A Study on NSL-KDD Dataset for Intrusion **Detection System Based on Classification** Algorithms

L.Dhanabal¹, Dr. S.P. Shantharajah²

Assistant Professor [SRG], Dept. of Computer Applications, Kumaraguru College of Technology, Coimbatore, India Professor, Department of MCA, Sona College of Technology, Salem, India²

Abstract: Intelligent intrusion detection systems can only be built if there is availability of an effective data set. A data set with a sizable amount of quality data which mimics the real time can only help to train and test an intrusion detection system. The NSL-KDD data set is a refined version of its predecessor KDD'99 data set. In this paper the NSL-KDD data set is analysed and used to study the effectiveness of the various classification algorithms in detecting the anomalies in the network traffic patterns. We have also analysed the relationship of the protocols available in the commonly used network protocol stack with the attacks used by intruders to generate anomalous network traffic. The analysis is done using classification algorithms available in the data mining tool WEKA. The study has exposed many facts about the bonding between the protocols and network attacks.

Keywords: Intrusion Detection System, NSL-KDD dataset, Anomaly, Protocol.

I. INTRODUCTION

Communication system plays an inevitable role in is used. This paper uses the NSL-KDD data set to reveal common man's daily life. Computer networks are effectively used for business data processing, education and learning, collaboration, widespread data acquisition and entertainment. The computer network protocol stack that is in use today was developed with a motive to make it transparent and user friendly. This lead to the development of a robust communication protocol stack. The flexibility of the protocol has made it vulnerable to the attacks launched by the intruders. This makes the requirement for the computer networks to be continuously monitored and protected. The monitoring process is automated by an intrusion detection system (IDS) [1]. The IDS can be made of combination of hardware and software.

At any point of time a web server can be visited by many clients and they naturally produce heavy traffic. Each network connection can be visualized as a set of attributes. The traffic data can be logged and be used to study and classify in to normal and abnormal traffic. In order to process the voluminous database, machine learning techniques can be used.

Data mining is the process of extracting interested data from voluminous data sets using machine learning techniques [2].

In this paper the analysis of the NSL-KDD data set [3] is made by using various clustering algorithms available in the WEKA [4] data mining tool. The NSL-KDD data set is analyzed and categorized into four different clusters depicting the four common different types of attacks. An in depth analytical study is made on the test and training data set. Execution speed of the various clustering algorithms is analysed. Here the 20% train and test data set

the most vulnerable protocol that is frequently used intruders to launch network based intrusions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II presents some related work based on intrusion detection. Section III gives a brief description on the contents of the NSL-KDD dataset. Section IV summarizes about analysis of the dataset with various classification techniques. Section V presents the graphical analysis report on various intrusions using different classification methods. Section VI, deals with conclusion and future work.

II. RELATED WORK

The NSL-KDD data set is the refined version of the KDD cup99 data set [5]. Many types of analysis have been carried out by many researchers on the NSL-KDD dataset employing different techniques and tools with a universal objective to develop an effective intrusion detection system. A detailed analysis on the NSL-KDD data set using various machine learning techniques is done in [6] available in the WEKA tool. K-means clustering algorithm uses the NSL-KDD data set [7] to train and test various existing and new attacks. A comparative study on the NSL-KDD data set with its predecessor KDD99 cup data set is made in [8] by employing the Self Organization Map (SOM) Artificial Neural Network. An exhaustive analysis on various data sets like KDD99, GureKDD and NSL-KDD are made in using various data mining based machine learning algorithms like Support Vector Machine (SVM), Decision Tree, K-nearest neighbor, K-Means and Fuzzy C-Mean clustering algorithms.

III.DATASET DESCRIPTION

The inherent drawbacks in the KDD cup 99 dataset [9] has been revealed by various statistical analyses has affected



the detection accuracy of many IDS modelled by researchers. NSL-KDD data set [3] is a refined version of its predecessor.

