The Zombie Roundup: Understanding Detecting, and Disrupting Botnets

Evan Cooke^{*}, Farnam Jahanian^{*†}, Danny McPherson[†] *Department of EECS - University of Michigan [†]Arbor Networks

SRUTI Workshop 2005 July 7, 2005





The Old Days...

washingtonpost.com sign In | Register Now

NEWS	OPINIÓN	SPORTS	ARTS & LIVING	Discussions Photos & Vid	eo Ente
SEARC	H: • New:	s 🕘 Web		90	powered

washingtonpost.com > Technology > Tech Policy > Security

""**Tech**News.com

Print This Article
E-Mail This Article

By David McGuire and Brian Krebs washingtonpost.com Staff Writers Tuesday, October 22, 2002; 5:40 PM

MOST VIEWED ARTICLES Technology On the Site

Updated 1:16 p.m. ET

China a Weak Ally on Piracy

The heart of the Internet sustained its largest and most sophisticated attack ever, starting late Monday, accordin officials at key online backbone organizations.

Attack On Internet Called Largest Ever



lorms

<u> These attacks disrupt infrastructure</u>



Home Site Index Site Search Forums Archives Mark

February 8,2000

Yahoo Attributes a Lengthy Service Failure to an Attack

By MATT RICHTEL BIO

S AN FRANCISCO, Feb. 7 -- **Yahoo** Inc. blamed a "planned attack" by computer hackers for a service failure that lasted nearly three hours today, in a rare interruption of one of the most popular and best performing sites on the World Wide Web.









- New *personal* attacks often rely on an another resource (e.g. phishing site, SPAM relay)
- Anonymous use of resource highly desirable
 => attackers use another compromised system as a proxy!

Attackers have learned a compromised system is more useful alive than dead!

This talk is about detecting and disrupting access to the anonymous infrastructure used in these attacks





Bot History and Structure

- Not New: An original use, help Internet Relay Chat (IRC) Operators (*Eggdrop/1993*)
- Nefarious attack bots soon emerged (DDoS)
- Developed Sophisticated Hiding and Attack Capabilities (*SubSeven, Bot/Bionet Bot*)
- Modern Bots: (*AgoBot*[PhatBot],*GTBot*[rBot])





- Total infected bot hosts 800,000 900,000 [CERT CA-2003-08]
 - > 100,000 nodes/botnet
- 1000's of new bots each day [Symantec 2005]
- Many articles/press citing thousands of infected hosts [IEEE S&P, Register]
- Difficult to measure:

=> Population likely *much much* larger!

Bot/Botnet Measurements - Operators

- Very little hard data on botnets!
- We asked operators (five Tier-1 & Tier-2 ops):
 - They are actively fighting the problem
 - # of Botnets *increasing*
 - Bots per Botnet *decreasing* Used to be 80k-140k, now 1000s (evasion/economics?)
 - More firepower:

Broadband (1Mbps Up) x 100s == OC3!!!

• Custom botnets (all .edu, .gov/.mil) - economics?

Bot/Botnet Measurements - Honeypot

- Windows 2000/XP Honeypot
- Placed behind proxy:
 - 1. Rate limit traffic 12KB/s
 - 2. Disallow local network
 - 3. Log all traffic
- 12 experimental runs over a month:
 - 12-72 hour traces > 100MBs
 - Recruited into least 15 unique botnets
 - Bots used DCOM/RPC, LSASS

=> Bots are extremely prevalent

Successful and failed outgoing connections from bot infected honeypot







- 1. Prevent systems from getting infected
- 2. Directly detect *bot* communications between *bots* and between *bots* and *bot controllers*
- 3. Detect the secondary features of a *bot* infection like propagation or attacks



Prevent Infection

- Well developed methods:
 - Anti-virus
 - Firewalls
 - Patching



- But:
 - Might not directly control of systems (ISPs)
 - Can't upgrade certain systems (Win98 DAQ)
 - Complex infection vectors: App-level (javascript, AIM)
 - Custom threat (Israeli trojan)
- Naïve to assume 100% protected ${\color{black}\bullet}$



• Many bots use IRC for Command and Control



Detect IRC Bot Commands

- Offramp TCP port 6667
- Inspect Payloads (*advscan*...) [honeynet05]
- IRC Behavior [Racine04]



Detecting Bot Communication...

Less knowledge of peers per Bot

eers per bot		Design		Message	
	Topology	Complexity	Detectablity	Latency	Survivability
I	Centralized	Low	Medium	Low	Low
↓	Peer-to-Peer	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium
	Random	Low	High	High	High
	Taxono	my of Bot	Communic	ation Top	ologies

- Reliance on detecting *Bot Communication* degenerates into **arms race** between bot authors and defenders
- Communication is very flexible
 - Easy to Encrypt/Obfuscate



- Relying on detecting bot communication is *not* viable in the long term
- Leverage all available bot characteristics
- Build detectors for each bot behavior







- Preliminary evidence very promising:
- Strong correlation between bot *communication* and bot *propagation*

Correlating data sources from a large live network (payloads & IMS dark IP sensors):

Bot Command Detected	Δ IMS Detection Time	Scan Type
ipscan r.r.r.r dcom2	11 secs	Global Random
ipscan s.s.s.s dcom2	0 secs	Global Seq.
ipscan 24.s.s.s dcom2	-	Local 24/8 Seq.
ipscan 69.27.s.s dcom2	_	Local 69.27/16 Seq.
ipscan s.s.s lsass	0 secs	Local /8 Seq.
ipscan s.s webdav3	0 secs	Local /16 Seq.



- Bots provide support infrastructure for a large range of devastating Internet attacks
- IRC-based botnet detection may be effective tool today
- Tomorrow must focus on holistic view of bot behavior
- Interesting questions:
 - How do we measure bots?
 - Who is responsible for cleanup? (Organizations/ISPs/Law Enforcement)
 - Global enforcement => bots in US attack China?



• Questions?

Many thanks to Michael Bailey, Jose Nazario, Chris Morrow, Tim Battles, Nicolas Fischbach, and Rob Thomas for helpful comments and feedback.

http://ims.eecs.umich.edu ims@umich.edu



- Once you detect a bot how to shut it down?
- Two goals
 - 1. Take down the bot
 - 2. Take down the botnet
- Problem is similar to infiltrating a gang: monitoring the bot => provide info on botnet (i.e. a "narc")
- Problem is complicated because many botnets span many countries