

# Retroactive Parametrized Monitoring

Paloma Pedregal<sup>1,2</sup>, Felipe Gorostiaga<sup>1,3</sup>, and César Sánchez<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IMDEA Software Institute, Spain

<sup>2</sup> Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (UPM), Spain

<sup>3</sup> CIFASIS, Argentina

**Abstract.** In online monitoring, we first synthesize a monitor from a formal specification, which later runs in tandem with the system under study, incrementally receiving its progress and evolving with the system. In offline monitoring the trace is logged as the system progresses to later do post-mortem analysis after the system has finished executing.

In this paper we propose *retroactive dynamic parametrization*, a technique that allows a monitor to revisit the past log as it progresses, while still executing in an online manner. This feature allows new monitors to be incorporated into a running system and to revisit the past for particular behaviors based on new information discovered. Retroactive parametrization also allows a monitor to lazily ignore events and revisit and process them later, when it discovers that it should have followed those events. We showcase the use of retroactive dynamic parametrization to monitor denial of service attacks on a network using network logs.

## 1 Introduction

Runtime verification (RV) is a lightweight formal dynamic verification technique that analyzes a single trace of execution using a monitor derived from a specification (see [2, 19]). The initial specification languages to describe monitors in RV were borrowed from property languages for static verification, including linear temporal logic (LTL) [23], adapted to finite traces [3, 20] or extensions [8]. Most RV languages describe a monolithic monitor that later processes the events received. Dynamic parametrization (also known as parametric trace slicing) allows quantifying over objects and spawn monitors that follow independently the actual objects observed, like in Quantified Event Automata (QEA) [1].

Stream runtime verification [4, 12, 22] (SRV), pioneered by Lola [7] defines monitors by declaring the dependencies between output streams and input streams. The initial application domain of Lola was the testing of synchronous hardware. Temporal testers [24] were later proposed as a monitoring technique for LTL based on Boolean streams. Copilot [12, 21, 22] is a DSL that, similar to Lola, declares dependencies between streams in a Haskell-based style, to generate C monitors. Lola2.0 [9] extends Lola allowing dynamically parametrized streams, similarly to QEA. Stream runtime verification has also been extended recently to asynchronous and real-time systems [6, 11, 13, 18]. HLola [5, 14, 16] is an implementation of Lola as an embedded DSL in Haskell, which allows borrowing datatypes

from Haskell directly as Lola expressions, and using features like higher-order functions to ease the development of specifications and the runtime system. In this paper we use HLola and extend it with capabilities for retroactive dynamic parametrization.

In some situations we want to monitor a property that we define once the system is already running, and we cannot or do not wish to stop and restart the monitor. Therefore, the monitor will receive online the events of a suffix of the original trace. At this point, we must decide to either (1) *ignore* that the monitor is plugged in the middle of the trace and let it work under the premise that it is watching the whole history, (2) *encode the lack of knowledge* about the beginning of the trace in the specification, or, (3) if the beginning of the trace was preserved in a *log* or a database and it is accessible, allow the monitor to collaborate with the log to process the missing past and then continue to process the future events online. The first option is the most natural and in many cases a good solution, while the second option has been explored in [17], but these two options ignore the beginning of the trace and thus we have to pick one of them if the trace is not preserved. The third option proposes a novel combination of *offline+online monitoring*, which offers the possibility of accessing the past of the trace. Moreover, enriching an SRV monitor with the ability of accessing the past allows the description of properties that revisit the past exploiting information discovered at a later time.

In this paper we show an instance of this combination of online and offline monitoring to implement a novel dynamic instantiation of monitors called *retroactive dynamic parametrization* that combines dynamic parametrization with the ability to revisit the past of a live stream of events.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces SRV and static parametrization, Section 3 presents the syntax and semantics of the operators that enable retroactive dynamic parametrization, Section 4 shows how we have implemented these features in our tool, Section 5 includes an empirical evaluation of the tool, and finally Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Preliminaries

Stream Runtime Verification (SRV) generalizes monitoring algorithms to arbitrary data, where temporal dependencies are maintained but datatypes are generalized using multi-sorted interpreted signatures, which we call data theories. The signatures are interpreted in the sense that every functional symbol  $\mathbf{f}$  used to construct terms of a given type is accompanied with an evaluation function  $f$  (the interpretation) that allows the computation of values (given values of the arguments). In this paper we use the extensible tool HLola, an implementation of Lola [7] developed as an embedded DSL in Haskell. We show in Section 4 how HLola allows the easy implementation of new powerful features as libraries with no changes to the core engine, leveraging the extensibility and expressiveness of the data theories of the tool. In this paper we show how retroactive parametrization is implemented in HLola.

A Lola specification  $\langle I, O, E \rangle$  consists of (1) a set of typed input stream variables  $I$ , which correspond to the inputs observed by the monitor; (2) a set of typed output stream variables  $O$  which represent the outputs of the monitor as well as intermediate observations; and (3) defining equations, which associate every output  $y \in O$  with a stream expression  $E_y$  that describes declaratively the intended values of  $y$  (in terms of the values of inputs and output streams). The set of *stream expressions* of a given type is built from constants and function symbols as constructors (as usual), and also from *offset expressions* of the form  $s[k|d]$  where  $s$  is a stream variable,  $k$  is an integer number and  $d$  is a value of the type of  $s$  (used as default). For example, `altitude[-1|0.0]` represents the value of stream `altitude` in the previous step of time, with `0.0` as the value used at the initial instant. We can define a stream `alt_ok` which checks that the `altitude` is always below a predefined threshold, for example `100` meters:

---

```
1 input Double altitude
2 output Bool alt_ok = altitude[now] < 100
```

---

Given values of the input streams, the formal semantics of a Lola specification is defined denotationally as the unique collection of streams of values that satisfies all equations. The existence and uniqueness of streams of outputs are guaranteed when specifications are not cyclic.

