#### DNS Anomaly Detection superDAD

Nick Barendregt Hidde van der Heide



# Agenda

- Introduction
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusion
- Questions and Discussion

# Introduction

"Examine the feasibility of detecting malware infected systems using DNS log data and develop a scheme for detecting these anomalies in DNS traffic.

Develop a simple proof of concept capable of processing text based output from our DNS logger."

#### Methods

- Non-DNS packets on port 53
- MX requests
- Keyword detection
- Blacklists
- Covert channel (DNS tunnel) detection
- Character frequency analysis
- Fast-flux detection
- Timing analysis
- Scoring mechanism

# **DNS Tunnel Detection**

#### Characteristics

- Non DNS data
- Large number of packets
- Large packets
  - Long domain names
  - $\circ$  Large strings in NULL or TXT records
- Random data when compressed or encrypted

# **DNS Tunnel Detection**

- Configure Iodine (tunnel DNS software)
- Downstream modes:
  - o Raw UDP
  - o NULL (experimental)
  - $\circ TXT$
  - $\circ$  CNAME
  - 0 **A**
  - o etc.
- Encoded Base32/64/128

# **Character Frequency Analysis**

English	ı Unigrams		Domai	n Unigrams
LETTER	FREQUENCY		LETTER	FREQUENCY
e	0.12702		е	0.10139
t	0.09056		а	0.08935
а	0.08167	K /	i	0.07346
0	0.07507 ·	$\mathbf{X}$	0	0.07105
i	0.06966 •		S	0.06804
n	0.06749	$\checkmark$	r	0.06524
S	0.06327 ·	$\sim$	t	0.06263
h	0.06094	/ `	n	0.06094
r	0.05987		I	0.04849
d	0.04253 🔹		С	0.03861
I	0.04025	$\mathbf{X}$	m	0.03249
C	0.02758	$\langle \rangle$	d	0.03247
u	0.02758	-	u	0.03105
m	0.02406		р	0.02689

English Bigrams		Domain Bigrams		
LETTER	FREQUENCY	LETTER	FREQUENCY	
th	0.03883	in	0.01702	
he	0.03681	er	0.01550	
in	0.02284	an	0.01333	
er	0.02178	re	0.01290	
an	0.02141	es	0.01271	
re	0.01749 🔸	ar	0.01188	
nd	0.01572	on	0.01135	
on	0.01418	or	0.01051	
en	0.01383	te	0.01017	
at	0.01336	al	0.00976	
ou	0.01286	st	0.00921	
ed	0.01276	ne	0.00921	
ha	0.01275	en	0.00897	

# **Character Frequency Analysis**



Domain N-gram Frequency

#### **Fast-Flux Detection**



#### **Fast-Flux Detection - Example**

\$ dig naughtydateingsite.net

;; ANSWER SECTION:									
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	77.	127.10	66.235	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	82.	228.65	5.61	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	84.	109.81	1.176	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	92.	253.40	0.134	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	94.	54.254	4.3	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	94.	228.11	18.59	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	114	.33.13	31.22	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	118	.101.2	225.28	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	201	.167.1	15.123	
naughtydateingsite.	net.	300	IN		A	203	.99.23	33.142	
;; AUTHORITY SECTIO	N:								
naughtydateingsite.	net.	172318		IN	N	S	ns1.	7418391.	com.
naughtydateingsite.	net.	172318		IN	N	S	ns2.7	7418391.	com.
naughtydateingsite.	net.	172318		IN	N	S	ns3.	7418391.	com.
naughtydateingsite.	net.	172318		IN	N	S	ns4.	7418391.	com.
naughtydateingsite.	net.	172318		IN	N	S	ns5.	7418391.	com.
naughtydateingsite.	net.	172318		ΙN	N	S	ns6.	7418391.	com.
; ADDITIONAL SECTIO	N:								
ns1.7418391.com.	85917	IN	A		173.	212.	75.160	C	
ns2.7418391.com.	85917	IN	A		79.1	19.1	88.9		
ns3.7418391.com.	85917	IN	A		88.8	7.25	1.45		
ns4.7418391.com.	85917	IN	A		82.2	28.6	5.61		
ns5.7418391.com.	85917	IN	A		79.1	17.1	22.25		
ns6.7418391.com.	85917	IN	A		186.	114.	80.139	9	

