

Secure IP Address Allocation at Cloud Scale

Eric Pauley, Kyle Domico, Blaine Hoak, Ryan Sheatsley, Quinn Burke, Yohan Beugin, Engin Kirda, Patrick McDaniel





Intended use: routing traffic between network endpoints

- Map to physical infrastructure
- Owned by organizations
- Long-lived associations



In Practice: Security Enforcement

- Firewall rules
- Routing sensitive data
- TLS certificate issuance (E.g., LetsEncrypt)
- Email server reputation



Result IPs as *security principals*

- Address control is short-lived
- Elasticity enables attackers to control many addresses
- Benign tenant has *temporal locality* with adversary
 - Next tenant could be adversarial
 - Attacker controlled address previously



- Problem 1: Cloud tenants use IP addresses as a *security principal*
 - Explicitly (security groups) or...





- Problem 1: Cloud tenants use IP addresses as a *security principal*
 - Explicitly (security groups) or...
 - Implicitly (DNS records)

Result: exploitation by next tenant





- Problem 1: Cloud tenants use IP addresses as a *security principal*
 - Explicitly (security groups) or...
 - Implicitly (DNS records)

Result: exploitation by next tenant

- Problem 2: Cloud tenants are harmed by previous IP owners
 - Poor address reputation or...





- Problem 1: Cloud tenants use IP addresses as a *security principal*
 - Explicitly (security groups) or...
 - Implicitly (DNS records)

Result: exploitation by next tenant

- Problem 2: Cloud tenants are harmed by previous IP owners
 - Poor address reputation or...
 - Unwanted/attack traffic Result: harmed by previous tenant





 Problem 1: Cloud tenants use IP Retrospective Prospective addresses as a security principal **BT1** Server utation • Explicitly (security groups) or... Implicitly (DNC Result: ex **Common Factor:** ersary Tenant **Benign Tenant 2** 92.0.2.1 192.0.2.1 Adversaries Scanning the IP Pool Release • Problem 2: harmed by phenode in onner Poor address reputation or... Configuration Unwanted/attack traffic Result: harmed by previous tenant

Client



Zone	Servers	Unique IPs	Estimated IPs	Capture Rate
us-east-1a	$581\mathrm{k}$	$383\mathrm{k}$	$789\mathrm{k}$	49%
us-east-1b	$607\mathrm{k}$	$389\mathrm{k}$	$762\mathrm{k}$	51%
us-east-1c	$630\mathrm{k}$	$236\mathrm{k}$	$313\mathrm{k}$	76~%
us-east-1d	$573\mathrm{k}$	$360\mathrm{k}$	$700\mathrm{k}$	51%
us-east-1f	$647\mathrm{k}$	$171\mathrm{k}$	$198\mathrm{k}$	87%
Total	$3039\mathrm{k}$	$1540\mathrm{k}$	$2762\mathrm{k}$	56~%

Random IP address allocation makes pool scanning trivial.

- Goal: Design new allocation *policies* that:
 - 1. Prevent adversaries from allocating many IPs
 - 2. Separate adversaries *spatially* and *temporally*
- Challenges:
 - 1. Adversaries are unknown (must infer from behavior)
 - 2. Policies cannot harm benign tenants



Key EIPSIM Features:

- Modular Allocation Policies
- Real & Simulated Traces
- Fine-grained Metrics
- Adversarial Simulation





Idea: released IPs are tagged with the tenant's account ID

- Allocations prefer available IPs tagged to that tenant
- Otherwise: LRU allocation



Idea: released IPs are tagged with the tenant's account ID

- Allocations prefer available IPs tagged to that tenant
- Otherwise: LRU allocation



Idea: released IPs are tagged with the tenant's account ID

- Allocations prefer available IPs tagged to that tenant
- Otherwise: LRU allocation

Problem: Relies on adversaries using one cloud account





- Prefer allocating the same IPs to these tenants
- Based on allocation duration (shorter is adversarial)





- Prefer allocating the same IPs to these tenants
- Based on allocation duration (shorter is adversarial)





- Prefer allocating the same IPs to these tenants
- Based on allocation duration (shorter is adversarial)





- Prefer allocating the same IPs to these tenants
- Based on allocation duration (shorter is adversarial)





- Prefer allocating the same IPs to these tenants
- Based on allocation duration (shorter is adversarial)



success (worst-case)







84% reduction in adversary success (worst-case)



# IPs	Runtime	Speedup	Allocations	Allocs/s
100	$500\mathrm{ms}$	$17\mathrm{M}$	$4.2\mathrm{k}$	8.3 k
$1\mathrm{k}$	$530\mathrm{ms}$	$16\mathrm{M}$	$26\mathrm{k}$	$48\mathrm{k}$
$10\mathrm{k}$	$2\mathrm{s}$	$4.3\mathrm{M}$	$220\mathrm{k}$	$110\mathrm{k}$
$100\mathrm{k}$	$14\mathrm{s}$	$630\mathrm{k}$	$2.2\mathrm{M}$	$160\mathrm{k}$
$1\mathrm{M}$	$187\mathrm{s}$	$46\mathrm{k}$	$22\mathrm{M}$	$120\mathrm{k}$
$10\mathrm{M}$	$2.3\mathrm{ks}$	$3.8\mathrm{k}$	$220\mathrm{M}$	$97\mathrm{k}$





Real-world allocations via Google clusterdata-2019 dataset



- Random --- LRU ····· Tagged --- Segmented

Now what?



Cloud Providers	Adopt new IP allocation policies to protect customers
Cloud Customers	Avoid public IP addresses for access control (use TLS, IAM, private networks)
Security Researchers	Embrace simulation using synthetic and real- world data for evaluation of secure systems
CS Departments	Hire me!





pauley.me/eipsim

