

Outlier detection on network flow analysis

Quang-Vinh Dang
TMC Data Science
High Tech Campus 96
NL-5656 AG Eindhoven, the Netherlands
vinh.dang@tmc.nl

ABSTRACT

It is important to be able to detect and classify malicious network traffic flows such as DDoS attacks from benign flows. Normally the task is performed by using supervised classification algorithms. In this paper we analyze the usage of outlier detection algorithms for the network traffic classification problem.

Keywords

outlier detection; DDoS attack

1. INTRODUCTION

A denial-of-service (DoS) attack is characterized “by an explicit attempt by attackers to prevent the legitimate use of a service” [14]. If the attackers coordinate the DDoS traffic from multiple sources to perform the attack, it will be Distributed Denial-of-Service (DDoS) [10].

Multiple studies have analyzed the detection and prevention strategies of DDoS attacks by using classification algorithms [4, 5, 10, 2]. While these methods achieved a lot of success, they suffer from imbalanced dataset problem [11] and lack of detecting unfamiliar flows. For instance, these techniques fail to detect a new DDoS attack technique that they did not see during the training period. Furthermore, supervised classification algorithms usually exhaust of data.

Outlier detection algorithms [1] try to distinguish outlier points from normal traffic data. Hence, the techniques might be performed in unsupervised manner [3]. Furthermore, outlier detection algorithms can deal well with extremed imbalanced dataset, such as 1:1000 ratio [11].

In this paper we evaluate the performance of outlier detection algorithms on detecting DDoS traffic. Our work is related to other evaluation studies, such as of [9]. However, the authors of [9] do not analyze the performance in case of imbalanced datasets.

2. EVALUATION

2.1 Algorithms

We evaluated the following algorithms:

- **CBLOF** (Clustering-Based Local Outlier Factor) [8].
- **HBOS** (Histogram-Based Outlier Score) [7].
- **IForest** Isolation Forest [12].

- **k-NN** (k Nearest Neighbors)[15].
- **MCD** (Minimum Covariance Determinant) [16].
- **OCSVM** (One-Class SVM) [13].
- **PCA** (Principal Component Analysis) [17].

2.2 Dataset

We used the dataset provided by [6] that contains 464,976 samples that are assigned the labels “Attack” or “Benign”. We consider these labels as ground truth. A set of 76 features is provided. Some of the features are:

- Flow.Duration
- Tot.Fwd.Pkts (Total Forward Packets)
- Tot.Bwd.Pkts (Total Backward Packets)
- Fwd.Pkt.Len.Max
- Fwd.Pkt.Len.Min

The “Attack” traffic contains 3.76% of the whole dataset (17,462 samples). In order to evaluate the performance of the outlier detection algorithms, we create different datasets with different “Attack” Ratio, range from 0.01 to 0.99.

To change the class ratio, we applied the following function to select a subset of the dataset:

```
def make_dataset(benign_ratio = 0.9,
                 df_attack = df_attack,
                 df_benign = df_benign):
    N_attack = len(df_attack.index)
    N_benign = len(df_benign.index)

    n_attack = N_benign /
                (benign_ratio / (1 - benign_ratio))
    sample_df_attack = df_attack.
        sample(int(n_attack),
              replace=False)
    res = pd.concat([df_benign, sample_df_attack])
    res = shuffle(res)

    res = res[[col for col in res
               if not len(set(df[col]))==1]]

#divide train/test
    train = res.sample(frac = 0.7, random_state=200)
    test = res.drop(train.index)
    return (train, test)
```

3. RESULTS

In this section we present the performance in term of *AUC* and *Accuracy* scores of each algorithms. Overall, while the *benign_ratio* increases the *Accuracy* scores increase for all algorithms, that can be explained by the imbalanced of the dataset. Another observation is that the performance of the algorithms are very similar between training and testing set due to the fact that these algorithms are all unsupervised. In term of *AUC* score we could see that IForest and PCA algorithms achieved the best scores while the *benign_ratio* increases.




Figure 1: CBLOF




Figure 2: HBOS

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we evaluate the performance of unsupervised outlier detection algorithms in detecting DDoS attacks. We showed that the outlier detection algorithms perform, particularly Isolation Forest or PCA-based algorithms, perform best if the proportion of outlier instances is small. This contrasts with popular classification algorithms. In the future we will focus on analyzing Isolation Forest and PCA algorithms in other scenarios.

5. REFERENCES

[1] C. C. Aggarwal. *Outlier Analysis*. Springer, 2 edition, 2017.




Figure 3: IForest




Figure 4: kNN




Figure 5: MCD

[2] A. Alsirhani, S. Sampalli, and P. Bodorik. Ddos attack detection system: Utilizing classification algorithms with apache spark. In *NTMS*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2018.

[3] G. O. Campos, A. Zimek, J. Sander, R. J. G. B. Campello, B. Micenková, E. Schubert, I. Assent, and M. E. Houle. On the evaluation of unsupervised outlier detection: measures, datasets, and an empirical study. *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, 30(4):891–927, 2016.

[4] C. Douligeris and A. Mitrokotsa. Ddos attacks and




Figure 6: OCSVM




Figure 7: PCA

defense mechanisms: classification and state-of-the-art. *Computer Networks*, 44(5):643–666, 2004.

- [5] R. F. Fouladi, C. E. Kayatas, and E. Anarim. Frequency based ddos attack detection approach using naive bayes classification. In *TSP*, pages 104–107. IEEE, 2016.
- [6] A. Ghorbani and A. H. Lashkari. Cdmc2018 dataset: Ddos attacks detection for enterprise network security, 2018.
- [7] M. Goldstein and A. Dengel. Histogram-based outlier score (hbos): A fast unsupervised anomaly detection algorithm. *KI-2012: Poster and Demo Track*, pages 59–63, 2012.
- [8] Z. He, X. Xu, and S. Deng. Discovering cluster-based local outliers. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 24(9-10):1641–1650, 2003.
- [9] V. J. Hodge and J. Austin. An evaluation of classification and outlier detection algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1805.00811, 2018.
- [10] A. Koay, A. Chen, I. Welch, and W. K. G. Seah. A new multi classifier system using entropy-based features in ddos attack detection. In *ICOIN*, pages 162–167. IEEE, 2018.
- [11] B. Krawczyk. Learning from imbalanced data: open challenges and future directions. *Progress in AI*, 5(4):221–232, 2016.
- [12] F. T. Liu, K. M. Ting, and Z. Zhou. Isolation forest. In *ICDM*, pages 413–422. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [13] J. Ma and S. Perkins. Time-series novelty detection using one-class support vector machines. In *Neural Networks, 2003. Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on*, volume 3, pages 1741–1745. IEEE, 2003.
- [14] J. Mirkovic and P. L. Reiher. A taxonomy of ddos attack and ddos defense mechanisms. *Computer Communication Review*, 34(2):39–53, 2004.
- [15] S. Ramaswamy, R. Rastogi, and K. Shim. Efficient algorithms for mining outliers from large data sets. In *SIGMOD Conference*, pages 427–438. ACM, 2000.
- [16] P. J. Rousseeuw and K. van Driessen. A fast algorithm for the minimum covariance determinant estimator. *Technometrics*, 41(3):212–223, 1999.
- [17] M.-L. Shyu, S.-C. Chen, K. Sarinnapakorn, and L. Chang. A novel anomaly detection scheme based on principal component classifier. Technical report, MIAMI UNIV CORAL GABLES FL DEPT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING, 2003.