Moreover, online efficient monitoring algorithms can be synthesized for specifications with (bounded) future accesses [7, 25]. Efficiency here means that resources (time and space) are independent of the length of the trace and can be calculated statically, and that each individual output can be generated immediately. HLola can be efficiently monitored in this trace-length independent sense [5]. As a byproduct of its design, HLola allows *static parametrization* in stream definitions, this is, streams that abstract away some concrete values, which can be instantiated by the compiler. Following the previous example, we can define a more generic version of the stream `alt_ok` as follows:

---

```
1 input Double altitude
2 output Bool alt_checker <Double threshold> = altitude[now] < threshold
3 output Bool alt_ok = (alt_checker 100)[now]
```

---

Static parametrization does not allow instantiations of a parametric stream with a value that is discovered at runtime. In static parametrization parameters must be known in static time before the monitor starts running. In the following sections we will detail the reason of this limitation and we offer alternatives to implement dynamic parametrization, analysing their pros and cons.

**Nested Monitors.** The keystone of the design of HLola is to use datatypes and functions from Haskell as the data theories of Lola. In turn, HLola also allows

using Lola specifications as datatypes, via a function `runSpec` that executes a specification over the input trace and produces a value of the result type. As a consequence, we can use Lola as a data theory within Lola itself, an approach that we have called *nested monitors* [15]. Nested monitors allows writing functions on streams as SRV specifications, creating and executing these specifications dynamically. Nested specifications are particularly useful when the caller monitor can invoke a nested monitor passing a sub-trace of the original trace as input. The HLola operator `s[:n]` creates a list with the next  $n$  values of the stream  $s$ . We often use slices as input streams for nested specifications, but any list of values of the appropriate type can be used. The type of the stream  $x$  determines the type of the value returned when the specification is invoked dynamically.

Defining a *nested* specification involves giving it a name and adding an extra clause: `return x when y` where  $x$  is a stream of any type and  $y$  is a **Boolean** stream. The type of the stream  $x$  determines the type of the value returned when the specification is invoked dynamically. Once we have defined a nested specification, we can execute it using the function `runSpec`.

*Example 1.* The following specification calculates whether input numeric streams **r** and **s** will cross within the following 50 instants. We define a topmost specification as follows, where stream **willCross** invokes the nested specification **crossspec** with the slices containing the next 50 events of **r** and **s** as input.

---

```

1 use innerspec crossspec
2 input Double r
3 input Double s
4 output Bool willCross = runSpec (crossspec r[:50] s[:50])

```

---

In our example, the nested specification **crossspec** is:

---

```

1 innerspec Bool crossspec
2 input Double r
3 input Double s
4 output Bool cross =
5   sign (r[now] - s[now]) /= sign (r[-1|r[now]] - s[-1|s[now]])
6 return cross when cross

```

---

The output stream **cross** simply checks that the relative order of the streams **r** and **s** changes. A nested specification with a clause `return x when y` returns the value of  $x$  at the first time  $y$  becomes **true**, or the last value of  $x$  if  $y$  never holds. Therefore, if  $y$  becomes **true** in the middle of an execution, the monitor does not have to run until the end to compute a value and can anticipate the result, so nested specifications can be incrementally computed as new elements of the input slice are available, and return the outcome as soon as it is definite.  $\square$

### 3 Combinig Online and Offline Monitoring

We introduce features to combine offline and online runtime verification. We start with nested monitors that can access past events when new information is discovered.

#### 3.1 Retroactive Nested Monitors

*Example 2.* Consider monitoring network traffic, where the monitor receives the source and destination of an IP packet, and the packets per second in the last hundred instants. We want to detect whether an address has received too many packets in the last hundred instants, specified as follows: *if the packet flow is low, then there is no attack, but when the flow rate is above a predefined threshold (`threshold_pps`) we have to inspect the last hundred packets and check if a given address is under attack.* We use the following specification to check the heuristics and trigger the finer analysis of the tail of the trace when necessary.

---

```

1 input Int packets_per_second
2 output Int counter = counter[-1|0] + 1
3 output Bool under_attack =
4   if packets_per_second[now] > threshold_pps then
5     let past = pastRetriever counter[now] in
6     runSpec (finerSpec 'withTrace' past)
7   else False

```

---

The auxiliary stream `counter` indicates `pastRetriever` which events it has to recover. We use `if · then · else ·` instead of the Boolean operator (`&&`) to stress the fact that the nested specification is only executed when the threshold is exceeded. Then, we define the nested specification `finerSpec` as follows:

---

```

1 innerspec Bool finerSpec
2 input String destination
3 output (Map String Int) entropy =
4   insertWith (+) destination[now] 1 entropy[-1|empty]
5 output Bool under_attack = maximum (elems entropy[now]) > threshold_dest
6 return under_attack when under_attack

```

---

The function `insertWith cmb k v m` inserts the element `v` associated to the key `k` into the map `m`, combining `v` with the previous value `m[k]` using `cmb` if it exists. The function `elems m` returns the list of values in the map `m`, and the function `maximum ls` returns the maximum in the list `ls`. The nested specification will return `true` as soon as `under_attack` becomes `true`, and `false` if such stream is always `false` until the end of the (sub)trace.  $\square$

Note how this specification detects an attack at most one hundred instants after it happens. Also, the nested monitors in this example are created, executed and destroyed at every instant. In Section 4, we explain how we can implement dynamic parametrization by keeping the nested monitors alive across the trace.

