

Memory efficient distributed sliding super point cardinality estimation by GPU

Jie Xu

School of computer science and engineer, Southeast university
Nanjing, China
xujieip@163.com

ABSTRACT

Super point is a kind of special host in the network which contacts with huge of other hosts. Estimating its cardinality, the number of other hosts contacting with it, plays important roles in network management. But all of existing works focus on discrete time window super point cardinality estimation which has great latency and ignores many measuring periods. Sliding time window measures super point cardinality in a finer granularity than that of discrete time window but also more complex. This paper firstly introduces an algorithm to estimate super point cardinality under sliding time window from distributed edge routers. This algorithm's ability of sliding super point cardinality estimating comes from a novel method proposed in this paper which can record the time that a host appears. Based on this method, two sliding cardinality estimators, sliding rough estimator and sliding linear estimator, are devised for super points detection and their cardinalities estimation separately. When using these two estimators together, the algorithm consumes the smallest memory with the highest accuracy. This sliding super point cardinality algorithm can be deployed in distributed environment and acquire the global super points' cardinality by merging estimators of distributed nodes. Both of these estimators could process packets parallel which makes it become possible to deal with high speed network in real time by GPU. Experiments on a real world traffic show that this algorithm have the highest accuracy and the smallest memory comparing with others when running under discrete time window. Under sliding time window, this algorithm also has the same performance as under discrete time window.

KEYWORDS

Super point detection, cardinality estimation, GPU computing, distributed computing, network measurement

ACM Reference format:

Jie Xu. 2018. Memory efficient distributed sliding super point cardinality estimation by GPU. In *Proceedings of* , , 13 pages. DOI:

2018. .
DOI:

1 INTRODUCTION

In nowadays network, there are huge packets passing through Internet every second [1]. It is too expensive to measure every host in the network. An efficient way is to focus on special ones which have great influence on the network security and management. The super point, a host which communicates with lots of others, is one of such special hosts, such as Web servers, P2P spreaders, DDoS victims, scanners and so on. For a host, the number of other hosts communicating with it is called as its cardinality. Detecting super point and estimating its cardinality can help us with network management and security[2][3][4]. It is also a foundation module of many instruction detection system[5].

For example, DDoS (Distributed Denial of Service) attack is a heavy threat to the Internet[6][7]. It appears at the beginning of the Internet and becomes complex with the rapid growth of the network technology. Although many defense algorithms have been proposed, most of them are too elaborate to deploy on the high-speed network. The peculiarity of a victim under DDoS attack is that it will receive huge packets with different source IP addresses in a short period[8][9]. A DDoS victim is a typical super point[10].

Super point only accounts for a small fraction of the overall hosts. If we detect super points first and spend more monitoring resource to them, we can defense DDoS much more efficiently. Real-time super points detection on core network is an important step of these applications.

Many researchers try to use small and fast memory, such as static random accessing memory SRAM, to detect super point. These algorithms used estimating method to record hosts' cardinalities and restore super points at the end of a time period. But the accuracy of these algorithms will decrease with the reduction of memory. And their memory requirement grows rapidly with the number of the packets in a certain period.

At the same computing platform, estimation algorithms are faster than precise algorithm because hash table needs an additional operation to deal with collision problem. Most of the previous algorithms tried to accelerate the packets processing speed by using fast memory SRAM. But the small size SRAM limits the accuracy of these algorithms in a high-speed network. What's more, estimation algorithm requires

lots of computation operations and the computation ability of CPU is also the bottleneck. Parallel computation ability of GPU (Graphic Processing Unit) is stronger than that of CPU because of its plenty operating cores. When using GPU to scan packets parallel, we would get high throughput.

Super point detection has been researched for a long time because of its importance. And many excellent algorithms have been proposed recent years. But these algorithms only work for discrete time window, under which there is no duplicating time period between two adjacent windows. These algorithms will reinitialize at the beginning of every window and discard hosts' cardinality information in previous time. This time window splits host cardinality into discrete piece and can only report super points at the end of a window which has a latency of the size of time window. Sliding time window which moves a small unit smoothly has a better measurement result than discrete time window. It stores and updates host cardinality information incrementally. Sliding time window estimates super point cardinality more precisely because it is not affected by the starting of window. And sliding time window reports super point more timely for the sake that the moving unit time is much smaller than the size of discrete time window and at the end of each moving unit time, super point will be detected and reported once. But super point detection and cardinality estimation under sliding time window is more complex than that under discrete time window because it maintains hosts state for some previous time.

The speed of nowadays network is growing rapidly. For a core network, it always contains several border routers which locate at different places. How to detect overall super points and estimate their cardinalities from all of these distributed routers under sliding time window is more difficult than from a small single router.

To overcome previous algorithms weakness, we devise a novel distributed super points algorithm which can detect super points and estimate their cardinalities under sliding time window. This algorithm also consumes the smallest memory. When running on a low-cost GPU, our algorithm can deal with core network traffic in real time. The contributions of this paper are list following:

- (1) A distributed sliding super point detection algorithm is proposed.
- (2) A memory efficient distributed sliding super point cardinality estimation algorithm is devised.
- (3) Deploy the sliding super point detection and cardinality estimation algorithm on a common GPU to deal with core network in real time.

In the next section, we will introduce previous super point detection algorithm and analyze their merit and weakness. In section 3, a novel super point detection algorithm under sliding time window will be introduced together with how

to run on GPU. Section 4 describes how to estimate host's cardinality under sliding time window and how to deploy it on GPU. Section 5 shows experiments of real world core network traffic. And we make a conclusion in the last section.

2 RELATED WORK

High speed network super point detection has been researched for a long time. At first, sampling method was used to solve the problem of slow processing speed[11][12]. But sampling method affected the accuracy of these algorithm especially in the situation where a high sampling rate was adopted. Then many works tried to improve the processing speed by using high speed memory, such as CBF[13], DCDS[14], VBFA[15].

