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DDoS attack boots Kyrgyzstan from net

Russian bears blamed

By Dan Goodin 28 Jan 2009 at 19:57

Kyrgyzstan Under DDoS Attack From Russia
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BY: COUNTER THREAT UNIT RESEARCH TEAM

The two primary Kyrgyzstan ISPs (www.domain.kg, www.ns.kg) have been under a massive, sustained DDoS attack... Few alternatives for Internet access exist in Kyrgyzstan... [the attacks] essentially knocked most of the small, Central Asian republic offline.
What are the technical mechanisms at play in these disconnections?
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Automatic identification of the Autonomous Systems with the highest transit influence:

potential capability to observe, manipulate and disrupt Internet traffic flowing towards a country
Challenges in inferring transit influence

- Bias due to limited measurement infrastructure (ASes & countries)
- Measurements prone to missing both backup and preferred links
- No direct way to map prefixes to geographic location
- Massive scale of the global Internet (~10,000s of ASes and links)
Challenges in inferring transit influence

• Bias due to limited measurement infrastructure (ASes & countries)

• Measurements prone to missing both backup and preferred links

• No direct way to map prefixes to geographic location

• Massive scale of the global Internet (∼10,000s of ASes and links)
Transit influence of $AS_t$ on $AS_o$:
Fraction of addresses originated by $AS_o$ where $AS_t$ is present as a transit provider

\[
TI(AS_t, AS_o) = \sum_{m \in M} \left[ \frac{A(AS_t, AS_o)}{a(AS_o)} \cdot \frac{w(m)}{d(AS_t, AS_o)} \right]
\]
Transit Influence Defined (2/3)

\[ TI(A,D) = TI(G,D) = 0.50 \]

Method to filter observation bias: treat ASes with multiple monitors as a single monitor

\[ TI(AS_t, AS_o) = \sum_{m \in M} \frac{A(AS_t, AS_o) \cdot w(m)}{a(AS_o) \cdot d(AS_t, AS_o)}, \]
How to factor in limited visibility: discount the influence of indirect transit providers – as the likelihood of missing a link increases with the AS-level distance from the origin.

\[ TI(AS_t, AS_o) = \sum_{m \in M} \frac{A(AS_t, AS_o) \cdot w(m)}{a(AS_o) \cdot d(AS_t, AS_o)} \]
Aggregate transit influence: how influential is this transit AS on the country’s organizations?

\[ ATI(AS_t) = \sum_{o \in O} TI(AS_t, AS_o); AS_t \neq AS_o, \]

Add up the transit influence of \( AS_t \) on each of the country’s origin ASes
How much address space does each additional compromised AS yield to the attack surface?
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- Etisalat (State-Owned)
- CANTV (State-owned)
- Kvant Telecom (Russian enterprise ISP)
- China Telecom (State-owned)
- AT&T
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How much address space does each additional compromised AS yield to the attack surface?

Bangladesh has a diverse ecosystem in their international connectivity that seems to have been enabled by a national government initiative to license International Internet Gateways (IIG) to:

“Ensure national security and protect national interest.”
How much address space does each additional compromised AS yield to the attack surface?

- We have preliminarily found that stronger democracies tend to have less concentrated address spaces.

- Wealth is not as good a predictor of that concentration.
Thank you!
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ATI and related metrics: Customer Cone and Hegemony

• Customer cone: who can this transit AS reach (and potentially extract revenue from) through its customers in this country?

• Hegemony: who are the most central ASes in this country’s network given the bias of the measurement infrastructure?

• ATI: whose international traffic can this transit AS potentially observe, manipulate or disrupt?
  • Draws on both customer cone and hegemony
  • Expands on prioritizing measurement AS diversity and factoring in unobserved links
• An AS with a high customer cone but low ATI may reach most of the origin ASes in this country indirectly
  • through its customers, as with AS A
  • AS A has a high AS-footprint in the country, and high potential revenue as the AS would be paid for forwarding traffic towards its customers

• Since AS A is an indirect provider of ASes D,E,F, it would have a lower ATI than both AS C and AS B
  • The probability that there are unseen backup or preferred links increases with the AS-level distance
  • Direct transit providers are more likely to have the capability to observe, manipulate or disrupt the origin’s traffic

Diagram from Huffaker et. al 2018
• Hegemony: who are the most central ASes in this network given the bias of the measurement infrastructure?
  • Consistency within tiers
  • Filter centrality of ASes with monitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample BC</th>
<th>Expected BC</th>
<th>AS Hegemony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit ISP</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ISP</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stub AS</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram adapted from Huffaker et. al 2019

• ATI: whose international traffic can this transit AS potentially observe, manipulate or disrupt?
  • Expand on filtering of observation bias by treating multi-monitor ASes as one monitor
  • Coarsely factor in unobserved backup links with indirect transit filter, dividing the TI by the AS-level distance from the origin

• In the above diagram, ATI would assign no influence to the origin ASes (as we are concerned primarily with international transit), and would filter the TI of the “Transit ISP” at the top given that it is never directly connected to the origin AS
South Africa: the rise of Seacom

![Graph showing Aggregate Transit Influence (ATI) from Dec '13 to Dec '18, with a notable increase in Seacom and Level3.]