### 3.2 (Forward) Dynamic Parametrization

We introduce now a novel operator `over`, which lets us instantiate a parametric stream over dynamic values. The `over` operator takes a parametric stream `strm` of type `S` with a parameter of type `P`, and a stream `params` of sets of values of type `P`, and creates an expression of type `Map P S`, whose keys at any given instant are the values in `params[now]`, and where the value associated to each key is the instantiation of `s` over the key.

Using the `over` operator we can dynamically instantiate a parametric stream over a set of parameters that are discovered while processing the trace of input.

*Example 3.* The specification below checks that every pair `(source, destination)` follows the TCP 3-way handshake in which (1) the source sends a packet `SYN`, then (2) the destination sends `SYN/ACK` and then (3) the source sends `ACK`. The following state machine described in HLola captures this:

---

```

1 input String source
2 input String destination
3 input PacketType p_type
4 data PacketType = SYN | SYNACK | ACK
5     deriving (Generic,Read,FromJSON,Eq)
6 data State = Uninit | Error | SYNED | SYNACKED
7     deriving (Generic,Read,FromJSON,Eq)
8 output State state <(String, String) srcdest> = let
9   prev_state = (state srcdest)[-1|Uninit]
10  in
11  if srcdest /= (source[now], destination[now]) then prev_state
12  else if p_type[now] == SYN    && prev_state == Uninit  then SYNED
13  else if p_type[now] == SYNACK && prev_state == SYNED  then SYNACKED
14  else if p_type[now] == ACK    && prev_state == SYNACKED then Uninit
15  else Error

```

---

However, we cannot know statically for which pair of addresses we have to instantiate this parametrized stream. Therefore, we define a set of parameters (in this case, a set of pairs of addresses) that we need to follow:

---

```

16 output (Set (String, String)) params =
17   insert (source[now], destination[now]) params[-1,empty]

```

---

At every instant, we add the current pair (`source[now]`, `destination[now]`) to the set of parameters. We are now ready to parametrize the parametric stream `state` over the values of `params`:

---

```
18 output Bool all_ok = let
19   states = elems (state 'over' params)
20   in all (/= Error) states
```

---

Note that we simply check that all the values in the map generated by the `over` expression are different from `Error`, this is, that no pair of addresses is in the `Error` state. This specification follows each pair of addresses independently. One thing to note is that we never remove parameters from `params`, and as a consequence, the set can grow indefinitely, even though it is not necessary. In fact, we can remove the previous pair of source and destination when the previous type of message was `ACK`. The reason why we keep the parametric stream alive for one more instant before removing it is to let `all_ok` check that the behavior was correct.  $\square$


Every time a new value is incorporated to the set of parameters, we spawn a new monitor parametrized with the new value. Then, we preserve the state of this monitor between instants in an auxiliary stream, executing the nested monitor alongside the outer monitor until the auxiliary monitor is no longer needed, that is, until its associated parameter is removed from the set.

The nested monitors just described will process the same events as the root monitor, but it is often the case that only some of the events are relevant to a specific parametrized stream. We can use *subtracing* to only update a subset of the parametrized streams at every instant.

### 3.3 Subtracing

Parametrized streams are internal monitors that observe the same trace as their parent. However, it is often the case that parametrized streams only care about the events that are related to their parameter, as in Example 3, where the events irrelevant to an instantiation do not change its state. Subtracing lets the nested stream focus only on its relevant subtrace. Moreover, subtracing enables the possibility of updating only the nested monitors that may be affected at the current instant. To implement subtracing we introduce the operator `updating` that lets us specify the parameters of the monitors that have to process the current event.

For example, we can use subtracing in Example 3 redefining the streams `state` and `all_ok` as follows:



**Fig. 1.** Subtracing of a parametrized stream  $s$  over parameters  $p_0$  and  $p_1$ . At every instant of the *root* monitor we show the sets of dynamic parameters on top, and the sets of parameters to update below.

---

```

8 output State state <(String, String) srcdest> = let
9   prev_state = (state srcdest)[-1|Uninit]
10  in   if p_type[now] == SYN    && prev_state == Uninit   then SYNED
11     else if p_type[now] == SYNACK && prev_state == SYNED   then SYNACKED
12     else if p_type[now] == ACK    && prev_state == SYNACKED then Uninit
13     else Error
14
15  output Bool all_ok = let
16    currentpair = singleton (source[now], destination[now])
17    states = elems (state 'over' params 'updating' currentpair)
18    in all (/= Error) states

```

---

Using subtracing, we can separate the parent trace from the traces received by the nested monitors, who will only observe a subtrace of the original trace. This is depicted in Fig. 1.

In the example above, the monitor follows the dynamically parametrized stream once the parameter has been discovered. In fact, the monitor may not even have access to the past of the trace because the online runtime monitoring infrastructure erases past events once they are processed. The only alternative is to monitor a parametrized stream after its parameter is discovered (like in Lola2.0 [10]).

If the infrastructure keeps the past events of the trace, we can combine *retroactive nested monitors* with *dynamic parametrization* when a new parameter is discovered, effectively implementing *retroactive dynamic parametrization*.

### 3.4 Retroactive Dynamic Parametrization

Static parametrization in HLola is limited because the monitor cannot know the state of a parametric stream over an arbitrary parameter in the middle of the trace unless the parameter is determined statically before the monitor starts running. One alternative to circumvent this limitation is to statically instantiate the stream with every potentially interesting parameter. This strategy is reasonable if the stream can only be parametrized with a domain of parameters with few



elements, like Boolean or a small enumerated type, but it becomes unfeasible when the space of potential parameters is large.

Instead, we propose an alternative technique: that the monitor revisits the past of the trace every time it discovers a new parameter to instantiate the parametric stream and from that point continue to monitor the new stream online.

