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Performance Breakthroughs with Programmable Switches

- Line-speed packet processing at Tbps
- Fully programmable in the P4 language
- Recent focus of HW manufacturers

New opportunities for network security
Securing High-Speed Networks

Programmable switches are used to:

- Obfuscate Network Topologies [NetHide, SEC’18]
- Filter spoofed IP traffic [NetHCF, ICNP’19]
- Mitigate DDoS attacks [Poseidon, NDSS’20]
- Thwart network covert channels [NetWarden, SEC’20]

Line-speed packet processing
Highly efficient

Fine-tuned for specific application domain
There are Other Prominent ML-based Security Applications

- Botnet Detection
- Website Fingerprinting
- IoT Behavioral Analysis
- Detection of Covert Channels

**Statistical Traffic Analysis**
- Packet lengths
- Packets inter-arrival time
- + ML-based classifier

**Generic approach towards detecting multiple attacks**
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Collecting Packet Distributions in Programmable Switches is Hard

- **Stateful memory is severely limited**
  - ~100 MB SRAM
  - No memory for storing many flows

- **Packets must be processed at line speed (< a few tens of ns)**
  - Limited number of operations
  - Reduced [domain-specific] instruction set

RQ: Can we collect packet distributions within programmable switches in an efficient way to support generic ML-based security tasks?
FlowLens Architecture

- Profiling
- Classification
- Compression of packet distributions

- Client
  - Training Dataset
  - Profile
  - Classification Results

- Profiler Server
  - Classifier
  - Automatic Profiler
    - Model
    - FMA Parameters: QL=4, TL=10

- Switch
  - Collector
  - Classifier
  - FMA
    - P4 Program

- Network
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**FlowLens**: a Flow Classification System for Generic ML-based Security Applications

- **Flow markers**: Compact representation of packet distributions
- **Flow marker accumulator**: HW implementation of flow marker collection
- **Automatic profiling**: Application-tailored configuration of flow markers
- **Evaluation**: Tested for 3 different security tasks
Implementation and Evaluation Challenges

1. Mismatch between software emulator testbed and hardware
2. Standardization of heterogeneous ML-based security tasks
3. Shortage of convenient means for testing traffic analysis frameworks
Implementation and Evaluation Challenges

1. **Mismatch between software emulator testbed and hardware**

2. **Standardization of heterogeneous ML-based security tasks**

3. **Shortage of convenient means for testing traffic analysis frameworks**
Implementation of the Flow Marker Accumulator
Typical Workflow for a Newbie in P4

1. Implementation in a software simulator
   - Environment: bmv2 P4-reference software switch
     - Open-source
     - Very flexible target architecture
     - Perfect for prototyping
   - Required software: P4 Tutorial VirtualBox image

2. Implementation in physical switching hardware
   - Environment: Barefoot Tofino ASIC
     - Proprietary SDE and documentation
     - Target-specific constraints
     - Real production networks
   - Required software: Intel P4 Studio SDE
How does a Programmable Switch Look Like?  
Protocol-Independent Switch Architecture (PISA)

- **Programmable packet parsing**
- **Match-action tables**
  - Arranged in stages
  - Match some packet field
  - Change packet headers or metadata

![Diagram](image)

**Feed-forward pipeline**

Sequential computations unrolled across stages

Resources are local to each stage
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What does it Take to Compress Packet Distributions Efficiently?

- **Produce flow markers with two operators**
  - Quantization
  - Truncation

How did we implement these operators?

---

**Raw packet size distribution**

**Quantized distribution**

\[ QL = 4 \ (2^4 \times \text{compression}) \]

**Truncated distribution**

Top-10 bins
Performing Quantization in the P4 bmv2 Behavioral Simulator

- packet size = 64
- FlowID = <162.2.13.42, 6901, 147.6.54.129, 3478, 17>
- Index = 2

**Stage 1**
- track_flow_1 QL = 5
  - 3 15 3 11 1 11 1 1
  - 0 1 0 0 0 0

**Stage 2**
- track_flow_2 QL = 5
  - 3 15 3 11 1 11 1 1
  - 0 1 0 0 0 0

**Stage 3**
- track_flow_3 QL = 5
  - 3 14 5 11 3 11 1 13 4 10

**Goal:** Leverage as much memory as possible to store flow markers

**Develop single action to:**
- a) Quantize packet size;
- b) Compute reg. grid index;
- c) Increment register cell

Unfortunately...

