>‡</sup>leon@darkk.net.ru

**Abstract**—Until now, censorship research has largely focused on highly centralized networks that rely on government-run technical choke-points, such as the Great Firewall of China. Although it was previously thought to be prohibitively difficult, large-scale censorship in decentralized networks are on the rise. Our in-depth investigation of the mechanisms underlying decentralized information control in Russia shows that such large-scale censorship can be achieved in decentralized networks through inexpensive commodity equipment. This new form of information control presents a host of problems for censorship measurement, including difficulty identifying censored content, requiring measurements from diverse perspectives, and variegated censorship mechanisms that require significant effort to identify in a robust manner.

By working with activists on the ground in Russia, we ob-



lemic attention as of the world begin cal tensions begin stworks have also : Internet. Recent s to wrestle with downs which, due ome the *de facto* ntries [14], [36], ating information mined India [89], countries, there has on of the specific for decentralized