

Oscilloscope: Detecting BGP Hijacks in the Data Plane

Tobias Bühler
ETH Zürich
buehlert@ethz.ch

Alexandros Milolidakis
KTH Royal Institute of Technology
miloli@kth.se

Romain Jacob
ETH Zürich
jacobr@ethz.ch

Marco Chiesa
KTH Royal Institute of Technology
mchiesa@kth.se

Stefano Vissicchio
University College London (UCL)
s.vissicchio@ucl.ac.uk

Laurent Vanbever
ETH Zürich
lvanbever@ethz.ch

Abstract

The lack of security of the Internet routing protocol (BGP) has allowed attackers to divert Internet traffic and consequently perpetrate service disruptions, monetary frauds, and even citizen surveillance for *decades*. State-of-the-art defenses rely on geo-distributed BGP monitors to detect rogue BGP announcements. As we show, though, attackers can easily evade detection by engineering their announcements.

This paper presents Oscilloscope, an approach to accurately detect BGP hijacks by relying on real-time traffic analysis. As hijacks inevitably change the characteristics of the diverted traffic, the key idea is to track these changes in real time and flag them. The main challenge is that “normal” Internet events (e.g., network reconfigurations, link failures, load balancing) *also* change the underlying traffic characteristics – and they are *way* more frequent than hijacks. Naive traffic analyses would hence lead to too many false positives.

We observe that hijacks typically target a *subset* of the prefixes announced by Internet service providers and only divert a subset of their traffic. In contrast, normal events lead to more uniform changes across prefixes and traffic. Oscilloscope uses this observation to filter out non-hijack events by checking whether they affect multiple related prefixes or not.

Our experimental evaluation demonstrates that Oscilloscope quickly and accurately detects hijacks in realistic traffic traces containing hundreds of events.

1 Introduction

BGP *hijacks* have plagued the Internet over the last decade, targeting critical societal services (e.g., finance services) [20], the core of the Internet infrastructure (e.g., the DNS system) [47], and citizens (e.g., for surveillance purposes) [53]. Even worse, several BGP hijacks have gone unnoticed for a long time [19]. The core problem is the lack of in-built security mechanisms in the interdomain routing protocol, *i.e.*, the Border Gateway Protocol (BGP), which makes launching a BGP hijack attack a simple task. Any network can falsely

announce in BGP as the legitimate owner of any IP prefix, and all other networks will trust such an announcement. So, when the attacker’s BGP announcement propagates in the Internet, some networks will reroute their traffic towards the attacker’s network.

Defenses to BGP hijacks aim to prevent them entirely or detect them reliably. Existing solutions to prevent hijacks incorporate crypto operations into BGP to verify the exchanged messages. However, complete prevention is tough to achieve. For example, BGPSec [32] faces insurmountable deployability barriers, while RPKI [5] only protects against limited hijack types. Proposals to detect hijacks, in contrast, are often easy to deploy but have other shortcomings. Control-plane-based solutions are inherently limited by the visibility of their vantage points and cannot detect all attacks (as our analysis shows in § 2.3). Data-plane-based systems (e.g., [59]) often require a large number of active probes, which leads to scalability problems, or they can only detect specific hijack types (e.g., blackholes).

In this paper, we introduce Oscilloscope, a system that detects BGP hijacks by observing and comparing hijack-specific characteristics in passively collected data-plane traffic. Oscilloscope is designed to run standalone, analyzing the *existing* traffic crossing the network it is deployed in.

Oscilloscope’s design leverages two simple yet powerful observations: (i) the existing data-plane data already carries “signals” which can be linked to an ongoing hijack attack (e.g., also shown in [16, 44]); and (ii) the often-used per-neighbor routing policies [38] result in forwarding paths that are similar (or equal) for traffic flows between any pair of networks (*i.e.*, ASes) in the Internet. More concretely, the first observation implies that when an attacker intercepts a set of flows towards one prefix, the packets’ Round Trip Times (RTTs) in the diverted traffic flow will increase (or decrease). In general, an interception attack fundamentally forces a change in the traffic forwarding path that cannot be avoided or hidden by the attacker. The second observation implies that “normal” forwarding changes (e.g., due to a link failure) will equally affect all the traffic flows from Oscilloscope’s network and a spe-

cific external AS. In contrast, a hijack targeting a small set of our prefixes will break this similarity and build an exploitable comparison point.

Oscilloscope detects hijacks in three steps, illustrated in the example in Figure 1. In the example, AS Z intercepts traffic towards the prefix 212.0.3.0/24, which is announced by our AS where Oscilloscope is deployed.

First, Oscilloscope combines collected RTT samples to build so-called “combined signals,” which contain all the RTT samples from flows that share the same local /24 prefix and target destinations belonging to one external AS (the figure shows three examples). Aggregating measurements this way improves the practicality and scalability of Oscilloscope, in terms of both data to maintain and comparisons to perform. We do not lose any information, given that /24 is the smallest prefix size globally advertised by BGP [50], and hence hijacks cannot target prefixes more specific than /24s.