It contains essential records of the complete KDD data set. There are a collection of downloadable files at the disposal for the researchers. They are listed in the Table 1

TABLE I : LIST OF NSL-KDD DATASET FILES AND THEIR
DESCRIPTION

	DESCRIPTION				
S.N o.	Name of the file	Description			
1	KDDTrain+.ARFF	The full NSL-KDD train set with binary labels in ARFF format			
2	KDDTrain+.TXT	The full NSL-KDD train set including attack-type labels and difficulty level in CSV format			
3	KDDTrain+_20Perce nt.ARFF	A 20% subset of the KDDTrain+.arff file			
4	KDDTrain+_20Perce nt.TXT	A 20% subset of the KDDTrain+.txt file			
5	KDDTest+.ARFF	The full NSL-KDD test set with binary labels in ARFF format			
6	KDDTest+.TXT	The full NSL-KDD test set including attack-type labels and difficulty level in CSV format			
7	KDDTest-21.ARFF	A subset of the KDDTest+.arff file which does not include records with difficulty level of 21 out of 21			
8	KDDTest-21.TXT	A subset of the KDDTest+.txt file which does not include records with difficulty level of 21 out of 21			

- Redundant records are removed to enable the classifiers to produce an un-biased result.
- Sufficient number of records is available in the train and test data sets, which is reasonably rational and enables to execute experiments on the complete set.
- The number of selected records from each difficult level group is inversely proportional to the percentage of records in the original KDD data set.

In each record there are 41 attributes unfolding different features of the flow and a label assigned to each either as an attack type or as normal.

The details of the attributes namely the attribute name, their description and sample data are listed in the Tables II, III, IV, V. The Table VI contains type information of all the 41 attributes available in the NSL-KDD data set.

The 42nd attribute contains data about the various 5 classes of network connection vectors and they are categorized as one normal class and four attack class. The 4 attack classes are further grouped as DoS, Probe, R2L and U2R. The description of the attack classes.

TABLE II: BASIC FEATURES OF EACH NETWORK
CONNECTION VECTOR

CONNECTION VECTOR					
Attribute No.	Attribute Name	Description	Sample Data		
1	Duration	Length of time duration of the connection	0		
2	Protocol_type	Protocol used in the connection	Тср		
3	Service	Destination network service used	ftp_data		
4	Flag	Status of the connection – Normal or Error	SF		
5	Src_bytes	Number of data bytes transferred from source to destination in single connection	491		
6	Dst_bytes	Number of data bytes transferred from destination to source in single connection	0		
7	Land	if source and destination IP addresses and port numbers are equal then, this variable takes value 1 else 0	0		
8	Wrong_fragm ent	Total number of wrong fragments in this connection	0		
9	Urgent	Number of urgent packets in this connection. Urgent packets are packets with the urgent bit activated	0		

TABLE III : CONTENT RELATED FEATURES OF EACH NETWORK CONNECTION VECTOR

Attribute	Attribute	Description	Sample
No.	Name		Data
10	Hot	Number of 'hot' indicators in the content such as: entering a system	0



		directors		
		directory,		
		creating		
		programs and		
		executing		
	27 6 7 1	programs		
11	Num_failed	Count of failed	0	
	_logins	login attempts	-	
		Login Status :		
		1 if		
12	Logged_in	successfully	0	
		logged in; 0		
		otherwise		
	Num comp	Number of		
13	Num_comp romised	``compromised'	0	
	Tomised	' conditions		
		1 if root shell is		
14	Root shell	obtained; 0	0	
		otherwise	·	
		1 if ``su root"		
		command		
15	Su_attempt	attempted or	0	
13	ed	used; 0	U	
		otherwise		
		Number of		
		``root" accesses		
1.6	Num_root	or number of	0	
16		operations	0	
		performed as a		
		root in the		
		connection		
		Number of file		
17	Num_file_c	creation	0	
1 /	reations	operations in	U	
		the connection	<u> </u>	
1.0	NI111	Number of	0	
18	Num_shells	shell prompts	0	
		Number of		
1.0	Num acces	operations on	_	
19	s files	access control	0	
		files		
		Number of		
	Num outbo	outbound		
20	. – .	commands in	0	
	und_cmds	an ftp session		
		1 if the login		
21	Is_hot_logi	belongs to the	0	
21	n	``hot" list i.e.,	0	
		root or admin;		
		else 0		
		1 if the login is		
22	Is_guest_lo	a ``guest"	0	
22	gin	login; 0		
		otherwise		