To implement this feature we add a special clause `withInit` to the `over` operator that allows specifying an *initializer*, which indicates how the nested monitor can update its state up to the current instant. An initializer will typically call an external program with the corresponding arguments that indicate an offline infrastructure how to efficiently retrieve the elements of past of the trace that are relevant to the parameter.

*Example 4.* Suppose we are monitoring file accesses in a file system, and we want to assess that every time a file is read or written, it must have been created previously. We could use *forward dynamic parametrization* as in Example 3 to follow all open files.

---

```

1 input String file_id
2 input OpType operation
3 data State = Created | NE | Error deriving (Generic,Read,FromJSON,Eq)
4 data OpType = Create | RW deriving (Generic,Read,FromJSON,Eq)
5 output State state <String fid> = let
6   prev_state = (state fid)[-1|NE] in
7   if (operation[now] == Create && prev_state == NE)
8     || (operation[now] == RW && prev_state == Created)
9     then Created else Error
10 output (Set String) params = insert file_id[now] params[-1,empty]
11 output Bool all_ok = let
12   fid = singleton file_id[now]
13   states = elems (state 'over' params 'updating' fid)
14   in all (/= Error) states


```

---

In this example we define datatypes to capture the state of a file id (`Created` or `NE`, “non existent”) and also the type of operations (`Create` or `RW`, “read or write”). Just like in Example 3, we define the state machine and we check that all the values are different from `Error`.  $\square$

Although this specification is valid, if most of the created files are never read or written (or only some read or writes are relevant for the specification), this forward monitor would be following many open files unnecessarily.

*Example 5.* We can use *retroactive* monitoring to only create the dynamic parameters when the corresponding file id is read or written, and use the retroactive



**Fig. 2.** Subtracing and retroactive effects in a parametrized stream  $s$  over  $p_0$  and  $p_1$ . We show the sets of dynamic parameters on top, and the parameters to update below. The events in grey are those retrieved by the corresponding initializer.

capability to inspect the past of the trace and see if the file was created previously. We redefine the streams `params` and `all_ok` accordingly.

---

```

10 output (Set String) params = let
11   prev_params = params[-1, empty]
12   in if operation == RW then
13     insert file_id[now] prev_params
14   else prev_params
15 output Bool all_ok = let
16   fid = singleton file_id[now]
17   states = elems (state 'over' params 'updating' fid 'withInit' initer)
18   in all (/= Error) states

```

---

The new stream of parameters only adds a file id when it is read or written. The new `over` expression specifies an initializer `initer` (whose definition is not shown in the specification) that calls an external program to retrieve the past of the corresponding parameter. The external program may use an index to efficiently retrieve only the events in the past relevant to the current file id. In fact, the program could fetch only the `open` events associated with the file id, making the installation phase even faster.  $\square$

Non-retroactive dynamic parametrization avoids retrieving old events at the expense of not preserving the semantics of static parametrization. Instead, the parametrized stream considers that the trace only started when the parameter was first instantiated shows up. We depict this conceptual difference in Fig. 2.

*Maybe over.* We now describe additional operators that introduce useful syntactic sugar. The operator `mover` (called *maybe over*) allows the discovery of a single parameter in the middle of the trace. Instead of applying a parametrized stream over a stream of sets of values, the operator `mover` takes the parametric stream and a stream of type `Maybe P`, creating an expression of type `Maybe S`. As in the original `over`, if it is retroactive or not depends on the presence of `withInit`. This syntactic sugar simply creates a stream of sets of parameters which will contain at most one element at every instant, and returns the only value in the map when the map is not empty.

*Example 6.* To illustrate `mover`, we instantiate the specification in Section 2 with a parametric threshold that is received in the middle of the trace.

---

```

1 input Double altitude
2 input Double threshold
3 output Bool alt_checker <Double threshold> = altitude[now] < threshold
4 output (Maybe Double) mthreshold = let
5   prev_mthreshold = mthreshold[-1|Nothing]
6   in if prev_mthreshold == Nothing && threshold[now] > 0
7     then Just threshold[now]
8     else prev_mthreshold
9 output Bool alt_ok = let
10  mok = alt_checker 'mover' mthreshold
11  in mok /= Just False

```

---

The value of `mthreshold` will be the first positive value of `threshold`, and `Nothing` until then. The stream `alt_ok` will be `false` only when the threshold has been set and the current altitude is greater than the established threshold. We can use the operator `withInit` to add an initializer and also revisit the past of the trace to see if the altitude had been exceeded before the actual value was determined.  $\square$

*Subtrace filter with expression.* The operator `when` lets us replace the `updating` clause with an expression that indicates when a parameter should be updated. For example, we can specify which file id to update using the `when` operator in Example 4 as follows:

---

```

18 output Bool all_ok = let
19   states = elems (state 'over' params 'when' (== file_id[now]))
20   in all (/= Error) states

```

---

The syntactic sugar will calculate the set of parameters  $\{p \text{ such that } e(p)\}$ , where  $e$  is the expression associated to the `when` clause. Note that if we use `when`, the engine has to check the condition  $e$  over every live parameter to see if the corresponding stream has to be updated. It is more efficient to directly specify the set of parameters to update, if possible.

## 4 Implementation


The implementation of the novel operators in HLola is based on the rich type expressivity of the tool, which include the ability to handle the Lola language itself as a data theory within HLola [15].