This does not work in hardware!

This action includes too much complexity for one stage
Performing Quantization in the P4 bmv2 Behavioral Simulator

- packet size = 64
- FlowID = <162.2.13.42, 6901, 147.6.54.129, 3478, 17>
- Index = 2

**Goal:** Leverage as much memory as possible to store flow markers

**Develop single action to:**
- a) Quantize packet size;
- b) Compute reg. grid index;
- c) Increment register cell

```c
action track_flow_1(bit<32> action_index, bit<32> flow_index) {
    bit<32> value;
    bit<32> binIndex = standard_metadata.packet_length >> binWidthShifts;
    a) bit<32> reg_grid_pos = flow_index << 6;
    b) reg_grid_pos = reg_grid_pos + (flow_index << 4);
    c) reg_grid_pos = reg_grid_pos + (flow_index << 3);
    reg_grid_pos = reg_grid_pos + (flow_index << 2);
    reg_grid_pos = reg_grid_pos + (flow_index << 1);
    reg_grid_pos = reg_grid_pos + binIndex;
    reg_grid0.read(value, reg_grid_pos);
    value = (action_index == 1) ? value+1 : value;
    reg_grid0.write(reg_grid_pos, value);
}
```
Restructuring the Quantization Code for the Physical Hardware

packet size = 64
FlowID = <162.2.13.42, 6901, 147.6.54.129, 3478, 17>

Split computation among different stages:
**Stage 1:** Quantize packet size;
**Stage 2:** Compute register grid index;
**Stage 3:** Increment register cell

Trade-off:
Action complexity vs Usable memory

Dependency on computations leads to some memory waste
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New Version of Quantization Performs Only Simple Actions in Each Stage

**Stage 1:**
```
action quantization_act()
{
    meta.binIndex = (bit<32>)
    (standard_metadata.packet_length >> BIN_WIDTH_SHIFT);
}
```

**Stage x:**
```
action set_flow_data(bit<32> flow_offset) {
    meta.rg_cell_offset = flow_offset + meta.binIndex;
}
```

**Stage x+1:**
```
action reg_grid0_action() {
    bit<16> value;
    reg_grid0.read(value, meta.rg_cell_offset);
    value = value + 1;
    reg_grid0.write(meta.rg_cell_offset, value);
}
```

Quantize packet size

Compute register grid index to increment

Increment register cell

How can we implement truncation?
Bins to Truncate are Selected in an Offline Fashion

Recall...

Quantized distribution
\( QL = 4 \) \( (2^4 \times \text{compression}) \)

Truncated distribution
Top-10 bins

Table-assisted truncation design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quant. packet size</th>
<th>Truncated bin offset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table defined in the control plane
Match on quantized packets of interest
Truncation Requires Only an Additional Pipeline Stage

packet size = 512
FlowID = <162.2.13.42, 6901, 147.6.54.129, 3478, 17>

Use an additional stage to:
Stage 2: Truncate quantized packet size;

Modify further stages to:
Stage 4: Compute register grid index;

Register cell increment is conditional:
Now depends on truncation operation
What did we Learn?
(The hard way)

- **Keep it simple!**
  - Very limited computation per-stage
  - Offload complex computations to the control plane as much as possible

- **Know the layout of your switch's pipeline!**
  - Physical vs logical memory layout (split memory and indexing across stages)

---

**Know the primitives and restrictions of your hardware before you start developing**

- Create your system to respect HW primitives & restrictions
  - But don’t base your whole design on those