TABLE IV : TIME RELATED TRAFFIC FEATURES OF EACH NETWORK CONNECTION VECTOR

Attribute	Attribute	Description	Sample
No.	Name		Data
23	Count	Number of connections to the same destination host as the current connection in the past two	2

24 Srv_count Seconds Number of connections to the same service (port number) as the current connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections			T	1	
connections to the same service (port number) as the current connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)			seconds		
the same service (port number) as the current connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in strv count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in strv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in strv count (24) Strv_rerror_rate Strv_rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)					
service (port number) as the current connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, or connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services.			_		
24 Srv_count number) as the current connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)					
current connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)	24		· ·	2	
connection in the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)	24 Sr	v_count		2	
the past two seconds The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
25 Serror_rate 26 Srv_serror_rate 27 Rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 29 Same_srv_rate Serror_rate Serror_rate Serror_rate Serror_rate Serror_rate Serror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
25 Serror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)			*		
25 Serror_rate of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
25 Serror_rate that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 28 Srv_rerror_rate 29 Same_srv_rate The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
25 Serror_rate flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 26 Srv_serror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 27 Rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 28 Srv_rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 28 Srv_rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 29 Same_srv_rate The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 29 The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
26 Srv_serror_rate 27 Rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 20 r s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that wave activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 29 The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)			activated the		
26 Srv_serror_rate 27 Rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Diff_srv_rate Srv_serror_rate Srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)	25 50	rror roto	flag (4) s0, s1,	0	
connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (24) Rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in revivated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in sry_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)	23 36	iioi_iate	s2 or s3,	0	
aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) Rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in sry_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in sry_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)			among the		
26 Srv_serror_rate 27 Rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 28 Srv_rerror_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 29 Same_srv_rate 20 The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections that have activated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in gagregated in count (23)					
of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)			`		
26 Srv_serror_rate that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 27 Rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 28 Srv_rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 29 Same_srv_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
26 Srv_serror_rate activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in garden the connections aggregated in count (23)					
26 Srv_serror_rate flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 27 Rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 28 Srv_rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 28 Srv_rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 29 Same_srv_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services among the connections aggregated in services among the connections aggregated in services among the services among t					
27 Rerror_rate					
among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)	26 Sr	v_serror_rate		0	
connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23)					
27 Rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 28 Srv_rerror_rate The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) 29 Same_srv_rate The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) 29 The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)			_		
The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)			aggregated in		
of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)			srv_count (24)		
27 Rerror_rate that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in segregated in services, among the connections aggregated in segregated in services, among the connections aggregated in segregated in services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the serv					
27 Rerror_rate			l .		
27 Rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)		Rerror_rate			
among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)	27 D.			0	
connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in	2/ K6			0	
aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23)					
28 Srv_rerror_rate Count (23) The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in Countertons aggregated in Countertons aggregated in Countertons aggregated Countertons					
The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in			CC C		
28 Srv_rerror_rate that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
28 Srv_rerror_rate activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in			of connections		
Srv_rerror_rate flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in	• •				
connections aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among 1 the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in	28 Sr	v_rerror_rate		0	
aggregated in srv_count (24) The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Service, among the connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in services, among the connections aggregated in services aggregated					
The percentage of connections that were to the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Same_srv_rate Service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
Same_srv_rate the same service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
Same_srv_rate service, among the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in			that were to		
the connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
connections aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in	29 Sa	me_srv_rate	, ,	1	
aggregated in count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
count (23) The percentage of connections that were to different 30 Diff_srv_rate services, among the connections aggregated in					
The percentage of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
of connections that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
Diff_srv_rate that were to different services, among the connections aggregated in					
Diff_srv_rate different services, among the connections aggregated in					
among the connections aggregated in			different		
connections aggregated in	30 Di	ff_srv_rate	services,	0	
aggregated in					
Leount (72)					
Count (23)	l l		count (23)	1	



31	Srv_diff_host_ rate	The percentage of connections that were to different destination machines among the connections aggregated in srv_count (24)	0
----	------------------------	--	---