Dynamically mapping a parametric stream `strm` with a stream of set of parameters `params` of type `Set P`, creates an auxiliary stream `x_over_params` of type `Map P FrozenMonitor` that associates, at every instant, each parameter  $p$  in `params` with the state of the nested monitor corresponding to  $s\langle p \rangle$ . The value of `x` ‘over’ `params` is simply the projection of the parametrized streams in the frozen monitors of `x_over_params[now]`. There are three possibilities for the behavior of the auxiliary stream for a given parameter  $p$ :

- (1)  $p \in \text{params}[-1|\emptyset] \setminus \text{params}[\text{now}]$ : the parameter was in the set in the previous instant, but it is no longer in the set in the current instant. In this case,  $p$  and its associated value are deleted from the map `x_over_params[-1|\emptyset]`.
- (2)  $p \in \text{params}[-1|\emptyset] \cap \text{params}[\text{now}]$ : the parameter was in the set and it is still in the set now. If  $p$  is in `updating`, we feed the current event to the monitor associated with  $p$  and let it progress one step. Then, the value of the parametrized stream in the nested monitor is associated with  $p$  in the returned map.
- (3)  $p \in \text{params}[\text{now}] \setminus \text{params}[-1|\emptyset]$ : the parameter was not in the set, but it is now. The monitor for  $p$  is installed, executing the initializer (possibly revisiting the past) to get the monitor up to date and ready to continue online. Once the monitor is installed, we proceed as in the previous case, checking whether  $p$  is in `updating` to decide to inject the current event, and associating the value of  $s\langle p \rangle$  to  $p$  in the returned map. Note that the past is only revisited when a new parameter is discovered. Once the stream is instantiated with the parameter, its corresponding nested monitor will continue executing over the future of the trace online.

A nested monitor can be installed with an empty initializer and at the same time  $p$  may not be in `updating`. In this case the nested monitor has not processed any event, the value of  $s\langle p \rangle$  is non-existent and the sets `params[now]` and `keys(x_over_params[now])` differ.

Since we want HLola to support initialization from different sources (e.g. a DBMS, a blockchain node, or plain log files) the initializer of the internal monitors typically invokes an external program. This external program, called *adapter*, is in charge of recovering the trace and formatting it adequately for the monitor. The following is the architecture of our approach.



## 5 Empirical Evaluation

We report in this section an empirical evaluation of retroactive dynamic parametrization. We have used HLola to implement several algorithms for the detection

of distributed denial of service attacks (DDOS). All the experiments were executed on a Linux machine with 256GB of RAM and 72 virtual cores (Xeon Gold 6154 @3GHz) running Ubuntu 20.04. The monitors were generated using the implementation of HLola<sup>4</sup> described in [14]. For conciseness we use RP to refer to retroactive parametrization, non-RP to implementations that do not use retroactive parametrization (and use dynamic parametrization instead). We evaluate empirically the following hypotheses:

- (H1) RP is functionally equivalent to non-RP.
- (H2) RP and non-RP run at similar speeds, particularly when most dynamic instantiations turn out to be irrelevant.
- (H3) RP consumes significantly less memory than non-RP, particularly when most instantiations are irrelevant.
- (H4) Aggregated RP—where the monitor receives summaries of the trace that indicate if further processing is necessary—is functionally equivalent to RP.
- (H5) Aggregated RP is much more efficient than RP and non-RP without aggregation.

The datasets for the experiments are (anonymized) samples of real network traffic collected by a Juniper MX408 router that routes the traffic of an academic network used by several tens of thousand of users (students and researchers) simultaneously, routing approximately 15 Gbps of traffic on average. The sampling ratio provided by the routers was 1 to 100 flows<sup>5</sup> Each flow contains the meta-data of the traffic sampled, with information such as source and destination ports and addresses, protocols and timestamps, but does not carry information about the contents of the packets. These flows are stored in aggregated batches of 5 minutes encoded in the **netflow** format.

Our monitors implement fourteen known DDOS network attacks detection algorithms. An attack is detected if the volume of connections to a destination address surpasses a fixed attack-specific threshold, and those connections come from a sufficiently large number of different attackers, identified by source IP address. The number of different source addresses communicating with a destination is known as the *entropy* of the destination. Each attack is concerned with a different port and protocol and considers a different entropy as potentially dangerous.

In order to process the network data needed by the monitors, we developed a Python adapter that uses **nfdump**, a toolset to collect and process netflow data. The tool **nfdump** can be used to obtain all the flows in a batch, optionally applying some simple filters, or to obtain summarized information about all the flows in the batch. For example, **nfdump** can provide all the flows received, filtered by a protocol or address, as well as the volume of traffic to the IP address that has received the most connections of a specific kind.

In our empirical evaluation we use four datasets in which we knew whether each attack was present:

<sup>4</sup> Available at <https://github.com/imdea-software/hlola/>

<sup>5</sup> Most detection systems use a much slower sampling of 1 to 1000 or even less.

- (D1) One batch of network flows with an attack based on malformed UDP packets (UDP packets with destination port 0). This batch contains 419938 flows, with less than 1% malformed UDP packets. The threshold for this attack is 2000 packets per second, which is surpassed in this batch for one single address, for which the entropy of 5 is exceeded.
- (D2) One batch of network flows with no attack, containing 361867 flows, of which only 66 are malformed UDP packets (roughly, 0.001%).
- (D3) One batch of network flows with no attack, but with many origin IP addresses and 100 destination addresses. Based on D2, we modified the source and destination IP addresses.
- (D4) Intervals with several batches, where only one batch has an attack based on malformed UDP packets.