# **DNS** Timing Analysis

- Group activity
- Regular queries (polling)
- Outside office hours

# Scoring Mechanism



#### Results

- DNS Tunnel Detection
- Single Flux Detection
- Double Flux Detection

# **DNS Tunnel Detection**

- Configured DNS tunnel software
- Captured stream of scp 10Mb random data
- Loaded in memory with Python Scapy
- Created frequency distribution graphs with NLTK toolkit
- Compare:
  - $\circ$  Other tunnel software
  - $\circ$  Frequency distribution for top sites
  - $\circ$  Frequency distribution for language

#### **DNS Tunnel Detection - Base 32**

Tunnel DNS Dump Unigrams Base32			
Letter	Frequency		
d	0.09367		
a	0.08899		
m	0.07194		
q	0.07153		
r	0.06279		
b	0.05572		
g	0.04647		
W	0.04637		
h	0.04044		
у	0.03982		
С	0.03971		
f	0.03951		
t	0.03909		
2	0.02817		

Domain Unigrams		
LETTER	FREQUENCY	
е	0.10139	
а	0.08935	
i	0.07346	
0	0.07105	
S	0.06804	
r	0.06524	
t	0.06263	
n	0.06094	
I	0.04849	
C	0.03861	
m	0.03249	
d	0.03247	
u	0.03105	
р	0.02689	

#### **DNS Tunnel Detection - Base 128**

Tunnel DNS Dump Unigrams Base128				
Letter	Frequency			
b	0.05615			
у	0.05273			
а	0.04613			
Þ	0.04156			
k	0.03635			
I	0.03097			
g	0.0308			
3/4	0.02608			
m	0.02575			
4	0.02371			
W	0.02298			
С	0.02249			
2	0.02119			
n	0.01988			

Domain Unigrams		
LETTER	FREQUENCY	
е	0.10139	
а	0.08935	
i	0.07346	
0	0.07105	
S	0.06804	
r	0.06524	
t	0.06263	
n	0.06094	
I	0.04849	
C	0.03861	
m	0.03249	
d	0.03247	
u	0.03105	
р	0.02689	

# **DNS Tunnel Detection**



# **Fast-flux Detection**

- Single Flux Detection

   Simple bash system nslookup
   Threaded python nslookup
- Double Flux Detection
  - DNS library
  - SOA Record
  - $\circ$  A Record
  - NS Record
    - ANY Record
- Database
  - Lookup previous entries
  - Takes time with more data

#### **Fast Flux Detection**



#### **Fast Flux Detection**

Good sites vs Blacklisted, Double Flux Detection



# Conclusion

- Promising methods need to be done off-line
- The amount of data needed for proper time analysis becomes problematic
- Best probe position would be at the network border since TTL is unreliable
- Good results for methods, better when combined

• Yes!

# Future Work

- Create full working tool
- Research best scoring mechanism
- Timing analysis
- Live data

#### Fun Facts

Single: 116 x 1 x 10.728 = 1.244.448
Double: 174 x 3 x 10.728 = 5.600.016
Good : 22 x 3 x 10.000 = 660.000 +
Total domain queries: 7.504.464
Extra 48 hour run: ~2.400.000

Tracked domains: 10.728 Unique IP addresses: 32.466 Total amount of time spend: ~5.000 minutes

Lines of code: ~15 Cups of coffee: 2 : Research papers read: ~30

~1500 2 x 20 x ~4 = ~160 ~30

#### **Questions and Discussion**