- Abstract system design beyond HW restrictions
  - Your system may be adaptable to multiple HW targets
Discussion

- Have you developed P4 code for other security applications?
- Have you tested your P4 code in other emulators?
- Have you deployed P4 code in the Tofino? What difficulties did you face?
- Besides Tofino, have you developed for any other hardware target?  
  ○ like Smart NICs
- Have you implemented some other kind of ML-based framework in programmable switches?
- What kind of data structures have you implemented?
Implementation and Evaluation Challenges

1. Mismatch between software emulator testbed and hardware

2. **Standardization of heterogeneous ML-based security tasks**

3. Shortage of convenient means for testing traffic analysis frameworks
We Need Multiple ML-based Security Applications to Evaluate our (Purposely) Generic System

- Can we find suitable application scenarios?
- How can we map the classification workflows of such applications to use flow markers?
ML-based Security Tasks

- **Detection of Covert Channels**

- **Website Fingerprinting**
  - *Website fingerprinting: attacking popular privacy enhancing technologies with the multinomial naïve-bayes classifier*. Herrmann et al., CCS Workshops, 2009

- **Detection of Botnet Traffic**
Datasets and Classifiers

- **Detection of Covert Channels**
  - Packet traces of Skype flows
  - XGBoost

- **Website Fingerprinting**
  - Packet lengths records of websites browsed over OpenSSH
  - Multinomial naive-Bayes

- **Detection of Botnet Traffic**
  - Packet traces of P2P & botnet traffic (Zeus, Storm, Waledac)
  - Random Forest
Experimental Artifacts

- **Detection of Covert Channels**
  - Code on GitHub
  - Dataset hosted on authors’ webpage

- **Website Fingerprinting**
  - No code, but good guidelines to reproduce testbed
  - Dataset hosted on authors’ webpage

- **Detection of Botnet Traffic**
  - Code on GitHub
  - Dataset hosted on authors’ webpage
Required Software Packages

- **Detection of Covert Channels**
  - Python’s `sklearn` and `xgboost`

- **Website Fingerprinting**
  - `weka` (+ classifier-specific plugin)

- **Detection of Botnet Traffic**
  - Python’s `sklearn`
How Hard was it to Reproduce the Original Results?

- **Scenario 1** [Covert Channel detection]
  - Easy to replicate
  - Code allowed for obtaining the numbers reported in the paper

- **Scenario 2** [Website Fingerprinting]
  - Easy to replicate

- **Scenario 3** [Botnet Detection]
  - Missing details about exact dataset composition
  - Slight mismatch between obtained numbers vs the paper
What Challenges are Involved in Adapting the Classification Process to Work with FlowLens?

- Adaptation of the training and classification workflow
- Apples-to-apples comparison with original work
- Deal with corner cases
How can we Adapt the Training and Classification Workflow to Use FlowLens? (I)

**a) Quantization**

1. Build models for each quantization level (QL)
2. Check feature importance for each model

**b) Truncation**

3. Build models for each QL and top-N truncation
   
   *e.g., QL = 5, top-N = 10*
How can we Adapt the Training and Classification Workflow to Use FlowLens? (II)

c) Test Flow Marker-enabled model

4. Obtain output of each model

We respect original paper’s performance metrics

In general, **Accuracy**
Is it Possible to Perform an Apples-to-apples Comparison with Original Results?

- **Not really...**
  - Adaptation to FlowLens changes dataset composition
  - Model training is different (holdout vs cross-validation)

- **But it is fine!**
  - We just want to measure accuracy w.r.t. flow marker size
We can Compare the Accuracy Obtained with Flow Markers vs Full Information

e.g., Website Fingerprinting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Bins</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>375</th>
<th>188</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory (B)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Bins</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>375</th>
<th>188</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory (B)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full information = 3000B
97% accuracy

Quant (QL=5) = 94B
95% accuracy

Diogo Barradas - LASER Workshop
Many ML-based security scenarios could use FlowLens!
- Widespread dependency on the analysis of packet length distributions
- Unfortunately, many authors only make available pre-processed features