The monitors in our experiments follow the same attack description: *In a batch of 5 minutes of flow records, an address is under attack if it receives more than  $t_0$  packets per second or bits per second from more than  $t_1$  different source addresses (where  $t_0$  and  $t_1$  depend on the attack).* We have implemented monitors in three different ways<sup>6</sup>

- (S1) Brute force: using dynamic parametrization the monitor calculates the number of packets and bits per second (which we call “volume”) for all potential target IP addresses. It also computes the entropy for each potential target address and for each attack. For every flow, the monitor internally updates the information about the source address, destination and volume.
- (S2) Retroactive: the monitor also analyses all flows, calculating the volume of packets for each address, but in this case the monitor lazily avoids calculating the entropy. The monitor only calculates the entropy, using RP, when the volume of traffic for an address surpasses the threshold. The monitor uses the *over* operator to revisit the past flows of the batch filtered by that attack, using the Python adapter which produces the subset of the flows required to compute the entropy. The monitoring then continues calculating the entropy until the end of the batch.
- (S3) Aggregated: the monitor receives a summary of a 5 minute batch of network data, as a single event containing 14 attack markers. The monitor is based on the ability of the backend to pre-process batches using `nfdump` to obtain—for each attack and for the whole batch—the maximum volume of traffic for any IP address. If an attack marker is over the threshold, the monitor spawns a nested monitor that retrieves a subsets of the flows for that batch and attack, which behaves as in **S2**.

The aggregation of data provides a first, coarse overview serving as a necessary condition to spawn the expensive nested monitor. This is particularly useful because attacks are infrequent and the ratio of false positives of the summary detection is relatively low.

---

<sup>6</sup> Due to space constraints, we have included the specifications for **(S1)**, **(S2)** and **(S3)** in Appendix A.

In the first experiment we run the three implementations against dataset **(D4)**. In this interval of multiple batches, only one of which contains an attack, all three implementations identify the batch with the attack and correctly detect the kind of attack and target address. This confirms empirically hypotheses **(H1)** and **(H4)**.

In the second experiment we run specifications **(S1)** and **(S2)** against datasets **(D1)**, **(D2)** and **(D3)**. The results are reported in the following table:


	<b>(D1)</b> (Attack)	<b>(D2)</b> (No Attack)	<b>(D3)</b> (No Attack)
<b>(S1)</b> (Brute force)	18m12.146s	15m51.599s	16m34.795s
<b>(S2)</b> (Retroactive)	20m43.921s	17m19.844s	19m30.518s
<b>(S3)</b> (Aggregated)	0m16.208s	0m2.109s	0m2.115s

We can see that the running times for the brute force and retroactive implementations are similar, while the aggregated implementation is extremely fast in comparison, which empirically confirms **(H2)** and **(H5)**. This is because **(S3)** exploits the summarized information, and does not find any marker over the threshold for the datasets **(D2)** and **(D3)** so the flows within the batch are never individually processed. For dataset **(D1)**, a nested monitor will be executed because one of the markers (for the attack with malformed UPD packets) is over the threshold, but it will only try to detect the attack corresponding to that marker, and it will only receive a small subset of the flows (less than 1% of the flows of the batch are relevant for the attack). If all the markers for all the attacks were over their threshold and all the flows were implicated in the attacks, the time required would be closer to the retroactive implementation. The ad-hoc aggregation of data by the external tool is very efficient, as is the verification of this data by the monitor, so this implementation is especially advantageous when the positives (or false positives) are expected to be infrequent, and when most of the data can be filtered out before executing the nested monitor.

In a third experiment we run a version of specifications **(S1)** and **(S2)**—instrumented with capabilities to measure memory consumption—on **(D1)**, **(D2)** and **(D3)**. The results, reported in Fig. 3, empirically confirm **(H3)**. For the three datasets, the memory used by the brute force approach increases linearly over time, as it has to keep track of the volume and IP entropy for every attack and every potential target address. On the other hand, the memory usage of the retroactive implementation remains close to constant, with a sudden increase when an attack is detected and the past flows have to be retrieved and processed.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we have introduced the concept of retroactive dynamic parametrization. In dynamic parametrization, proposed in QEA and Lola2.0 a new monitor (which is an instance of a generic monitor) is instantiated the first time a parameter is discovered. In retroactive dynamic parametrization the decision to



**Fig. 3.** Memory usage of the brute force (a), (b), (c) and retroactive (d), (e), (f).

instantiate a dynamic parametric monitor can be taken later in the future, for example when a given parameter is discovered to be interesting.

Effectively implementing retroactive parametrization requires the ability to revisit the history of the computation, a task that can be efficiently implemented with a logging system. Therefore, retroactive parametrization allows a fruitful combination of offline and online monitoring. Retroactive parametrization also allows monitors to be created in the middle of an execution without requiring to process the whole trace from the beginning.

We have implemented this technique in HLola and empirically evaluated its efficiency, illustrating that it can efficiently detect distributed denial of service attacks in realistic network traffic.