Second, according to our insight (i), Oscilloscope detects changes in the combined signals. It compares the long-term minimum RTT value against RTT values in consecutive short-term windows and flags changes bigger than a given threshold (e.g., see the middle plot in Figure 1). Comparing the RTT across consecutive short-term values filters out noise. Since the minimum RTT can be computed efficiently, changes for all combined signals are detected in near real-time.

Finally, Oscilloscope performs two-sample statistical tests between RTT samples from the combined signal, which observes the change and its “buddy” prefixes (i.e., the combined signals not affected by the hijack in Figure 1) – where buddy prefixes are defined based on our observation (ii). In the case of a hijack-induced, prefix-specific change, the test will indicate that the samples come from different distributions increasing Oscilloscope’s hijack evidence.

We implemented Oscilloscope and used it to analyze hundreds of network events. We show that Oscilloscope reliably detects blackhole and interception attacks (recall of 94%) while ignoring most “normal” forwarding events (precision of 93%) found in more than six hours of traffic traces collected in a realistic virtual environment. Oscilloscope detects most events in fewer than 10 seconds.

Contributions. We make the following contributions:

1. We perform studies to show that interception attacks (invisible to current control-plane-driven detection systems) are easy to compute, have a good probability of succeeding, and can affect many networks (§ 2);
2. We introduce Oscilloscope which can detect interception and blackhole attacks using data-plane traffic (§ 3);
3. We explain how Oscilloscope can detect changes in noisy RTT signals (§ 4) and validates its observations (§ 5);
4. We perform an in-depth analysis of Oscilloscope’s performance (§ 7) based on RTT signals from simulated hijack events in a realistic virtual environment (§ 6);
5. We confirm that Oscilloscope’s requirements are fulfilled in the real Internet based on control-plane data (§ 7.4).




Figure 1: As Z intercepts traffic from AS 739 towards our prefix 212.0.3.0/24, which leads to an observable RTT change in the corresponding “combined signal”. Note that traffic between other prefixes and AS 739 does not show the change that Oscilloscope uses as comparison points.

2 Background, Related Work, and Motivation

In this section, we introduce the relevant background and our attacker model. Afterwards, we discuss related work and how hijackers can evade monitor-based detection systems.

2.1 Background and attacker model

Basics. The Border Gateway Protocol (BGP [41]) is the de-facto routing protocol that glues together all the tens of thousands of Autonomous Systems (ASes) forming the Internet. Using BGP, neighboring ASes generate, receive, and propagate announcements about the *routes* that can be used to reach the announced IP prefixes. Each AS is identified by an *AS number*, and each route contains an *AS path* field, which contains a sequence of AS numbers representing the ASes through which an announcement has propagated. Each BGP router within an AS selects a single best route towards each IP prefix and processes each prefix independently. A router selects routes based on operator-defined routing policies and attributes such as the AS path length.

For instance, an AS will likely prefer to route traffic destined to an IP prefix through one of its customers (which pays money) rather than using a provider (which costs money) regardless of the AS path length [17]. Similarly, an AS may not be willing to exchange traffic between two providers as it does not gain any monetary benefits.

Hijack attacks. BGP has not been designed with security in mind [6]. Any network may announce an IP prefix regardless of whether they lawfully own that prefix or not, a so-called BGP *hijack* attack. Since other networks do not have the means to verify the legitimacy of the information contained in a BGP announcement, networks may inadvertently select malicious routes and reroute their traffic towards the adversar-

ial networks. We say that a hijack attack is a blackhole hijack if the malicious network cannot forward the traffic to the legitimate destination after hijacking it. For example, if the hijack also affects all the neighbors of the malicious network. In this case, the traffic is dropped. We refer instead to an interception hijack if the malicious network can still forward the traffic to the legitimate destination (i.e., a neighbor of the malicious network is still selecting a legitimate route).

Attacker model. We assume that an attacker either performs *same-prefix* attacks, i.e., the attacker announces the same IP prefix and length as the legitimate prefix; or *more-specific* attacks, i.e., the attacker announces a more-specific prefix than the legitimate one. Note that same-prefix attacks do not propagate through the entire Internet. Some regions of the Internet will select the legitimate announcement, and others will choose the illegitimate one, making detecting these attacks more challenging. In both cases, the hijacker might forward the attracted traffic back to the victim AS if a return path is available or through a pre-configured tunnel (which in both cases results in an interception hijack) or drop the collected traffic (resulting in a blackhole hijack). To achieve that, the attacker can use techniques such as AS path poisoning [29] (i.e., adding specific AS numbers to the announced AS path) to limit the spread of its advertisements or keep a return path open for an interception attack (when traffic tunneling cannot be used) [18].