Application scenarios can be adapted despite heterogeneity!
- We can reproduce 3rd party results after modification (training / classification)
- Possible to apply truncation (with slight adjustments in WF)

The heterogeneity of ML scenarios does not prevent experimentation
- ML-based scenarios can be adapted to work in a uniform classification framework like FlowLens, despite relying on different classification processes / datasets
- Make full packet traces available to provide richer datasets
Discussion

- Do you have a “killer app” for FlowLens that you’d like to share?
  - Would flow markers make that task harder for any specific reason?

- Are you involved in some project that requires the adaptation of ML classification frameworks?
  - What do you adapt? Training process? Dataset composition?
  - Did you adapt something but got bad results?

- Do you have any idea for an alternative profiling step for FlowLens?
Implementation and Evaluation Challenges

1. Mismatch between software emulator testbed and hardware
2. Standardization of heterogeneous ML-based security tasks
3. Shortage of convenient means for testing traffic analysis frameworks
How can we Compare the Scalability Gains Offered by FlowLens with Other Approaches?

- We compress packet distributions through the creation of flow markers

How good are flow markers vs. other compression approaches?

How good is FlowLens vs. packet aggregation approaches?
Comparing the Use of Flow Markers with Other Packet Distribution Compression Approaches

- **Online Sketching**
  - *Online sketching of network flows for real-time stepping-stone detection.* Coskun et al., ACSAC, 2009

- **Compressive Traffic Analysis**

No source code available...

... even upon request

Re-implementation
Comparing FlowLens with Alternative Packet Aggregation Approaches

● *Flow
  ○ Scaling Hardware Accelerated Network Monitoring to Concurrent and Dynamic Queries With *Flow. Sonchack et al., USENIX ATC 2018

Opaque target-specific instructions
No end-to-end testbed at the “press of a button”

Analytical Estimation of Required Bandwidth
What did we Learn?
(The hard way)

- **Re-implementation is oftentimes required!**
  - Represents *extra effort*
  - May *fail to respect original implementation decisions* (not always obvious)

- **Traffic analysis tooling can be difficult to test!**
  - Hard to experiment with P4 traffic analysis frameworks
  - Programmable switching testbeds are *expensive* ($$$$)

There is a lack of reproducible experimental testbeds

- Make your code available and provide documentation
- Provide convenient end-to-end experimental testbeds
Discussion

● What hurdles did you face when using 3rd party experimental testbeds?

● Have you tested your own P4 programs in a distributed setting?
  ○ Did you experiment on emulators only?
  ○ Did you experiment in software switches?
  ○ Did you experiment in a distributed physical switch infrastructure?

Like a Tofino-powered PlanetLab?
Our Experimentation Artifacts are Publicly Available

- P4 implementation of Flow Marker Accumulator
- Testbed for flow marker-enabled classification
  - Includes adaptations for the 3 ML-based tasks covered in this talk

Code available in Github!
https://github.com/dmbb/flowlens
Next Steps and Plans for Workshop Paper

- Design end-to-end FlowLens test platform in P4 Tutorial VM
  - How cool would it be to replay your own traces through FlowLens?
- Look towards future developments on distributed testbeds
  - What if you could experiment with multiple vantage points enabled with programmable switching devices?
- Compile lessons learned - bmv2 vs Hardware
  - We hit our own heads on the wall so you don’t have to :)

https://web.ist.utl.pt/diogo.barradas
Can we Truncate when Classifiers do not Output Feature Importance?

- **We found a corner case**
  - The multinomial Naive-Bayes classifier does not output feature importance
  - Can we still apply truncation?

- **Insight**
  - Accesses to different websites generate different packet length signatures
  - Weed out bins that never show up on the distribution of a target website

---

**For amazon.com:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Bins</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>375</th>
<th>188</th>
<th>940</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Bins (After Truncation)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant space savings for QL={0,2,3}