## References

1. Barringer, H., Falcone, Y., Havelund, K., Reger, G., Rydeheard, D.: Quantified event automata: Towards expressive and efficient runtime monitors. In: Proc of the 18th Int'l Symp. on Formal Methods (FM'12). LNCS, vol. 7436, pp. 68–84. Springer (2012)
2. Bartocci, E., Falcone, Y. (eds.): Lectures on Runtime Verification - Introductory and Advanced Topics, LNCS, vol. 10457. Springer (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75632-5>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75632-5>
3. Bauer, A., Leucker, M., Schallhart, C.: Monitoring of real-time properties. In: Proc. of the 26th Int'l Conf. on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS'06). LNCS, vol. 4337, pp. 260–272. Springer (2006). [https://doi.org/10.1007/11944836\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/11944836_25)
4. Bozzelli, L., Sánchez, C.: Foundations of boolean stream runtime verification. *Theoretical Computer Science* **631**, 118–138 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.04.019>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.04.019>
5. Ceresa, M., Gorostiaga, F., Sánchez, C.: Declarative stream runtime verification (hLola). In: Proc. of the 18th Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (APLAS'20). LNCS, vol. 12470, pp. 25–43. Springer (2020). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64437-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64437-6_2)
6. Convent, L., Hungerecker, S., Leucker, M., Scheffel, T., Schmitz, M., Thoma, D.: TeSSLa: Temporal stream-based specification language. In: Proc. of the 21th Brazilian Symp. on Formal Methods (SBMF'18). LNCS, vol. 11254, pp. 144–162. Springer (2018). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03044-5\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03044-5_10)
7. D'Angelo, B., Sankaranarayanan, S., Sánchez, C., Robinson, W., Finkbeiner, B., Sipma, H.B., Mehrotra, S., Manna, Z.: LOLA: Runtime monitoring of synchronous systems. In: Proc. of the 12th Int'l Symp. of Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME'05). pp. 166–174. IEEE CS Press (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIME.2005.26>
8. Eisner, C., Fisman, D., Havlicek, J., Lustig, Y., McIsaac, A., Campenhout, D.V.: Reasoning with temporal logic on truncated paths. In: Proc. of the 15th Int'l Conf. on Computer Aided Verification (CAV'03). LNCS, vol. 2725, pp. 27–39. Springer (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45069-6\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-45069-6_3)
9. Faymonville, P., Finkbeiner, B., Schirmer, S., Torfah, H.: A stream-based specification language for network monitoring. In: Proc. of the 16th Int'l Conf. on Runtime Verification (RV'16). LNCS, vol. 10012, pp. 152–168. Springer (2016). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46982-9\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46982-9_10)
10. Faymonville, P., Finkbeiner, B., Schledjewski, M., Schwenger, M., Stenger, M., Tentrup, L., Hazem, T.: StreamLAB: Stream-based monitoring of cyber-physical systems. In: Proc. of the 31st Int'l Conf. on Computer-Aided Verification (CAV'19). LNCS, vol. 11561, pp. 421–431. Springer (2019). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_24)
11. Faymonville, P., Finkbeiner, B., Schwenger, M., Torfah, H.: Real-time stream-based monitoring. *CoRR* **abs/1711.03829** (2017)
12. Goodloe, A.E., Pike, L.: Monitoring distributed real-time systems: A survey and future directions. Tech. rep., NASA Langley Research Center (2010)
13. Gorostiaga, F., Sánchez, C.: Striver: Stream runtime verification for real-time event-streams. In: Proc. of the 18th Int'l Conf. on Runtime Verification (RV'18).

- LNCS, vol. 11237, pp. 282–298. Springer (2018). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03769-7\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03769-7_16)
14. Gorostiaga, F., Sánchez, C.: HLola: a very functional tool for extensible stream runtime verification. In: Proc. of the 27th Int’l Conf on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS’21). Part II. pp. 349–356. LNCS, Springer (2021). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72013-1\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72013-1_18)
  15. Gorostiaga, F., Sánchez, C.: Nested monitors: Monitors as expressions to build monitors. In: Feng, L., Fisman, D. (eds.) Runtime Verification. pp. 164–183. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2021). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88494-9\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88494-9_9)
  16. Gorostiaga, F., Sánchez, C.: Stream runtime verification of real-time event streams with the Striver language. International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer **23**, 157–183 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-021-00605-3>, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10009-021-00605-3>
  17. Gorostiaga, F., Sánchez, C.: Monitorability of expressive verdicts. In: Deshmukh, J.V., Havelund, K., Perez, I. (eds.) NASA Formal Methods. pp. 693–712. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2022)
  18. Leucker, M., Sánchez, C., Scheffel, T., Schmitz, M., Schramm, A.: Tessler: Runtime verification of non-synchronized real-time streams. In: Proc. of the 33rd ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC’17). pp. 1925–1933. ACM Press (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3167132.3167338>, <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3167132.3167338>, track on Software Verification and Testing Track (SVT)
  19. Leucker, M., Schallhart, C.: A brief account of runtime verification. J. Logic Algebr. Progr. **78**(5), 293–303 (2009)
  20. Manna, Z., Pnueli, A.: The Temporal Logic of Reactive and Concurrent Systems. Springer-Verlag, New York (1992)
  21. Perez, I., Dedden, F., Goodloe, A.: Copilot 3. Tech. Rep. NASA/TM–2020–220587, NASA Langley Research Center (April 2020)
  22. Pike, L., Goodloe, A., Morisset, R., Niller, S.: Copilot: A hard real-time runtime monitor. In: Proc. of the 1st Int’l Conf. on Runtime Verification (RV’10). LNCS, vol. 6418, pp. 345–359. Springer (2010). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16612-9\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16612-9_26)
  23. Pnueli, A.: The temporal logic of programs. In: Proceedings of the 18th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS’77),. pp. 46–67. IEEE CS Press (1977)
  24. Pnueli, A., Zaks, A.: PSL model checking and run-time verification via testers. In: 14th International Symposium on Formal Methods (FM’06). LNCS, vol. 4085, pp. 573–586. Springer-Verlag (2006)
  25. Sánchez, C.: Online and offline stream runtime verification of synchronous systems. In: Proc. of the 18th Int’l Conf. on Runtime Verification (RV’18). LNCS, vol. 11237, pp. 138–163. Springer (2018). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03769-7\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03769-7_9)

## A Specifications of the Empirical Evaluation

In this appendix we show the specifications that we have used to empirically evaluate the different techniques of retroactive dynamic parameterization in the context of network attack detection.