Hijack example. Figure 2 shows an example of a same-prefix interception attack. All networks select their best BGP routes based on the shortest AS-path length. For this example, we do *not* consider that M1 and M2 act as BGP monitors. Bob has two providers, P1 and P2, and configures BGP to announce its /23 IP prefix to both of them. P1 has a neighbor Eve and does not announce routes to Eve. N1 has two providers, Eve and M1, and it decides to announce Bob’s route only to M1. Bob’s announcement, therefore, propagates through Alice and M2. (Alice may propagate the announcement to Eve, but this is irrelevant in this example). Now, imagine Eve wants to intercept the traffic flow from Alice to Bob. Eve can generate a bogus BGP announcement towards Alice, stating that it has a route towards Bob’s network for the same IP prefix that goes through P1. Since this route has only three hops (i.e., Eve, P1, and Bob) while Alice’s currently selected route has four hops (i.e., M1, N1, P2, and Bob), Alice will select this new route towards Eve and divert her traffic accordingly. Eve can now either drop the traffic (i.e., a blackhole attack) or reroute the traffic to any of its neighbors that still have a valid route towards the legitimate Bob network, e.g., N1, which results in an interception attack.¹

In a more-specific attack, Eve would announce a /24 subnet of the original /23 prefix originated by Bob. Since BGP treats different IP prefixes independently, Eve’s announcement prop-




Figure 2: Hijack example of Eve intercepting Bob’s traffic from Alice. M1 and M2 are the monitoring ASes that report their BGP routes to the BGP collector.

agates everywhere. Eve can additionally “poison” the AS path by including P1 and Bob. As a result, the BGP loop detection algorithm [41] running on P1’s and Bob’s routers will drop the /24 route. They continue to use the original /23 route.

More-specific vs. same-prefix attacks. Limiting the spread of more-specific attacks is more challenging than for same-prefix attacks since their propagations are inherently limited by the competing, legitimate announcement, which may be preferred in some parts of the Internet (e.g., when the AS path is shorter). More-specific hijacks do not compete against any other legitimate announcement, so they tend to propagate everywhere (unless one carefully exploits AS path poisoning).

2.2 Analysis of existing solutions

Secure routing protocols are either undeployable or have limited effectiveness. Over the years, multiple techniques and modifications to BGP have been proposed to *proactively* secure the Internet against BGP hijacking [6, 51]. However, the lack of global consensus, the ever-increasing size of the BGP tables [26], as well as the extra overhead required to authenticate each entry have led to complex cryptographic signing techniques [30, 54, 56], such as BGPsec [32], to be far from deployable in production [51, 60]. As such, simpler forms of crypto-based mitigations have been proposed. For instance, RPKI [5] only stores a digitally-signed mapping between an IP prefix and the AS number allowed to originate a route for it. Unfortunately, previous results have shown that by picking a victim and malicious ASes at random over the Internet, the probability of attracting at least 10% of the traffic, even with RPKI fully deployed, was above 60% [18]. **Monitor-based countermeasures have limited visibility.** To overcome the limited deployment and effectiveness of crypto-based solutions, today’s networks rely on *reactive* approaches that monitor the BGP announcements propagated through the Internet from various vantage points [33, 45, 46]. These systems typically provide real-time detection within 5 s by analyzing BGP announcements through the publicly available BGP monitoring infrastructure, i.e., RIPE RIS [1],

¹N1 could easily detect that it is receiving traffic for a non-announced prefix. However, today’s networks do *not* check the consistency of the BGP routes (control plane) with data-plane observations.

BGPStream [39]. An inherent limitation of such solutions is that same-prefix BGP hijacks are only detectable if any monitor receives illegitimate announcements. We show in § 2.3 that monitor-based detection systems can easily be evaded by carefully crafting BGP announcements that do not propagate to the monitors.

Probing-based data-plane countermeasures can be evaded. Data-plane approaches rely on active probing measurements (e.g., pings, traceroutes, nmap, ...) often performed between external probe locations and the victim’s network. Since traffic is forwarded to the attacker during the hijack period, we may discover hijacks by probes that fail to reach their destinations. Those approaches’ success heavily relies on their ability to distinguish hijack signals from common traceroute problems. As the hijacker can attack any sub-prefix of the victim’s prefix, detecting all possible attack scenarios with low false positive rates (or false positives in case of interceptions) is time-consuming and computationally expensive.

For example, iSPY [59] offers a lightweight approach with low false positives that detect hijacks by observing unusual changes to usually stable traceroute paths. However, it protects only against blackholing and same-prefix attacks. Zheng et Al. [61] discover interception attacks by observing AS hop count changes in traceroutes. However, an interception hijacker can easily manipulate this information by replying with false IPs. Hu et Al. [25] extract “fingerprints” from the devices of the correct origin and compare them with the fingerprints of the potential hijacker. Since the hijacker cannot completely mimic and lie about a network, blackholes become distinguishable, yet interceptions easily evade detection as the traffic reaches the correct origin. As such, systems operating in the data plane have been challenging to commercialize.

Naive RTT-based solutions generate false positives or are challenging to deploy. There exists other work which uses RTT measurements to detect certain BGP hijacks. The RTT-based detection method in [27, 44] uses a simple, threshold-based change-detection algorithm to observe possible attacks. [23] focuses on a crowd-based detection approach that highlights possible routing anomalies. Both methods have difficulties in distinguishing hijacks from other events. Oscilloscope can validate some of its observations using statistical tests and buddy prefixes. DARSHANA [3] also uses changes in the RTT to detect hijacks but actively generates RTT samples with a new “cryptographic” ping protocol which requires the exchange of public keys with the destination. In comparison, Oscilloscope does not need support from other networks to detect possible hijacks.