Chen et al. [13] proposed a contacting hosts estimator called counter bloom filter CBF based on the theorem of bloom filter. When a flow appears, several counters in CBF were added by one. A flow only updated CBF once. This algorithm had a high accuracy and speed when running with a single thread on SRAM. According to the statement of the authors, this algorithm could scan 2 million packets per second. But this speed was still too low for nowadays high speed network which forwards more than 6 million packets every second. And this algorithm couldn't work on parallel and distributed environment because a flow may update CBF many times in these cases.

Wang et al.[14] used linear estimator [16] to estimate hosts' cardinalities and proposed a novel structure called DCDS based on Chinese Remainder Theory(CRT) which can restore hosts directly. But CRT is so complex that it requires many computing resource and time. To overcome this weakness, Liu et al.[15] proposed a structure called VBF which was similar to a bloom filter. VBF regained hosts by bits comparing and concatenation, instead of by CRT. VBF had a much faster speed than DCDS because of its simple regain procedure. VBF used sub bits of IP address to map a host to several linear estimators. Sub bits can be acquired quickly but had little randomness which caused that most of linear estimators in VBF were not be used and memory was wasted.

Those algorithms only focused on how to speed up by reducing memory latency. They neglected the huge computing resource requirement. GPU can solve this two problems, high memory operation speed and plenty computing resource, all together.

GPU is the best desktop super computing platform which has the same computing ability as a small cluster. In a single GPU chip, hundreds or thousands of cores sharing a big global graphic memory. Different threads can read and store this memory parallel. Although a core in GPU is a little slower, lower frequency, than a core in CPU, the total computing ability of these hundreds of GPU cores is much stronger than that of a CPU which only have teens of cores at most. The convenient program environment, such as CUDA[17],

OpenCL[18], makes GPU becomes one of the most popular parallel computing platform.

GPU was firstly used to detect super points by Seon-Ho et al.[19]. They deployed a novel structure called virtual vector on GPU to estimate hosts' cardinalities. But virtual vector could only estimate contacting hosts number under discrete time window and super points could not be reconstructed from it directly.

None of these algorithms can estimate super points cardinalities under discrete time window. This paper will introduce a sliding super points detection algorithm and describe how to deploy it on GPU for real time distributed running.

3 SLIDING SUPER POINT DETECTION

3.1 Sliding super point

Suppose there are two networks $ANet$ and $BNet$. These two networks are contacting with each other through a set of edge routers ER . $ANet$ might be a city-wide network or even a country-wide network. And $BNet$ might be another city-wide network or the Internet. All traffic between $ANet$ and $BNet$ could be observed from ER . Split this traffic by successive time slices as shown in figure 1.




Figure 1: Sliding time window and discrete time window

These time slices have the same duration. The length of a time slice could be 1 second, 1 minute or any period in different situations. Every time slice is identified by a number. A sliding time window $W(t, k)$ contains k successive slices starting from the t time slice as shown in the top part of figure 1. Sliding time window will move forward one slice once a time. So two adjacent sliding time windows contain $k - 1$ same slices. When k is set to 1, there is no duplicate

time period between two adjacent windows, which is the case of discrete time window in the bottom part of figure 1.

Let $ANet$ be the network from which we want to detect super points. A host's packets stream in a sliding time window is defined as below.

Definition 3.1 (Packets stream of a host). For a host $aip \in ANet$, every packet passing through ER in sliding time window $W(t, k)$ which has aip as source or destination address composes packets stream of aip , written as $Pkt(aip, t, k)$.

aip 's opposite hosts stream $ST(aip, t, k)$ could be derived from $Pkt(aip, t, k)$ by extracting the other IP address except aip . A IP address bip may appear several times in $ST(aip, t, k)$ because aip can send several packets to bip or receive many packets from bip . Hosts in $ST(aip, t, k)$ make up of opposite hosts set of aip , written as $OH(aip, t, k)$. The number of element in $OH(aip, t, k)$, denoted as $|OH(aip, t, k)|$, is no bigger than that of $ST(aip, t, k)$. $|OH(aip, t, k)|$ is the cardinality of aip in sliding time window $W(t, k)$. Sliding super point is defined according to host's cardinality.

Definition 3.2 (Sliding super point). For a host $aip \in ANet$, if $|OH(aip, t, k)| \geq \theta$, aip is a sliding super point in sliding time window $W(t, k)$. Where θ is a positive integer.

When $k = 1$, sliding super point could be called as super point. Threshold θ is defined by users for different applications. It could be selected according to the average cardinality of all host in the past or the normal cardinality of a server. How to get $|OH(aip, t, k)|$ from $ST(aip, t, k)$ is a hard task. Because packets pass through ER with high speed and every packet could only be scanned a time in the stream. How to process every coming packet and give an accurate estimation of $|OH(aip, t, k)|$ at the end of the last time slice of $W(t, k)$ is the key step in the whole algorithm.

3.2 Detecting sliding super point with rough estimator

The key step of sliding super point detecting is to determine if a host is a super point in a sliding time window. Because discrete time window is a special case of sliding time window and working under discrete time window is much simpler than that under sliding time window, we firstly introduce how to judge super point under discrete time window and then give its sliding time window version.

For a host aip , the task of judging super point under discrete time window is to determine if $|OH(aip, t, 1)| \geq \theta$ by scanning every host in $ST(aip, t, 1)$ once. Rough estimator RE proposed in this paper is a memory efficient algorithm which can tell if a host is a super point in a time period with only 8 bits. These 8 bits are initialized to zero at the begin of a time period. RE samples and records hosts in $ST(aip, t, 1)$

by the least significant bits of their hashed values. Least significant bit of an integer is defined in the below.

Definition 3.3 (Least significant bit, LSB). Given an integer i , let $BIN(i)$ represent its binary formatter. The least significant bit of i , $LSB(i)$, is the index of the first ‘1’ bit of $BIN(i)$ starting from right.

For example, $LSB(3) = 0$, $LSB(40) = 3$. The binary formatters of 3 and 40 are “11” and “101000”. The first bit of $BIN(3)$ is ‘1’, so $LSB(3)$ equals to 0. While $BIN(40)$ meets its first ‘1’ until the fourth bit, so its LSB is 3. For every host bip in $OH(aip, t, 1)$, RE hashes it to a random value between 0 and $2^{32} - 1$ by a hash function H_1 [20]. If $LSB(H_1(bip))$ is smaller than an integer τ , this IP will not be recorded by RE where τ is derived from θ by equation 1.

$$\tau = \text{ceil}(\log_2(\theta/\eta)) \quad (1)$$

When $LSB(H_1(bip)) \geq \tau$, a bit selected by $H_2(bip)$ will be set where H_2 is another hash function mapping bip to a value between 0 and $\eta - 1$.