Seacom

Level3
Russian ecosystem is dominated by domestic ASes

Level3
How do ASes communicate?

• ASes announce routing policies using the **Border Gateway Protocol (BGP)**

• Announcements are made to neighbors

  ![Diagram of AS communication](attachment:image.jpg)

  1.2.3.0/24

• In this toy example, AS1 announces that it “owns” the 256 addresses
  • AS2 has a direct link to AS1 and can just forward packets to it
  • AS3 knows it can direct traffic towards those IP addresses to AS2
\[ TI(AS_t, AS_o) = \sum_{m \in M} \frac{p(AS_t, AS_o) \cdot w(m)}{a(AS_o) \cdot d(AS_t, AS_o)}, \text{ where} \]

- \( TI \) is the **transit influence** \( \sim [0,1] \)
- \( AS_t \) is the transit AS
- \( AS_o \) is the origin AS
- \( p(AS_t, AS_o) \) is the number of the origin’s addresses that the transit serves
- \( a(AS_o) \) is the total number of addresses originated by \( AS_o \) in this country
- \( d(AS_t, AS_o) \) is the AS-level distance between \( AS_o \) and \( AS_t \)
- \( m \) is the BGP monitor in the set of \( M \) available monitors
BGP Announcements and Transit Influence

• Goal: extract country-level transit influence of ASes from Border Gateway Protocol (BGP) announcements
• Find prefixes and ASes that are relevant to each country (*geolocate*)
• Find transit providers servicing many of those prefixes and ASes

Sample parsed BGP announcement

```
ripe/rrc00|5 1836|13030|61716 131.72.23.0/24 i 146.228.1.4
```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ATI Rank</th>
<th>AS Number – AS Name</th>
<th>Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Revenue USD (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16735-ALGAR TELECOM S/A</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7738-Telemar Norte Leste S. ^</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>262589-INTERNEXA Brasil Opera</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10429-Telcel Data S.A.</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>60,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8151-Uninet S.A. de C.V.</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>47,350~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18734-Operbes S.A. de C.V.</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11172-Alestra S. de R.L. de</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32098-Transtelco Inc</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6503-Axcel S.A.B. de C.V.</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17072-TOTAL PLAY TELECOMUNIC ^</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23520-Columbus Networks USA</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18678-INTERNEXA S.A. E.S.P</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3816-COLONIA TELECOMUNICAC ^</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>60,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6147-Telefonica del Peru S. ^</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>60,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8048-CANTV Servicios Venez</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11562-Net Uno C.A.</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14259-Gtd Internet S.A.</td>
<td>Enterprise Broadband</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7004-CTC Transmisiones Regi</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>60,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27978-Telmex Servicios Empre</td>
<td>IP Transit</td>
<td>47,350~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6471-ENTEL CHILE S.A.</td>
<td>Telephony</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Domestic Companies by ATI. There is diversity in their size; revenues range from USD 32 million to over 60 billion. There are also three state-owned providers (in red). Four of these companies are owned by Telefonica (bold), two by America Movil (underlined), and two by Alfa (Italics). All but four (marked with ^) of these companies are known to provide IP transit commercially.
## State-Owned Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ATI Rank</th>
<th>AS Number – AS Name</th>
<th>Avg. Influence</th>
<th>Perc. ASes in Country</th>
<th>Revenue USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>262589-INTERNEXA Brasil Opera</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>1,700,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18678-INTERNEXA S.A. E.S.P</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1,700,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8048-CANTV Servicios Venez</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>3,750,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Internexa, a subsidiary of a company owned by the Colombian government, provides transit to about 18% of Brazilian Ases with an average influence of 0.22.

- CANTV is the largest telecommunications provider in Venezuela with a large AS footprint (22%) and dominant influence (Avg. Influence 0.65).

- CANTV also has 16 million direct customer accounts.
### Telefonica and America Movil Subsidiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ATI Rank AS Number – AS Name</th>
<th>Commercial Name</th>
<th>Avg. Influence</th>
<th>Perc. ASes in Country</th>
<th>Subscribers (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8 10429-Telefonica Data S.A.</td>
<td>Telefonica Vivo</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>NA (Enterprise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10 3816-COLOMBIA TELECOMUNICAC</td>
<td>Movistar</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6147-Telefonica del Peru S.</td>
<td>Movistar and Tuenti</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3 7004-CTC Transmisiones Regi</td>
<td>Movistar</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3 8151-Uninet S.A. de C.V.</td>
<td>Uninet</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>NA (Enterprise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>9 27978-Telmex Servicios Empre Telmex</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>NA (Enterprise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Four domestic companies are subsidiaries of Telefonica. Three of them are major mobile operators, with upwards of 10M subscribers.
- Telefonica’s subsidiaries are also dominant providers, with avg. influences ranging from 0.48 to 0.93.
- Another two companies are subsidiaries of America Movil (a Mexican company) in Mexico and Chile.