2.3 Evading monitor-based detection

We now show how hijackers can evade detection from the state-of-the-art monitor-based detection system Artemis [45]. The main idea is to generate interception attacks that do not disrupt the hijacked traffic so that the malicious BGP an-

nouncements do not propagate to the BGP monitors. All the attacks are RPKI valid by consistently placing the legitimate owner as the originator of an announcement.

Similarly to [45], we rely on a large-scale BGP simulator to model the propagation of BGP announcements Internet-wide. The simulator is based on CAIDA topologies [11], augmented with IXP datasets [12], and the routing policies follow the standard Gao-Rexford conditions [15]: prefer customer routes over peers and provider ones and do not export provider-to-provider routes. See Appendix A.2 and [36] for more details.

A stealthy hijacker. We introduce a hijack attacker that crafts malicious BGP announcements to avoid propagating to any BGP monitors using AS path poisoning attacks [29]. Concretely, the attacker computes a set of ASes to include in the AS path of the bogus announcements so that the route is both *i)* long enough to avoid propagating far in the Internet and *ii)* contains carefully selected AS numbers of critical ASes (e.g., transit ASes). The BGP loop-detection mechanism [41] prevents these ASes from propagating the bogus route further. For instance, in Figure 2, M1 and M2 are networks that send their BGP routes to a BGP route collector (*i.e.*, BGP monitors). Eve may announce Bob’s IP prefix with the following AS path <Eve, M2, Bob>. In this case, Alice selects this three-hop route which does not propagate to M2. Also, M1 still selects the <N1, P2, Bob> route, which is shorter than <N2, Alice, Eve, M2, Bob>. The attack is not visible from the monitors. Appendix A gives more details.

Stealthy hijacks can often evade detection. We compare the previously introduced stealthy hijacker (called *smart*) with a simpler one (called *normal*), which announces the victim prefix in an RPKI-valid manner. To do so, we run 2000 simulations in which we pick a different victim and hijack AS and verify whether the hijacker can attract traffic from other networks without being detected by any of the 320 BGP monitors used by Artemis. Figure 3a on the left y-axis shows the percentage of successful attacks for the normal hijacker undetected by the BGP monitors (depending on how many are deployed). With a factor of one, *i.e.*, 320 monitors, the percentage of successfully invisible attacks is 14%, decreasing to less than 1% when we deploy five times more monitors. On the right y-axis, we show the maximum amount of networks affected by a successful invisible hijack (in the order of thousands with 320 monitors). We also observe (not shown in the graph) that in 30% of the attacks, more than one hundred networks have been hijacked. Even if we have five times the amount of monitors, 5 percent of the attacks affect more than 300 networks. Figure 3b shows the same analysis for the stealthy hijacker (*smart*). In this case, the amount of successfully invisible interception hijacks grows to 31%, and the maximum amount of hijacked networks remains in the order of thousands even when the number of deployed monitors increases five times. These results indicate that BGP-based monitoring systems are insufficient to detect some more sophisticated hijack types.




Figure 3: Stealthy hijacks produced by a naive (baseline) hijacker versus our stealthy hijacker as we scale the number of existing monitors. The bars depict the number of stealthy hijacks that succeeded (out of 2000 simulations), while the line shows the maximum number of poisoned/affected ASes for the corresponding scale of monitors.

3 Overview

This section introduces Oscilloscope’s main components and characterizes the type of hijack attacks it can detect.

3.1 Oscilloscope’s main components

The Oscilloscope pipeline comprises three main functional blocks (Figure 4): the combination of RTT signals, the detection of changes in the signals, and the hijack validation.

Input: RTT sample extraction. The main input to Oscilloscope is a set of RTT samples extracted from the flows that traverse the network Oscilloscope operates in. There exist multiple methods to extract RTT signals from network traffic. For example, Google’s Espresso [58] provides such RTT samples from their servers, and recent work has shown how to extract RTT samples from programmable data-plane devices [13, 44]. Therefore, this work assumes that the RTT signals have already been extracted.

Extracting and gathering RTT signals from all the flows in a large network may become a scalability problem. In such cases, we can feed the RTT signals of only the largest flows to Oscilloscope. As we show later, Oscilloscope does not need to monitor all the flows from/to an IP prefix to detect a hijack.

Stage 1: Signal combination. The first step of Oscilloscope is to build a “combined” RTT signal that captures changes at the level of entire IP prefixes and/or ASes. This level of granularity allows us to detect a hijack attack that affects even a single external AS, provided that we have ongoing traffic flows from/to that AS network. The challenge is to combine flows (i) efficiently while (ii) preserving the necessary information to detect potential hijacks.