The first specification analyzes summaries of batches of flows, executing a nested specification over the current batch (indicated by `file_id` and the suspected attack when one of the markers is above a predefined threshold:

---

```

1 use innerspec flowAnalyzer
2 input String fileid
3 input Int marker<AttackData>
4 output [String] attacked_IPs = map detect attacks
5   where detect atk = (attack_detection atk)[now]
6 define String attack_detection <AttackData atk> =
7   if (marker atk)[now] > threshold atk then
8     runSpec (flowAnalyzer atk 'withTrace' pastRetriever atk fileid[now])
9   else "No attack"

```

---

The constant `attacks` is a list of the attack data of the 14 different attacks that the monitor can detect. The nested specification `flowAnalyzer` can use retroactive dynamic parameterization or (the less efficient) non-retroactive dynamic parameterization.

The second specification analyzes individual flows:

---

```

1 type Entropy = Map.Map String (Set.Set String)
2 type Histogram = Map.Map String Int
3 -- packets, bits, starttime, endtime
4 type AddressInfo = Map.Map String (Int, Int, Int, Int)
5 input String fileid
6 input Flow flow
7 define Int flowCounter = flowCounter[-1|0] + 1
8 define Bool firstFlow = fileId[now] /= fileId [-1|"" ]
9 define Bool lastFlow = fileId[now] /= fileId[1|"" ]
10 output [String] attacked_IPs = map detect attacks
11   where detect atk = (attack_detection atk)[now]
12 define String attack_detection <AttackData atk> =
13   if (markerRate atk)[now] > threshold atk then
14     if (ipEntropy atk)[now] > maxEntropy atk then
15       (maxDestAddress atk)[now]
16     else "Over threshold but not entropy"
17   else "No attack"

```

---

---

```

18 define Int markerRate <AttackData atk> =
19   if timeDur == 0 then 0
20   else (getMarker addrData)[now] 'div' timeDur
21   where
22     timeDur = getTE addrData - geTS addrData
23     addrData = (addrInfo atk)[now] ! (maxDestAddress atk)[now]
24 define String maxDestAddress <AttackData atk> =
25   if occurrencesCurrent > occurrencesPrev
26   then currentAddr else previousMaxAddr
27   where
28     currentAddr = destAddr[now]
29     currentHist = (attackHist atk)[now]
30     occurrencesCurrent = currentHist ! currentAddr
31     occurrencesPrev = currentHist ! previousMaxAddr
32     previousMaxAddr = (maxDestAddress atk)[-1|""]
33 define AddrInfo addrInfo <AttackData atk> =
34   insertWith updateValue destAddr[now] flow[now] prev
35   where
36     prev = if firstFlow[now] then empty else (addrInfo atk) [-1|empty]
37     updateValue (p,b,ts,te) (p',b',ts',te') = (p+p',b+b',min ts ts',max te te')
38 define Histogram attackHist <AttackData atk> =
39   insertWith (+) destAddr[now] 1 hist
40   where
41     hist = if firstFlow[now] then empty else (attackHist atk) [-1|empty]

```

---

The specification defines many auxiliary types to carry information about the destination addresses. It also needs to keep the `flowCounter` to perform retroactive dynamic parameterization. As in the previous case, the stream `attacked_IPs` maps the parametric stream `attack_detection` over the list of attacks. The stream `attack_detection` checks that the marker (bits per seconds or packets per second) of the attack and the IP entropy of any address do not exceed the thresholds. If the thresholds are exceeded, the IP address most accessed (which is calculated in `maxDestAddress`) is considered to be under attack. The stream `markerRate` calculates the bits per seconds or packets per second of an attack. The stream `maxDestAddress` calculates the most accessed address, comparing the accesses of the current destination address (`destAddr[now]`) with the accesses of the previously most accessed address (`(maxDestAddress atk)[-1|""]`). The binary operator (!) retrieves an element from a map. The stream `addrInfo` keeps a map of the packets, bits, start time and endtime per destination address. Similarly, the stream `attackHist` keeps a map of the number of accesses per destination address.

The IP entropy used in line 14 can be defined using brute force, or retroactive dynamic parameterization. We will first see the brute force version.

---

```

1 define Int ipEntropy <AttackData atk> =
2   size ((ipEntropyAllAddr atk)[now] ! (maxDestAddress atk)[now])
3 define Entropy ipEntropyAllAddr <AttackData atk> =
4   insertWith union destAddr[now] (singleton srcAddr[now]) prevEntropy
5   where
6     prevEntropy = if firstFlow[now] then empty
7                   else (ipEntropyAllAddr atk) [-1|empty]

```

---

In this specification we calculate the ip entropy of every address at all times, and we simply return the size of the set of different origin IP addresses of the most accessed IP. The entropy calculation that uses retroactive parameterization is the following.

---

```

1 define Int ipEntropy <AttackData atk> =
2   maybe 0 size mset
3   where
4     mset = setSrcForDestAddr atk
5           'mover' maybeAddress attData
6           'withInit' initer atk (maxDestAddress atk)[now] flowCounter[now]
7 define (Set String) setSrcForDestAddr <AttackData atk> <String dst> =
8   insert srcAddr[now] prevSet
9   where
10    prevSet = if firstFlow[now] then empty
11             else (setSrcForDestAddr atk) [-1|empty]
12 define (Maybe String) maybeAddress <AttackData atk> =
13   if (maxOverThreshold atk)[now]
14   then Just (maxDestAddress atk)[now]
15   else Nothing

```

---

In this case, we define a parametric stream `setSrcForDestAddr` that calculates the set of different origin IPs of a destination address. We define an auxiliary stream `maybeAddress` that contains the most accessed address, if it exceeds the threshold. The definition of `ipEntropy` will instantiate dynamically the stream `setSrcForDestAddr` with the most accessed address once it exceeds the threshold, with an initializer specific to the suspected attack and address.