TABLE V: HOST BASED TRAFFIC FEATURES IN A NETWORK CONNECTION VECTOR

A 44m214	CONNECTI	ON VECTOR	Cow1-	
Attribut e	Attribute Name	Description	Sample Data	
No.		Number of		
		Number of connections	ĺ	
	Dst host coun	having the		
32	t Dst_liost_couli	same	150	
		destination		
		host IP address		
		Number of		
	Dat hant am	connections		
33	Dst_host_srv_ count	having the	25	
	Count	same port		
		number		
		The percentage		
		of connections		
		that were to the		
2.4	Dst host same	same service,	0.17	
34	_srv_rate	among the	0.17	
		connections		
		aggregated in dst_host_count		
		(32)		
		The percentage		
		of connections		
		that were to		
		different		
25	Dst_host_diff_	services,	0.02	
35	srv_rate	among the	0.03	
	_	connections		
		aggregated in		
		dst_host_count		
		(32)		
		The percentage		
		of connections		
		that were to the		
	Dst host same	same source		
36	_src_port_rate	port, among the	0.17	
	_5.6_5511_1416	connections		
		aggregated in		
		dst_host_srv_c		
		ount (33)		
		The percentage		
		of connections		
		that were to		
		different		
37	Dst_host_srv_	destination	0	
5,	diff_host_rate	machines,	-	
		among the		
		connections		
		aggregated in		
		dst_host_srv_c		

		ount (33)	
38	Dst_host_serro r_rate	The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in dst_host_count (32)	0
39	Dst_host_srv_s error_rate	The percent of connections that have activated the flag (4) s0, s1, s2 or s3, among the connections aggregated in dst_host_srv_c ount (33)	0
40	Dst_host_rerro r_rate	The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in dst_host_count (32)	0.05
41	Dst_host_srv_r error_rate	The percentage of connections that have activated the flag (4) REJ, among the connections aggregated in dst_host_srv_c ount (33)	0

The attack classes present in the NSL-KDD data set are grouped into four categories [5][9]:

- 1. DOS: Denial of service is an attack category, which depletes the victim's resources thereby making it unable to handle legitimate requests e.g. syn flooding. Relevant features: "source bytes" and "percentage of packets with errors"
- Probing: Surveillance and other probing attack's objective is to gain information about the remote victim e.g. port scanning. Relevant features: "duration of connection" and "source bytes"
- 3. U2R: unauthorized access to local super user (root) privileges is an attack type, by which an attacker uses a normal account to login into a victim system and tries to gain root/administrator privileges by exploiting some vulnerability in the victim e.g. buffer overflow attacks. Relevant features: "number of file creations" and "number of shell prompts invoked,"



4. R2L: unauthorized access from a remote machine, the attacker intrudes into a remote machine and gains local access of the victim machine. E.g. password guessing Relevant features: Network level features – "duration of connection" and "service requested" and host level features – "number of failed login attempts"

TABLE VI: ATTRIBUTE VALUE TYPE

Type	Features
Nominal	Protocol_type(2), Service(3), Flag(4)
Binary	Land(7), logged_in(12), root_shell(14), su_attempted(15), is_host_login(21),, is_guest_login(22)
umeric	Duration(1), src_bytes(5), dst_bytes(6), wrong_fragment(8), urgent(9), hot(10), num_failed_logins(11), num_compromised(13), num_root(16), num_file_creations(17), num_shells(18), num_access_files(19), num_outbound_cmds(20), count(23) srv_count(24), serror_rate(25), srv_serror_rate(26), rerror_rate(27), srv_rerror_rate(28), same_srv_rate(29) diff_srv_rate(30), srv_diff_host_rate(31), dst_host_sount(32), dst_host_srv_count(33), dst_host_same_srv_rate(34), dst_host_diff_srv_rate(35), dst_host_srv_diff_host_rate(37), dst_host_srv_diff_host_rate(37), dst_host_srv_serror_rate(38), dst_host_srv_serror_rate(39), dst_host_rerror_rate(40), dst_host_srv_rerror_rate(41)

The specific types of attacks are classified into four major categories. The table VII shows this detail.