Oscilloscope takes as input a given set of internal IP prefixes to be monitored and groups the RTT samples at the granularity of /24 IP prefixes. For instance, a /23 IP prefix will result in two combined RTT signals corresponding to the two /24 subnets, allowing us to detect both same-prefix




Figure 4: Oscilloscope contains three major functional blocks. It combines RTT samples, then detects changes in the combined signals and performs statistical tests to validate the detected events.

and more-specific attacks. In fact, common BGP filters [50] would block hijacks of a /25 IP prefix or more specific ones. We note that aggregating the RTT signals of all the flows from/to a monitored /24 is, however, still too coarse-grained, as hijacks invisible to BGP monitors only affect certain Internet regions. Thus, we combine RTT signals per i) /24 prefix and ii) per external AS with which a flow communicates. In other words, each *combined signal* contains RTT samples from traffic exchanged between one of our /24 IP prefixes and all the prefixes belonging to a *single* external AS.

To figure out which IP prefixes belong to which AS, Oscilloscope relies on the AS path of the BGP routes received at the local routers. For each IP prefix, the corresponding AS path usually indicates which AS originated the route

Stage 2: Change detection. In the second block, Oscilloscope analyzes each combined signal to detect sudden RTT changes (increase or decrease). We present a simple overview and refer the reader to § 4 for more details. We perform the change detection by comparing long- and short-term minimum RTT values. Suppose the difference exceeds a user-defined threshold (input parameter) and is ongoing for the entire duration of a user-defined time window. In this case, Oscilloscope detects an event and triggers the last operation of the pipeline: It validates whether this event is a BGP hijack or a genuine change in the Internet state. In addition, we also forward combined signals to the validation stage if they suddenly terminate, which could indicate a blackhole attack.

Stage 3: Hijack validation. Several Internet routing events may lead to changes in the RTT of specific flows, e.g., reconfiguration, policy updates, load balancing, or fiber cuts. The last block in Oscilloscope’s pipeline is therefore responsible for distinguishing “true” hijacks from normal routing events.

Oscilloscope validates hijacks using the concept of “buddy” prefixes which translate insights from [33] into the data plane. We say that a set of IP prefixes originated by the same AS are *buddies* if their flows towards the same external AS destination follow the same path. In the absence of malicious hijack attacks, IP prefixes originated by the same AS propagate through BGP along the same paths, as most ASes do not apply per-prefix policies [17]. Hence, buddies offer comparison points that can identify hijacks: a hijack of one of our prefixes does not affect its buddies, whereas normal routing events affect *all* buddy prefixes similarly as they traverse the same AS path. When the change detection block reports an event for a particular IP prefix, Oscilloscope collects RTT samples from the prefix and one of its buddies. Using a two-sample statistical test, Oscilloscope checks whether the two RTT samples appear to come from the same *distribution*; if not, we take this as evidence that the flows started to follow different paths, which indicates a potential hijack. If possible, Oscilloscope repeats this validation step with additional buddy prefixes to increase its confidence.

3.2 Detectable hijacks

Oscilloscope detects hijacks based on changes in the observed data-plane signals, which reveal blackhole and interception BGP hijacks. In a blackhole attack, traffic from one or multiple external ASes targeted to some of our internal prefixes is terminated/reaches a blackhole in an unwanted AS. An interception attack is more refined. Instead of terminating the ongoing flows, an attacker intercepts the traffic and forwards packets over different/additional ASes before they reach their original destination, *i.e.*, our AS. Both hijack types emit data-plane signals, which we can detect by analyzing RTT samples collected in our AS. A blockhole hijack leads to a (one-directional) traffic loss, resulting in an abrupt termination of any observable RTTs. In contrast, an interception hijack leads to a potential change in the RTTs. Given Oscilloscope’s combined signals that focus on a /24 level, Oscilloscope can use its detection pipeline for same-prefix and more-specific hijack attacks. In summary, Oscilloscope can detect all hijack types introduced in our attacker model (§ 2.1) but might miss hijacks that do not generate a representative data-plane signal (no flows or small RTT change), as we show in § 7.

4 Large-Scale Data-Plane Change Detection

This section explains how Oscilloscope detects changes in the combined RTT signals, filters noise, and reacts to events where no RTT samples are available.

4.1 Change detection

Figure 5 shows Oscilloscope’s workflow to detect changes in a combined RTT signal using simplified examples. As




Figure 5: Oscilloscope uses long- and short-term windows to detect minimum RTT changes larger than a given threshold.

explained in § 3.1, a “combined signal” contains all RTT traffic samples exchanged between one of our /24 prefixes and all the prefixes belonging to a single external AS. The change detection process runs on each combined signal separately once every second. That also means that the number of RTT samples considered each second depends on the amount of traffic in a specific combined signal.

Using a threshold to detect large enough RTT changes. RTT signals are often noisy due to network congestion and end-host processing delays. This noise may even be exacerbated when combining RTT samples from different flows, which is the case when Oscilloscope builds combined signals. Therefore, Oscilloscope uses a threshold (indicated in Figure 5 with the red vertical bars) to dismiss changes in the RTT signal that are too small (example on the left). The network operator defines the threshold directly impacting the number of detectable hijack events (as empirically validated in § 7).

Using the minimum RTT over time windows to track the RTT. However, we do not apply the threshold for every two consecutive RTT samples but rather use it to detect changes in the *minimum* RTT observed in a long-term and short-term window. Oscilloscope uses the minimum RTT for two reasons. First, the minimum is practical when considering RTT measurements, as there is an explicit lower bound on how fast packets can traverse over a given path [40]. As such, a change in the observed long-term minimum RTT indicates a potential path change. Second, Oscilloscope can update the current minimum value whenever it receives a new RTT sample and does not need to store all the samples belonging to one combined signal. That improves efficiency and saves storage resources which is essential as the number of combined signals is large depending on the network size.