RE deals with every host in $ST(aip, t, 1)$ in this way. At the end of slice t , if the number of ‘1’ bits is no smaller than $\rho * \eta$, $|OH(aip, t, 1)|$ is judged as bigger than θ by RE , where $\rho = 0.99 * (1 - e^{-1/3})$. ρ is acquired from [21].

RE has a high probability to report a super point.

Suppose there are α hosts in $OH(aip, t, 1)$ updating RE . The probability that there are η_1 bits are set to 1 is :

$$Pr\{\alpha, \eta, \eta_1\} = \frac{FN(\alpha, \eta, \eta_1)}{\eta^\alpha} \quad (2)$$

Every host in $OH(aip, t, 1)$ has probability $\frac{1}{2^\tau}$ to update RE . So the probability that there are α hosts in $OH(aip, t, 1)$ updating RE is:

$$\begin{aligned} & Pr\{|OH(aip, t, 1)|, \alpha\} \\ &= C_{|OH(aip, t, 1)|}^\alpha * \left(\frac{1}{2^\tau}\right)^\alpha * \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^\tau}\right)^{|OH(aip, t, 1)| - \alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Combine equation 2 and 3, we will get the probability that there are η_1 ‘1’ bits in RE after scanning $ST(aip, t, 1)$ as shown in equation 4.

$$\begin{aligned} & Pr\{|OH(aip, t, 1)|, \eta, \tau, \eta_1\} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=\eta_1}^{|OH(aip, t, 1)|} Pr\{|OH(aip, t, 1)|, \alpha\} * Pr\{\alpha, \eta, \eta_1\} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The probability that there are more than η_1 ‘1’ bits in RE after scanning $ST(aip, t, 1)$ could be derived from 4 as shown

in equation 5.

$$\begin{aligned} & Pr^+\{|OH(aip, t, 1)|, \eta, \tau, \eta_1\} \\ &= \sum_{\eta_1=n}^{\eta} Pr\{|OH(aip, t, 1)|, \eta, \tau, \eta_1\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Equation 5 proofs that RE has a high probability to detect super point in discrete time window. There is only one time slice in $W(t, 1)$. So one bit is enough to represent if a host appears in this slice. But when $k > 1$, a single bit can’t know if some hosts still appear in $W(t + 1, k)$ when the window sliding from $W(t, k)$.

Unlike discrete version using η bits, RE sliding version SRE uses η short integers, where each short integer is unsigned short integer with 16 bits, to record host’s cardinality. SRE has five operations: initialization, hosts scanning, super point detection, slice updating, SRE s merging.

Before SRE launching, every short integer will be initialized to the biggest value 65535. Like RE , SRE scans every host in a time slice $t + k - 1$ by hashing the host, comparing the LSB of hashed value with τ . When the hashed value is no smaller than τ , an short integer will be selected and set to 0, unlike RE which sets a bit to 1. Let $SRE[i]$ point to the i th short integer in SRE . The weight of RE is the number of 1 bits in it. But the weight of SRE is the number of integer whose value is smaller than k , denoted as $|SRE|^k$. SRE will check aip at the end of time slice $t + k - 1$. It judges if aip is super point by comparing its weight $|SRE|^k$ with $\eta * \rho$ like RE . After checking aip , the window will slide to $W(t + 1, k)$. SRE will not initialize its short integers at the beginning of a new time slice. But every short integer will increment 1 before scanning new hosts in this time slice. A short integer in SRE records the distance between the nearest time slice when it is set and the scanning time slice. So when the window moves forward, the distance will grow too. If a short integer is mapped by some host in the time slice, the distance is 0. When merging two SRE s together, short integers in the new SRE will be selected from the biggest ones. Algorithm 1 and 2 describe the hosts scanning and SRE merging process.

There is no accessing conflict in SRE which means SRE could deal with several hosts parallel to speed up the process. SRE can determine if a host is super point in a window. But there are millions of hosts in $ANet$ for a high speed network. It’s too expensive and slow to allocate a SRE for every host in $ANet$. A smart structure based on SRE is devised to solve this problem. The new algorithm uses a fixed number of SRE s to record hosts and restore sliding super points at the end of a time slice as shown in the next part.

3.3 Running rough estimator on GPU

Many hosts in $ANet$ have a smaller cardinality. Allocating a SRE for every host will waste lots of memory and slow

Algorithm 1 Scan hosts

Input:

opposite host bip ,
Sliding rough estimator SRE

```

hbip <  $-H_1(bip)$ 
lsb <  $-LSB(hbip)$ 
if  $lsb < \tau$  then
  Return
end if
sInt <  $-H_2(bip)$ 
SRE[ $sInt$ ] <  $-0$ 
  
```

Algorithm 2 Merge sliding rough estimators

Input:

sliding rough estimator SRE_1, SRE_2

Output: merged sliding rough estimator SRE_3

```


Init  $SRE_3$ 
for  $sInt \in [0, \eta - 1]$  do
  if  $SRE_1[sInt] > SRE_2[sInt]$  then
     $SRE_3[sInt] < -SRE_1[sInt]$ 
  else
     $SRE_3[sInt] < -SRE_2[sInt]$ 
  end if
end for
Return  $SRE_3$ 
  
```

down hosts scanning speed. Based on SRE , a smart structure, called as reversible sliding rough estimator array RSRA, is proposed. RSRA contains 2^q columns and r rows of sliding rough estimators as shown in figure 2. Let $RSRA[i, j]$ point to the SRE in the i th row, j th column. This structure is reversible because sliding super point could be reconstructed from it without any other data. This reversible ability comes from a novel hash functions group, reversible hash functions group RHFG.