TABLE VII : MAPPING OF ATTACK CLASS WITH ATTACK TYPE

Attack Class	Attack Type			
DoS	Back, Land, Neptune, Pod, Smurf, Teardrop, Apache 2, Udpstorm, Processtable, Worm (10)			
Probe	Satan, Ipsweep, Nmap, Portsweep, Mscan, Saint (6)			
R2L	Guess_Password, Ftp_write, Imap, Phf, Multihop, Warezmaster, Warezclient, Spy, Xlock, Xsnoop, Snmpguess, Snmpgetattack, Httptunnel, Sendmail, Named (16)			
U2R	Buffer_overflow, Loadmodule, Rootkit, Perl, Sqlattack, Xterm, Ps (7)			

The Table VIII shows the distribution of the normal and attack records available in the various NSL-KDD datasets.

TABLE VIII: DETAILS OF NORMAL AND ATTACK DATA IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF NSL-KDD DATA SET

ъ.	Total No. of					
Data Set Type	Reco rds	Norm al Class	Do S Cla ss	Probe Class	U2R Class	R2L Class
KDD	2510	13449	923 4	2289	11	209
Train+ 20%	2519	53.39 %	36. 65 %	9.09%	0.04 %	0.83 %
KDD	1259	67343	459 27	11656	52	995
Train+	73	53.46 %	36. 46	9.25%	0.04	0.79 %
KDD	2254	9711	745 8	2421	200	2754
KDD Test+	4	43.08	33. 08 %	10.74 %	0.89 %	12.22

Figure 1 clearly exhibits the count of normal and various attack class records in the different train and test NSL-KDD data sets.




Fig 1. Network vector distribution in various NSL-KDD train and test data set

Further analysis of the KDDTrain+ data set has exposed one of the very important facts about the attack class network vectors as shown in Table IX.

From the Figure2, it is apparent that most of the attacks launched by the attackers use the TCP protocol suite. The transparency and ease of use of the TCP protocol is exploited by attackers to launch network based attacks on the victim computers.



TABLE IX: PROTOCOLS USED BY VARIOUS ATTACKS

Attack Class Protocol	DoS	Probe	R2L	U2R
ТСР	42188	5857	995	49
UDP	892	1664	0	3
ICMP	2847	4135	0	0




Fig2 . Protocol-wise attacks in the KDDTrain+ data set

IV. CLASSIFICATION TECHNIQUES

Classification is a data mining method of assigning data instances in to one among the few categories. There are many classification algorithms developed to outperform one another. They all work based on mathematical techniques like decision tree, linear programming and neural networks. These techniques analyze the available data in a several ways to make its prediction.

Decision Tree: This technique divides the classification problem in to sub-problems. It builds a decision tree which in turn is used to develop a model that is used for the classification purpose.

Neural Networks: It is a collection of statistical learning models motivated by biological neural networks which are used to estimate or approximate functions that usually depend on a large amount of training data

Nearest Neighbour: This method saves all classes supplied to it by means of training data set and classifies new classes based on a similarity measure.

All the methods discussed are known for their salient features and inherent drawbacks. Decision tree takes time to build the tree. Nearest Neighbour method is considerably time consuming when the size of the data set grows. Neural network works best only on numerical data, which requires conversion of the textual data in the data set to a numerical value.

The drawbacks mentioned in the above methods give rise to an idea of going for a hybridized approach involving some optimization technique. Hybridization should consider only the salient features of the existing algorithm that could work well in the problem domain and with the available data set.

A good collection of classification algorithm with proven results are C4.5, K-Means Algorithm, Support

Vector Machines (SVM), Apriori Algorithm, PageRank, AdaBoost, K-Nearest Neighbor and Naïve Bayes in existence[10].

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULT AND ANALYSIS

This section deals about the experiment setup and result analysis

A. Experiment Setup

Many standard data mining process such as data cleaning and pre-processing, clustering, classification, regression, visualization and feature selection are already implemented in WEKA. The automated data mining tool WEKA is used to perform the classification experiments on the 20% NSL-KDD dataset. The data set consists of various classes of attacks namely DoS, R2L, U2R and Probe.