Example. Figure 5 shows how Oscilloscope uses short- and long-term windows. In the example in the middle, Oscilloscope realizes that the short- and long-term RTT difference exceeds the given threshold for a few RTT samples (indicated with the green tick below the short-term window). If Oscilloscope would now immediately report the change and continue with the validation step, we would be very susceptible to short-living RTT spikes (*e.g.*, due to queues filling up). For this reason, Oscilloscope saves the long-term RTT minimum and repeats the comparison in the next short-term windows. In the example, the RTT difference no longer exceeds the threshold (red cross), and we dismiss the change. Oscilloscope only

deems a change as significant if the RTT difference exceeds the threshold in as many consecutive short-term windows as the long-term window is wide. In our implementation, we use a four-second long-term window and a short-term window of one second. For that reason, Oscilloscope needs to detect the change in four consecutive short-term windows before acknowledging the RTT change (as shown in the example on the right in Figure 5). We found out that a long-term window of four seconds is long enough to filter out short delay spikes (due to congestion) while being short enough to allow Oscilloscope to operate reactively and detect potential hijacks in a timely manner.

Detecting positive and negative RTT changes. To detect potential hijack events that would decrease the observed minimum RTT (i.e., a hijacker that can provide better connectivity than the original path), Oscilloscope compares the absolute value of the minimum difference with the threshold. Also, it checks that the sign of the difference is consistent in the four consecutive short-term windows. If all these conditions hold, Oscilloscope continues with the validation step.

4.2 Dealing with a lack of RTT samples

It is important to note that Oscilloscope handles short-term windows without any RTT samples in a unique way. We observe short-term windows without samples if, for example, the combined signal consists of flows with low activity or an event that causes packet loss (which results in the loss of RTT samples). In such a case Oscilloscope performs two operations. First, it extends the long-term window by one unit (i.e., keeps track of the existing long-term RTT minimum) rather than decreasing the amount of RTT samples in the long-term window with every empty short-term one. Without that, Oscilloscope would eventually lose the long-term minimum RTT value, which an attacker could abuse to evade detection. More precisely, an attacker could drop the initial hijacked packets before starting an interception attack, and Oscilloscope would no longer be able to detect the introduced RTT change. Second, Oscilloscope starts a blackhole detection process. Oscilloscope once again uses a similar approach to track the minimum RTT, but this time it searches for four consecutive short-term windows *without* any RTT samples. However, to accommodate combined signals containing flows with infrequent RTT samples (i.e., some short-term windows without any samples), the number of required consecutive short-term windows without any samples (4) is multiplied by $n + 1$ where n corresponds to the number of empty short-term windows in the currently considered long-term window. With this design choice, we combine the well-working long-term window size of four with an adaptive component (multiplication by $n + 1$) based on the current behavior of the combined signal. If enough consecutive short-term windows contain no samples, Oscilloscope forwards the potential blackhole to the validation stage.




Figure 6: Short-term windows without any RTT samples increase the corresponding long-term windows and influence the detection process of potential blackholes.

Example. Figure 6 illustrates these two operations. In the example on the left, the current long-term window now contains five instead of four short-term windows, as one does not contain any RTT samples. The same holds for the example on the right, where Oscilloscope requires $4 \times (1 + 1) = 8$ consecutive short-term windows before the potential blackhole observation is forwarded to the validation stage.

5 Validation and Analysis of Changes

We now introduce the concept of buddy prefixes and explain how we use statistical tests to validate our hijack assumptions.

5.1 Buddy concept

Oscilloscope’s primary validation strategy is built around the intuition that successful interception (or blackhole) hijacks will introduce a forwarding change reflected in the collected RTT signals. To have a baseline reference for detecting hijack attacks, Oscilloscope uses the concept of so-called “buddy” prefixes. In the absence of any hijacks, traffic from two buddy prefixes should follow the same paths when communicating with identical external ASes. The concept of “buddy” prefixes is not new. Buddyguard [33] first introduced the term to describe prefixes that behave similarly (in the absence of hijacks) when looking at them in the *control plane*. Oscilloscope translates this concept to the *data plane*.

To build buddy prefixes, we split the IP space advertised by our own AS into /24 prefixes, the smallest prefix size advertised by BGP Internet-wide [50]. As a result, a potential hijacker must create fake advertisements for at least one of these /24 prefixes to influence our traffic. Consequently, the hijack will equally affect traffic inside one buddy prefix. We leave the problem of identifying buddy prefixes in real-time as future work. Our analysis with real BGP data in § 7.4 shows that most IP prefixes have multiple buddies.

Figure 7 shows simplified RTT distributions for various network events. Most of these examples are based on traces used in our evaluation (§ 6). Buddy prefixes (P1 and P2) exchange traffic with AS X. The first two examples (forwarding change due to link failure and load balancing) show that




Figure 7: RTT samples of two buddy prefixes (P1, P2) exchanging traffic with AS X. We only observe an asymmetric behavior between buddy samples if a hijack affects P1 or P2.