RHFG is an array of r hash functions, each of which hashes an IP address to a value between 0 and $2^q - 1$. Let $RHFG[i]$ represent the i th hash function. $RHFG[0]$ is a random hash function [22] which maps a IP address to an integer between 0 and $2^q - 1$, $0 \leq RHFG[0](aip) \leq 2^q - 1$ where $aip \in ANet$. The rest $r - 1$ hash functions are derived from $RHFG[0]$ according the following equation.

$$RHFG[i](aip) = ((aip \gg (i * \delta)) XOR RHFG[0](aip)) \bmod (2^q) \quad (6)$$

In equation 6, $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, $aip \in ANet$. δ is an positive integer that smaller than q and $(r - 2) * \delta + q \geq 32$. "XOR" is the bit wise exclusive or operation. ">>" is the bit wise


Figure 2: Reversible sliding rough estimator array

right shift operation. According to the property of "XOR", we can recover $(aip \gg (i * \delta)) \bmod (2^q)$ by equation 7.

$$(aip \gg (i * \delta)) \bmod (2^q) = RHFG[i](aip) XOR RHFG[0](aip) \quad (7)$$

$(aip \gg (i * \delta)) \bmod (2^q)$ is q successive bits of aip starting from $i * \delta$, written as $B(i)$. Because $(r - 2) * \delta + q \geq 32$, every bit in aip will appear in some $B(i)$ where $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$. For a host $aip \in ANet$, let $RHFG(aip)$ represent the array of r hashed values where $RHFG(aip) = \{RHFG[0](aip), RHFG[1](aip), \dots, RHFG[r - 1](aip)\}$. aip could be regained from $RHFG(aip)$ by extracting bits from $B(i)$.

$RHFG$ has high randomness and reversible ability. It is used to select r sliding rough estimators from each row of RSRA for every host in $ANet$. For a host aip in $ANet$, its r sliding rough estimators are denoted as $RSRA(aip) = \{RSRA[0, RHFG[0](aip)], RSRA[1, RHFG[1](aip)], \dots, RSRA[r - 1, RHFG[r - 1](aip)]\}$. A IP pair is a set of two IP addresses extracting from a packet where one address is in $ANet$ and the other is in $BNet$. When a IP pair comes, these r sliding rough estimators will be updated at the same time as shown in algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 describes how to update RSRA for a IP pair. But there are millions of IP pairs every second for example in a 40 Gb/s network. Dealing with these IP pairs one by one will consume much time for a single thread. In algorithm 3 only line 13 update memory while others are computing operations such as getting sliding estimator index in RSRA, calculating which distance recorder to be set. A distance recorder could be set to zero multi times which makes sure that there is no need to synchronize among memory access and several IP pairs could update RSRA at the same time.

Algorithm 3 Update RSRA

Input:

IP pair $\langle aip, bip \rangle$,
Reversible hash functions group $RHFG$,
Reversible sliding rough estimator array $RSRA$
 $hbip \leftarrow -H_1(bip)$
 $lsb \leftarrow -LSB(hbip)$
if $lsb < \tau$ **then**
 Return
end if
 $DRidx \leftarrow H_2(bip)$
for $i \in [0, r - 1]$ **do**
 $COLidx \leftarrow RHFG[i](aip)$
 $sre \leftarrow RSRA[i, COLidx]$
 $sre[DRidx] \leftarrow 0$
end for

Nowadays CPU contains several cores, from 2 to 22 or more such as Intel E5-2699v4. When exploiting all cores of CPU to scan IP pairs parallel, the processing speed will be raised. But the memory bandwidth of CPU will limit the increment. What's more, the price of CPU grows rapidly with the number of cores because the single core of CPU is so powerful, high frequency and complex control ability, that it occupies much space on chip.

Unlike CUP's core, each core of GPU is a little simple, lower frequency and fewer controlling unit, but occupies much smaller space. So a GPU could contain hundreds or even thousands of cores in a chip easily. The total computation ability of GPU is much stronger than that of CPU. And GPU has a lower memory access latency because it has several memory controllers for multi threads. For tasks, which dealing with different data by the same instructions, GPU can acquire a high speed-up. IP pair scanning is such a task.

IP pair scanning consumes the most time in sliding super points detection because the huge number of IP pairs appearing in every slot. Every IP pair is processed by the same algorithm, algorithm 3. So thousands of threads running algorithm 3 could be launched to scan thousands of IP pairs at the same time. Figure 3 illustrates how to detect sliding super point on GPU.

IP pair will be copied to GPU's global memory by PCI-E bus. A IP pair buffer on GPU memory, which can contain α IP pairs, is allocated to receiving IP pairs. When the buffer is full or IP pairs in a slot are all copied, the same number of threads, as the number of receiving IP pairs, will be launched on GPU to process these IP pairs. Every thread reads one IP pair from global memory and update a distance recorder in RSRA which locating in global memory too. For IP v4 address, the buffer of IP pair occupies $8 * \alpha$ bytes. When α is set to 2^{15} , this buffer needs 256 KB memory. The graphic




Figure 3: Hosts scan on GPU

memory on GPU, ranging from 1 GB to 11 GB, is big enough to hold it. Although the RSRA requires more memory than IP pair buffer, the global memory is plenty enough to store a RSRA which is big enough for a 40 Gb/s networks. Other running parameters, such as hash function parameters, r , q and δ , are stored in the constant memory which is read only but has high speed. A low cost GPU, which can be brought within 200 dollars, is fast enough to scan IP pairs in 40 Gb/s in real time. RSRA could be deployed in many nodes at different places to processes packets in the distributing environment. Every node should maintain the same size RSRA and same hash functions' parameters.

After scanning all IP pairs in a slice, sliding super point will be reconstructed from RSRA. If there are many nodes in the distributing environment, RSRA in these nodes should be merged to a global one by SRE merging and sliding super point will be detected from this global RSRA. According to the feature of RHFG, if $RSRA(aip)$ is known, aip could be restored from it. But $RSRA(aip)$ is not stored directly. According to the definition, if aip is a sliding super point, every sliding rough estimator in $RSRA(aip)$ will contain no less than $\eta * \rho$ short integers whose value is smaller than k . The sliding rough estimator whose weight is no less than $\eta * \rho$ is called as hot sliding rough estimator denoted by HSE.