B. Pre-processing, Feature Selection and Classification

The data set to be classified is initially pre-processed and normalized to a range 0 -1. This is done as a requirement because certain classifiers produce a better accuracy rate on normalized data set. Correlation based Feature Selection method is used in this work to reduce the dimensionality of the features available in the data set from 41 to 6. Classification is done in this work by using J48, SVM and Naïve Bayes algorithms

C. Result Analysis

The experiments are carried out in WEKA and effectiveness of the classification algorithms in classifying the NSL-KDD data set is analyzed. The accuracy rate in detecting normal and attack class of network connection is shown in the table VI. This shows that when CFS is used for dimensionality reduction, J48 classifies the data set with a better accuracy rate.

TABLE X: ACCURACY IN DETECTION OF NORMAL AND ATTACK NETWORK FLOWS BY USING THE J48, SVM AND NAÏVE BAYES CLASSIFIERS

Classification	Class	Test Accuracy	
Algorithm	Name	with 6 features	
	Normal	99.8	
	DoS	99.1	
J48	Probe	98.9	
	U2R	98.7	
	R2L	97.9	
	Normal	98.8	
	DoS	98.7	
SVM	Probe	91.4	
	U2R	94.6	
	R2L	92.5	
	Normal	74.9	
	DoS	75.2	
Naïve Bayes	Probe	74.1	
	U2R	72.3	
	R2L	701.1	

The protocol-wise distribution of normal and attack records in the various versions of the NSL-KDD data set is listed in the table VII



TABLE XI: PROTOCOL-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF DATA IN THE NSL-KDD DATA SET

Data Set	ТСР	UDP	ICMP
KDDTrain+20%	20526	3011	1655
KDDTrain+	102689	14993	8291
KDDTest+	18880	2621	1043

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

The analysis results on the NSL-KDD dataset show that it is a best candidate data set to simulate and test the performance of IDS. The CFS method for dimensionality reduction reduces the detection time and increase the accuracy rate. This analysis conducted on the NSL-KDD dataset with the help of figures and tables helps the researcher to have clear understanding of the dataset. It also brings to light that most of the attacks are launched using the inherent drawbacks of the TCP protocol.

In future, it is proposed to conduct an exploration on the possibility of employing optimizing techniques to develop an intrusion detection model having a better accuracy rate.

REFERENCES

- Aleksandar Lazarevic, Levent Ertoz, Vipin Kumar, Aysel Ozgur, Jaideep Srivastava, "A Comparative Study of Anomaly Detection Schemes in Network Intrusion Detection"
- [2] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Data_mining
- [3] http://nsl.cs.unb.ca/NSL-KDD/
- [4] http://www.cs.waikato.ac.nz/ml/weka/
- [5] Mahbod Tavallaee, Ebrahim Bagheri, Wei Lu, and Ali A. Ghorbani "A Detailed Analysis of the KDD CUP 99 Data Set", Proceedings of the 2009 IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence in Security and Defense Applications (CISDA 2009)
- [6] S. Revathi, Dr. A. Malathi, "A Detailed Analysis on NSL-KDD Dataset Using Various Machine Learning Techniques for Intrusion Detection", International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT), ISSN: 2278-0181, Vol. 2 Issue 12, December 2013
- [7] Vipin Kumar, Himadri Chauhan, Dheeraj Panwar, "K-Means Clustering Approach to Analyze NSL-KDD Intrusion Detection Dataset", International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE) ISSN: 2231-2307, Volume-3, Issue-4, September 2013
- [8] Santosh Kumar Sahu Sauravranjan Sarangi Sanjaya Kumar Jena, " A Detail Analysis on Intrusion Detection Datasets", 2014 IEEE International Advance Computing Conference (IACC)
- [9] Sapna S. Kaushik, Dr. Prof.P.R.Deshmukh," Detection of Attacks in an Intrusion Detection System", International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technologies, Vol. 2 (3), 2011, 982-986
- [10] XindongWu · Vipin Kumar · J. Ross Quinlan · Joydeep Ghosh · Qiang Yang · Hiroshi Motoda · Geoffrey J. McLachlan · Angus Ng · Bing Liu · Philip S. Yu · Zhi-Hua Zhou · Michael Steinbach · David J. Hand · Dan Steinberg, "Top 10 algorithms in data mining", Knowledge and Information Systems Journal, Springer-Verlag London, vol. 14, Issue 1, pp. 1-37, 2007.