RTT samples from both buddies are equally affected. That means, eventually, flows from both buddies will use the new forwarding path after the link failure or use the same set of physical paths when load balanced, respectively. The same observation holds in the third case (an interception hijack targeting prefixes of AS X), where traffic from P1 *and* P2 will be affected. Note that Oscilloscope does *not* try to detect such hijacks as the hijack does not target one of *our* prefixes. Finally, the interception attack of P1 and the blackhole attack targeting P2 (lower two examples) are the only two events leading to observable asymmetries in the RTT distributions of the two buddy prefixes. Oscilloscope is precisely looking for such changes and compares samples between multiple buddy prefixes to validate its hijack assumptions in these cases.

5.2 Sample collection

As soon as Oscilloscope detects a change in traffic belonging to a combined signal (§ 4), it collects RTT samples from this combined signal. In addition, we also look for comparison samples from valid buddy prefixes. Initially, Oscilloscope assumes that all our /24 prefixes are buddies (compare § 7.4 and § 8). However, Oscilloscope cannot blindly collect comparison samples from these buddy prefixes. The problem is that Oscilloscope neither knows a priori how many /24 prefixes are affected by the potential hijack (*i.e.*, a hijack targeting a /23 prefix affects two /24 buddies) nor do we want to make any assumptions. Suppose Oscilloscope would pick validation samples from a buddy also targeted by the hijack. In that case, the validation step might report wrong results because we do not have a valid comparison point.

For this reason, Oscilloscope *ignores* buddies that (i) were recently declared as hijacked towards the currently observed external AS (an operator can clear these buddies after investi-

gating the event); or (ii) are currently also in the process of being validated as we detected a change in their corresponding combined signal towards the same external AS (remember that we perform the change detection for each combined signal individually). The second criterion includes buddies for which the change is *nearly* confirmed, *i.e.*, we already found the change in three of the required four consecutive short-term windows (see § 4), to prevent strict time synchronization requirements between the change detection processes. From the remaining buddy prefixes, Oscilloscope follows a “first come, first served” principle to pick the required amount of comparison samples from the specified number of buddy prefixes (two operator-defined parameters).

Note that all buddy prefixes are ignored for apparent events (*e.g.*, a forwarding change introducing a significant RTT change). In this case, Oscilloscope correctly terminates the validation process and does not report any hijacks. In the more likely cases (*e.g.*, changes detected due to noise, hijacks targeting specific prefixes, ...) Oscilloscope applies the statistical test described in the following subsection. It compares the distributions of samples collected from the combined signal that observed the change and its buddy prefixes.

If Oscilloscope tries to validate a potential blackhole, it expects to find no samples from the corresponding combined signal. We will immediately discard the blackhole assumption if we still observe a sample. Suppose, in addition, the buddy prefix(es) also do not provide any RTT samples (*i.e.*, no more traffic towards this external AS), and we cannot confirm the blackhole idea. It looks like a total traffic loss, *e.g.*, due to a link failure, and Oscilloscope will not report anything.

5.3 Statistical tests

After collecting samples from the combined signal, which observes a change and at least one buddy prefix, Oscilloscope uses the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test (*e.g.*, [48, p. 128+]) to compare the two sample sets. The Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test is a non-parametric statistical test that only assumes that the samples from both sets are independent (given as they come from different /24 prefixes) and that we can order them (*i.e.*, one RTT sample is bigger than another one). We selected this test for at least two reasons. First, given that it belongs to the class of non-parametric tests, we do not require that the collected RTT samples follow additional assumptions, *e.g.*, that they belong to a specific distribution. Second, we can also apply the test if the number of found RTT samples is small (compare [48, Appendix Table J]), which is often problematic for comparable parametric tests.

As null hypothesis H_0 , we assume that the two sample-set distributions are equal. In contrast, the alternative hypothesis H_1 states that one sample distribution is stochastically larger (or smaller) than the other. An interception hijack will most likely increase the observed RTT but could also decrease it. For this reason, we perform a *two-sided* test.

The test first sorts all collected RTT samples in increasing order and then sums up the ranks of samples belonging to the same set (i.e., ranks of all samples coming from the buddy prefix). If both sample sets belong to the same distribution (H_0), the rank sum should roughly be equal.

The network operator defines a confidence level as an input parameter to Oscilloscope’s validation step. Whenever the test result is above the confidence level, we assume that the null hypothesis holds and the two sample sets come from the same distribution, i.e., they follow the same forwarding path. Otherwise, we assume they come from two different distributions, strengthening our confidence that we observe an ongoing hijack. If available, Oscilloscope repeats the same test with samples from additional buddy prefixes.

If the validation test indicates that the null hypothesis holds, Oscilloscope immediately discards the event and will not report anything. However, if the tests suggest that the RTT samples come from different distributions, we can optionally repeat the validation step once (or multiple times). That means Oscilloscope will collect another batch of RTT samples from the combined signal observing the change and its buddy prefixes. Not only will that strengthen our hijack assumption, but it also allows us to compare against other buddy prefixes, diversifying the collected samples. As we show in § 7.1, repeating the validation step once greatly reduces the number of false positives/increases Oscilloscope’s precision.