A candidate tuple CT consists of r HSEs could be acquired by selecting a HSE from every $HSE(i)$ where $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$. $CT = \{he_0, he_1, he_2, \dots, he_{r-1}\}$ where $he_i \in HE(i)$. Sliding super point could be regained by testing all of these candidate tuples.

Two additional buffers of candidate tuples are used in this algorithm, one for storing and the other for reading. Their roles exchange in different levels when adding hot estimators in different rows. Let $SCTB$ point to the candidate tuple buffer for storing and $RCTB$ point to the candidate tuple buffer for reading.

Candidate tuple in these two buffers grows incrementally from empty to a valid tuple containing r hot estimators in different rows. Let CTB_1 and CTB_2 represent these two buffers respectively. Figure 4 shows how candidate tuple grows with two buffers' support.




Figure 4: Regain sliding super points on GPU

These two candidate tuple buffers are located on GPU's global memory. Candidate tuple $CT_2 = \{he_0, he_1, he_2\}$ with three hot estimators, selected from $HSE(0), HSE(1), HSE(2)$ separately, will be inserted into CTB_1 after checking. The checking procedure is to test if $B(1)$ and $B(2)$ extracted from CT_2 is valid, if the left $q - \delta$ bits of $B(1)$ is the same as the right $q - \delta$ bits of $B(2)$. Only when passing the test, will CT_2 be added to CTB_1 . When $q - \delta$ is big, only a small part of such candidate tuple will appear in CTB_1 . The memory updating latency caused by candidate tuple insertion will be concealed by the huge parallel running threads on GPU. So candidate tuple checking determines the time consumption of a thread. When every thread deals with the same amount of candidate tuples, they will finish approximately at the same time. In this situation, the load of every thread is balance and GPU realizes its full potential.

There are total $Q = |HSE(0)| * |HSE(1)| * |HSE(2)|$ candidate tuples like CT_2 . Suppose V threads are launched on GPU to deal with these candidate tuples. Let U, V, Q and W be non-negative integers. In order to let every thread has the same candidate tuples to check, each thread will be assigned at least $U = Q/V$ candidate tuples evenly. Still there are $W = Q \bmod V$ candidate tuples rest. In these V threads, every of first W threads has $U + 1$ candidate tuple and every

of the rest $V - W$ threads has U candidate tuple. Let $CT_2(i)$ represent the set of candidate tuples to be tested by the i th threads in GPU which can be acquired from $HSE(0), HSE(1), HSE(2)$. Algorithm 4 shows how every thread checks candidate tuples.

Algorithm 4 global function on GPU
Generate candidate tuple CT_2

Input:

Hot sliding estimator set $HSE(0), HSE(1), HSE(2)$,
Storing candidate tuple buffer $SCTB$

$TID \leftarrow$ thread index

get candidate tuple set from $HSE(0), HSE(1), HSE(2)$

$CT_2(TID) \leftarrow$ candidate tuple set to be tested by this thread

for $ct = \{he_0, he_1, he_2\} \in CT_2(TID)$ **do**

$B(1) \leftarrow he_0 \text{ XOR } he_1$

$B(2) \leftarrow he_0 \text{ XOR } he_2$

if left $q - \delta$ bits of $B(1)$ not equal to right $q - \delta$ bits of $B(2)$ **then**

Continue

end if

insert ct into $SCTB$

end for

$CT_2(TID)$ could be acquired from $HSE(0), HSE(1), HSE(2)$ according to the index of a GPU thread. When testing candidate tuple in $CTB_2(TID)$, valid candidate tuple which passes checking process from line 8 to 10 will be stored in $SCTB$ for further checking with hot estimators in other rows.

When all threads finished, CTB_1 which has stored all valid candidate tuples extracting from the first three rows will work as reading buffer and the other buffer, CTB_2 will be used for storing new candidate tuple as shown in figure 4.

For $HSE(i)$ where $i \geq 3$, a new candidate tuple for checking is generated from a candidate tuple in reading tuple buffer, candidate tuple buffer which has stored valid candidate tuple, and a hot estimator in it. Then $Q = |RCTB| * |HSE(i)|$ where $|RCTB|$ means the number of candidate tuple storing in reading candidate tuple buffer. When i is an odd number, $RCTB$ points to CTB_1 , $SCTB$ points to CTB_2 ; when i is an even number, CTB_1 and CTB_2 exchange roles. A new candidate tuple consists of a hot estimator in $HSE(i)$ and a candidate tuple in $RCTB$. The set of such new candidate tuple to be checked by the j th thread, $CT_i(j)$, could be generated from $HSE(i)$ and $RCTB$. Algorithm 5 shows how to check new candidate tuples.

When checking a candidate tuple newly adding a hot estimator in $HSE(i)$, only $B(i-1)$ and $B(i)$ should be tested. After update candidate tuple with the last row, $SCTB$ contains candidate tuple from which a valid host could be reconstructed. Set $Q = |SCTB|, U = \frac{Q}{V}$ and launch V threads. Every thread

Algorithm 5 global function on GPU
Update candidate tuple

Input:

Row index i ,
Hot estimators set $HSE(i)$,
Storing candidate tuple buffer $SCTB$,
Reading candidate tuple buffer $RCTB$

$TID \leftarrow$ thread index

$CT_i(TID) \leftarrow$ get new candidate tuple from $HSE(i)$ and $RCTB$

for $ct = \{he_0, he_1, he_2, \dots, he_{i-1}, he_i\} \in CT_2(TID)$ **do**

$B(i-1) \leftarrow he_0 \text{ XOR } he_1$

$B(i) \leftarrow he_0 \text{ XOR } he_2$

if left $q - \delta$ bits of $B(0)$ not equal to right $q - \delta$ bits of $B(1)$ **then**

Continue

end if

insert ct into $SCTB$

end for

scans U or $U + 1$ reconstructed hosts to estimate their opposite number according their union sliding estimators in the candidate tuple and check if they are sliding super points. By this method, every thread on GPU has the similar load with the cost of additional buffers for storing middle candidate tuples. Nowadays GPU has plenty global memory and the buffers not occupy many space because the number of sliding super points takes up a small part of hosts.

$RSRA$ reconstructs sliding super points fast on GPU. But it can't get their cardinality and some fake host may hide in the candidate list. This problem will be solved by the method proposed in the next section.

4 MEMORY EFFICIENT SLIDING CARDINALITY ESTIMATION

Linear estimator, LE , is a famous cardinality estimation algorithm[16].

It uses η' bits, which are initialized to 0 at the beginning of a discrete time window, to estimate host's cardinality. When scanning a host bip in $ST(aip, t, 1)$, one bit in LE selected by hash function H_3 will be set. $H_3(bip)$ maps bip to a random value between 0 and $\eta' - 1$. Let $|LE|$ represent the weight of LE , which means the number of 1 bit in it. At the end of a discrete time window, $|OH(aip, t, 1)|$ will be estimated by the following equation.

$$|OH(\hat{a}ip, t, 1)| = -\eta' * \ln\left(\frac{\eta' - |LE|}{\eta'}\right) \quad (8)$$

But LE only works when $k = 1$. Like SRE , a sliding version of LE , SLE , is devised by replacing η' bits in LE with η' short integers. Every short integer has the same operations as that

in SRE . The k weight of SLE denoted as $|SLE|^k$ is the number of short integer whose value is smaller than k . SLE estimates a host's cardinality by equation 9.

$$|OH(\hat{a}ip, t, 1)| = -\eta' * \ln\left(\frac{\eta' - |SLE|^k}{\eta'}\right) \quad (9)$$

To avoid allocating a SLE for every host, a SLE array, $SLEA$, is used to estimate all hosts' cardinalities. $SLEA$ contains r' rows and every row has $2^{q'}$ $SLEs$. In order to have a high accuracy estimation of sliding super point's cardinality, η' should be big enough. Generally, η' should be no less than half of a sliding super point's cardinality [16]. But big η' causes great memory consumption. To reduce the memory consumption of $SLEA$, two adjacent $SLEs$ in a row share $\eta' - \delta'$ short integers. $SLEA$ could be regarded as an array of short integers with r rows and $2^{q'} * \delta' + \eta' - \delta'$ columns as shown in figure 5.




Figure 5: Sliding linear estimator array

δ' is the offset of short integers between two adjacent $SLEs$. When δ' is set to η' , no short integers will be shared by different $SLEs$ in a row and there are total $\eta' * r * 2^{q'}$ short integers. The memory reduction rate MRR is defined below.

$$MRR(\delta') = 1 - \frac{2^{q'} * \delta' + \eta' - \delta'}{\eta' * 2^{q'}} \quad (10)$$

Considering that $2^{q'}$ is much bigger than $\eta' - \delta'$, $MRR(\delta')$ is determined by $\frac{\delta'}{\eta'}$. A small δ' will save memory greatly. But δ' must be bigger than zero because when short integer offset is set to 0, there is only one SLE in a row to record all hosts' cardinalities. For every IP pair $\langle aip, bip \rangle$, r' $SLEs$ in each row will be selected by r' random hash functions $LH_i(aip)$ where LH_i maps aip to a random value between 0 and $2^{q'} - 1$. For every selecting SLE , a short integer determined by $H_3(bip)$ will be set to 0.

$SLEA$ could scan several IP pairs at the same time. High processing speed will be acquired if deployed it on GPU to run parallel. $SLEA$ locates on the global memory of GPU.

When the IP pairs buffer is full, thousands of threads will be launched to process them at the same time. Each thread on GPU will run algorithm 6 to deal with a IP pair.

Algorithm 6 Sliding linear estimator array scans IP pair

Input:

Sliding linear estimator array $SLEA$,
IP pair $\langle aip, bip \rangle$

```

sInt  $\leftarrow H_3(bip)$ 
for  $i \in [0, r' - 1]$  do
   $\leftarrow LH_i(aip)$ 
   $SLEA[i, j][sInt] \leftarrow 0$ 
end for

```

In algorithm 6, $SLEA[i, j]$ points to the j th SLE in the i th row.

Several GPU nodes could be used to scan different IP pairs in a distribute environment. Every node has a $SLEA$ with the same size: same rows, same columns number and same hash functions. When estimating hosts cardinality at the end of a time slice, $SLEA$ in different nodes should be merged together by algorithm 7.

Algorithm 7 Sliding linear estimator array scans IP pair

Input:

Sliding linear estimator array set:
 $SS = \{SLEA_0, SLEA_1, \dots, SLEA_{n-1}\}$
Distributed nodes number n

Output: Global sliding linear estimator array $GSLEA$

```

Initialize  $GSLEA$ 
for  $i \in [0, r' - 1]$  do
  for  $j \in [0, 2^{q'} * \delta' + \eta' - \delta' - 1]$  do
     $v \leftarrow 0$ 
    for  $z \in [0, n - 1]$  do
      if  $v < SLEA_z[i][j]$  then
         $v \leftarrow SLEA_z[i][j]$ 
      end if
     $GSLEA[i][j] \leftarrow v$ 
  end for
end for
end for

```

$SLEA_z[i][j]$ points to the j th short integer in the i th row of $SLEA$ in the z th node. Global $SLEA$ contains all hosts' cardinalities information and $GSLEA$ will be used to estimate cardinalities of candidate super points acquired by $SREA$. A SLE in $SLEA$ will be shared by many hosts. For a certain host aip , there are r' $SLEs$ relating with it. Merging these $SLEs$ to get a union one $USLE$ and estimating $|OH(aip, t, k)|$

from it could reduce the impact of other hosts. But in the $USLE$, some short integers would still be set by other hosts, especially when most of the short integers in $SLEA$ set to 0.

Definition 4.1 (SLEA row setting factor). For the i th row of $SLEA$, its setting factor $SF(i, k)$ is the ratio of the number of short integers in the i row whose value is smaller than k to $2^{q'} * \delta' + \eta' - \delta'$.

$SF(i, k)$ reflects the usage of a row in $SLEA$. A big $SF(i, k)$ means that the $SLEA$ is used efficiently, but a host's $USLE$ will be effected by other hosts heavily. In order to remove this effect, the number of error setting short integers should be calculated.

When $USLE$ is used by aip exclusively, $|SLE|^k$ are expected to be $|SLE|^k = \eta' - \eta' * e^{-\frac{|OH(aip, t, k)|}{\eta'}}$ according to equation 9. When $USLE$ contains short integers set by other hosts, the number of these error setting integers are expected to be $(\eta' - |SLE|^k) * \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1} SF(i, k)$. Remove this value from $|USLE|^k$ and the rest value are expected to be $|SLE|^k$ as shown in equation 11.

$$|SLE|^k = |USLE|^k - (\eta' - |SLE|^k) * \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1} SF(i, k) \quad (11)$$

The expectation of $|SLE|^k$ is acquired by modifying equation 12.

$$|\hat{SLE}|^k = \frac{|USLE|^k - \eta' * \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1} SF(i, k)}{1 - \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1} SF(i, k)} \quad (12)$$

Estimating $|OH(aip, t, k)|$ by $|\hat{SLE}|^k$ acquires a higher accuracy than using $|USLE|^k$ directly.

When estimating a host's cardinality, there are only reading operation to $GSLEA$. So several hosts' cardinalities could be estimated parallel in GPU. Algorithm 8 describes how to estimate the cardinality of a given host from the $GSLEA$.

Algorithm 8 calculates the cardinality of every host in the candidate sliding super point list generated by $SREA$ and remove these hosts whose estimation is smaller than θ to improve the detection accuracy. Both $SREA$ and $SLEA$ could be updated parallel. With this algorithm, a common GPU is strong enough to detect sliding super points and estimate their cardinalities of the core network whose speed is as high as 40 Gb/s.

5 EXPERIMENTS AND ANALYZE

We use a real world traffic to evaluate the performance of this sliding super point cardinality estimation algorithm SRLG. The traffic is OC192 downloading from Caida[23]. This traffic contains one hour packets last from 13:00 to 14:00 on February 19, 2015. In our experiment, the threshold θ for super point is 1024. First we compare $SRLE$ with other algorithms under discrete time window. In the discrete time window,

Table 1: Traffic information

Traffic start time	#host in NT1	#host in NT2	#Flow	Packet Speed(kpps)	#Super points
13:00	2844368	1535804	6965239	945.0777	160
13:05	2736768	1513171	6791528	915.6641	153
13:10	2789483	1511596	6810350	911.6672	159
13:15	2657288	1523394	6702763	895.8222	155
13:20	2673979	1493717	6661038	881.5199	159
13:25	2727247	1526358	6814957	925.2882	161
13:30	2762495	1564023	6932738	937.1126	163
13:35	2402347	1490879	6409882	894.9519	159
13:40	2159194	1532697	6241517	920.4772	159
13:45	2106495	1544624	6272998	911.0253	165
13:50	2026263	1564114	6258009	941.0973	175
13:55	2119151	1639128	6435876	935.0507	178

Algorithm 8 Sliding linear estimator array scans IP pair

Input:

Global sliding linear estimator array $GSLEA$
Candidate sliding super point aip

Output: Cardinality estimation $|OH(aip, t, k)|'$

$j \leftarrow LH_0(aip)$
 $USLE \leftarrow SLEA[0, j]$
for $i \in [1, r' - 1]$ **do**
 $j \leftarrow LH_i(aip)$
 for $z \in [0, \eta' - 1]$ **do**
 if $USLE[z] < SLEA[0][j * \delta' + z]$ **then**
 $USLE[z] < SLEA[0][j * \delta' + z]$
 end if
 end for
end for
end for
 $|\hat{SLE}|^k = \frac{|USLE|^{k-\eta' * \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1} SF(i, k)}}{1 - \prod_{i=0}^{r'-1} SF(i, k)}$
 $|OH(aip, t, k)|' \leftarrow -\eta' * \ln(\frac{\eta' - |\hat{SLE}|^k}{\eta'})$
Return $|OH(aip, t, k)|'$

a time slice is set to 5 minutes. Under this time period, the one-hour traffic is divided into 12 sub traffics and we will detect super points from them. Table 1 shows the detail information of every sub traffic.

Accuracy, time consumption and memory requirement are three criteria to evaluate super point detection algorithm. False positive ratio FPR and False negative ratio FNR are two classic rates for accuracy comparing. They are given in definition 5.1.

Definition 5.1 (FPR/FNR). For a traffic with N super points, an algorithm detects N' super points. In the N' detected super points, there are N^+ hosts which are not super points.

And there are N^- super points which are not detected by the algorithm. FPR means the ratio of N^+ to N and FNR means the ratio of N^- to N .

FPR may decrease with the growth of FNR. If an algorithm reports more hosts as super point, its FNR will decrease but FPR will increase. So we use the sum of FPR and FNR, total false rate TFR, to evaluate the accuracy of an algorithm.

To compare the performance of SRLG with other algorithms, we use DCDS[14], VBFA[15], GSE [19] to compare with it. All of these algorithms are running on a common GPU card: GTX950 with 680 CUDA cores and 4 GB memory. The parameters of SRLG are: $\delta = 5$, $\delta' = 16$, $\eta' = 2^{14}$, $\eta = 8$, $q = q' = 17$, $r = r' = 5$. Table 2 lists the average result of all the 12 sub traffics.

GSE has a lower FPR than other algorithms. It can remove fake super points according the estimating cardinality. But GSE may remove some super points too, which causes it has a higher FNR. Because it uses discrete bits to record host's cardinality, collecting all of these bits together when estimating super points cardinality will use lots of time. DCDS uses CRT when storing host's cardinality. CRT has a better randomness which makes DCDS has a lower FNR. But CRT is very complex containing many operations. So DCDS's speed is the lowest among all of these algorithms. VBFA has the fastest speed but its TFR is higher than that of SRLG.

From table 2 we can see that, SRLG uses the smallest memory, smaller than half of others' memory, and has the lowest total false rate. SRLG is the only one which can work under sliding time window.

In the sliding time window experiments, a time slice is set to 1 second and k is 300. SRLG's FPR, FNR and TFR are illustrated in figure 6, 7 and 8.

Under most sliding time window, SRLG has a low FPR, smaller than 1.5%. When FNR is small, FPR is relative high.

Table 2: Average detection result

Algorithm	Memory(MB)	SlidingAvailable	avgFNR(%)	avgFPR(%)	avgTFR(%)	avgSpeed(Mpps)
DCDS	96.00	No	0.2490808	2.817954	3.067035	52.30668
VBFA	80.00	No	0.5246158	2.562461	3.087077	124.99155
GSE	128.00	No	1.7498133	1.076437	2.826251	69.61885
SRLG	30.16	Yes	0.2486842	1.779752	2.028436	80.55959




Figure 6: Sliding time window FPR




Figure 7: Sliding time window FNR

But the total false rate is stably small. This experiments show that SRLG has low TFR and smallest memory for sliding

super point detection in core network. It can be applied to a bigger network by increasing of the size of *SREA* and *SLEA*.




Figure 8: Sliding time window TFR

6 CONCLUSION

Sliding super point cardinality estimation is an important issue in network research areas. This paper firstly proposed an algorithm SRLG to solve this problem. SRLG has the ability to run parallel in distributing environment. It uses two novel cardinality estimation methods: SRE and SLE. Based on SRE and SLE, two smart structures *SREA* and *SLEA* are devised. *SREA* detects sliding super points and generates a candidate list by the novel reversible hash functions *RHFG*. *SLEA* estimates the cardinality of every host in the candidate list with high accuracy. By sharing short integers of different SLEs, *SLEA* consumes very small memory, even smaller than those algorithms running under discrete time window. Small memory consumption reduces the communication cost between different nodes which is always the bottle neck of many distributing algorithm. Both *SREA* and *SLEA* could be updated parallel. When deployed on GPU, SRLG can deal with high speed network in real time.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cisco. Global ip traffic forecast. <http://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/solutions/collateral/service-provider/visual-networking-index-vni/vni-hyperconnectivity-wp.pdf>, 2017. Online.
- [2] Monowar H. Bhuyan, D.K. Bhattacharyya, and J.K. Kalita. Surveying port scans and their detection methodologies. *Comput. J.*, 54(10):1565–1581, October 2011.
- [3] Mansour Alsaleh and P. C. van Oorschot. Network scan detection with lqs: A lightweight, quick and stateful algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security*, ASIACCS '11, pages 102–113, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.
- [4] Poonam Sinai Kenkre, Anusha Pai, and Louella Colaco. *Real Time Intrusion Detection and Prevention System*, pages 405–411. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2015.
- [5] Martin Roesch. Snort - lightweight intrusion detection for networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Conference on System Administration*, LISA '99, pages 229–238, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1999. USENIX Association.
- [6] S. Karthik and J. J. Shah. Analysis of simulation of ddos attack in cloud. In *International Conference on Information Communication and Embedded Systems (ICICES2014)*, pages 1–5, Feb 2014.
- [7] Jelena Mirkovic and Peter Reiher. A taxonomy of ddos attack and ddos defense mechanisms. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 34(2):39–53, April 2004.
- [8] S. T. Zargar, J. Joshi, and D. Tipper. A survey of defense mechanisms against distributed denial of service (ddos) flooding attacks. *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials*, 15(4):2046–2069, Fourth 2013.
- [9] J. Mirkovic, G. Prier, and P. Reiher. Attacking ddos at the source. In *10th IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 312–321, Nov 2002.
- [10] Chenfeng Vincent Zhou, Christopher Leckie, and Shanika Karunasekera. A survey of coordinated attacks and collaborative intrusion detection. *Comput. Secur.*, 29(1):124–140, February 2010.
- [11] Shobha Venkataraman, Dawn Song, Phillip B. Gibbons, and Avrim Blum. New streaming algorithms for fast detection of superspreaders. In *Proceedings of Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, pages 149–166, 2005.
- [12] J. Cao, Y. Jin, A. Chen, T. Bu, and Z. L. Zhang. Identifying high cardinality internet hosts. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2009*, pages 810–818, April 2009.
- [13] Guang Cheng and Yongning Tang. Line speed accurate superspreader identification using dynamic error compensation. *Computer Communications*, 36(13):1460 – 1470, 2013.
- [14] P. Wang, X. Guan, T. Qin, and Q. Huang. A data streaming method for monitoring host connection degrees of high-speed links. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 6(3):1086–1098, Sept 2011.
- [15] W. Liu, W. Qu, J. Gong, and K. Li. Detection of superpoints using a vector bloom filter. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 11(3):514–527, March 2016.
- [16] Kyu-Young Whang, Brad T. Vander-Zanden, and Howard M. Taylor. A linear-time probabilistic counting algorithm for database applications. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 15(2):208–229, June 1990.
- [17] Shane Ryoo, Christopher I. Rodrigues, Sara S. Baghsorkhi, Sam S. Stone, David B. Kirk, and Wen-mei W. Hwu. Optimization principles and application performance evaluation of a multithreaded gpu using cuda. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles*

and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPOPP '08, pages 73–82, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.

- [18] John E. Stone, David Gohara, and Guochun Shi. Opencl: A parallel programming standard for heterogeneous computing systems. *IEEE Des. Test*, 12(3):66–73, May 2010.
- [19] Seon-Ho Shin, Eun-Jin Im, and MyungKeun Yoon. A grand spread estimator using a graphics processing unit. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 74(2):2039 – 2047, 2014.
- [20] Piotr Indyk. A small approximately min-wise independent family of hash functions. *Journal of Algorithms*, 38(1):84 – 90, 2001.
- [21] Daniel M. Kane, Jelani Nelson, and David P. Woodruff. An optimal algorithm for the distinct elements problem. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-ninth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, PODS '10, pages 41–52, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [22] Mihai Patrascu and Mikkel Thorup. The power of simple tabulation hashing. In *Proceedings of the Forty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '11, pages 1–10, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.
- [23] Center for Applied Internet Data Analysis. The caida anonymized internet traces. <http://www.caida.org/data/passive>, 2017. Online;accessed 2017.