6 Experimental Setup

We face two challenges when evaluating the hijack-detection performance of Oscilloscope. First, we require a realistic Internet-like virtual environment, which is notoriously hard to obtain. And second, we need an extensive dataset of hijack events (with corresponding data-plane information) which, to the best of our knowledge, does not exist. Testbeds such as the PEERING [43] platform have only limited prefixes and ASes under their control. This section describes how we address these two challenges.

6.1 Mini-Internet emulation

To evaluate Oscilloscope, we need an environment emulating

- Multiple ASes with BGP connectivity;
 - Realistic BGP relationships between ASes;
 - Inter-domain links with realistic delays;
 - Prefix advertisements and traffic generation from end hosts.
- We use the mini-Internet platform [24] as a basis for our emulation. The mini-Internet runs each device (e.g., router, host) in its own Docker container and links them together to enable Internet-like connectivity. We build an AS topology extracted from the real Internet using the RIPE Atlas platform [42]. We collect the built-in IPv4 traceroute measurements from a global network of probes, each of which automatically performs those measurements at 20-30 minute intervals towards

the 13 DNS root servers. Using the IPv4 Paris-enabled traces, which are protected against common load balancing problems [2], we extract the inter- and intra-domain links observed by each probe. We also estimate the link delay between two destinations, A and B , as $delay_{A \rightarrow B} = RTT_B - RTT_A$.

One day of measurements from RIPE contains about 149M traceroutes involving 520k intra-domain and 116k inter-domain links interconnecting 12k ASes. The mini-Internet platform does not scale to networks that large (when running on a single server). Thus we keep only the most frequently discovered inter-domain links in our topology. Keeping only the 3% most commonly found links yield 2303 links interconnecting 968 ASes, out of which the most significant connected subset contains more than 600 ASes, which we use for our emulated topology. Finally, we use the AS-relation dataset [11] to obtain the BGP relationships between the ASes in our topology. The internal AS topology is abstracted as one router connected to one or multiple hosts, which act as endpoints for the advertised prefixes. The ASes build eBGP connections with their neighbors following the extracted relationships. For all the external links between the ASes we use `tc-netem` [22] to apply link delays and jitters based on the collected traceroute measurements. If we do not have enough data to estimate a link delay, we default to a delay of 5 ms and 2 ms jitter.

These extracted links, delays, and relationships are configured in the mini-Internet to provide a realistic Internet emulation environment for our evaluation.

6.2 Hijack dataset

We leverage our emulated mini-Internet (§ 6.1) to generate a synthetic dataset of packet traces containing hijacks. First, we identify a set of possible hijack events for our topology. Then we collect packet traces for simulated traffic from multiple runs with and without hijack events.

First, we select one well-interconnected AS as “our AS”; it advertises twelve different /24 prefixes in the entire mini-Internet. We then choose 70 other ASes to perform an interception attack towards our prefix space. For each of these ASes, we generate one hijack event where the AS hijacks one or two of our /24 prefixes from one or two of its directly connected neighbors. The hijacking AS uses path poisoning [29], and thus, the fake advertisement can propagate in a localized part of the mini-Internet and potentially hijack traffic from additional ASes. Similarly, we generate more than a hundred blackhole events by simply dropping the attracted traffic rather than forwarding it back to our AS. Finally, we also generate “normal” forwarding events, such as link failures, by dropping all the traffic on a given link. The routers run Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) [28] to detect link failures and trigger corresponding actions. As a result, such a link failure either leads to a complete loss of traffic or a benign forwarding change with corresponding increases or

decreases in the observed RTT. For the evaluation, knowing how a specific event influences the observable data-plane signals (i.e., ground-truth behavior) is essential. Therefore, we compare traceroute outputs before and after each event to extract all pairs of /24 prefixes and external ASes that observe a forwarding path change due to the event. Additionally, we can quantify the induced RTT change. Obviously, Oscilloscope does not have access to this information. We only used it to label and group the events for the following evaluation.

We can now collect packet traces containing these hijacks or normal network events. We use Flowgrind [62] to generate traffic mimicking real applications, e.g., video streaming or HTTP-style request-response patterns. We generate an average of 100 flows resulting in about 200MBps or 70k packets per second from our /24 prefixes towards ASes affected by the various events. We use tcpdump [21] to record the packets observed on all interfaces connected to the hosts in our AS. Each experiment runs for two minutes, with the event starting after one minute and staying active until the end of the run. We perform one run for each event in our dataset and 30 runs without any specific events, which results in more than six hours of traces. For each trace, we extract the RTTs of all TCP flows by matching sequence and acknowledgment (SEQ/ACK) numbers (similar to the method in [13]).

Equipped with this set of RTTs traces, we can now evaluate the hijack-detection performance of Oscilloscope *offline* for different choices of parameters (§ 7).

7 Evaluation

This section first evaluates Oscilloscope’s accuracy looking at precision and recall values for different input parameters. With a detection threshold of 3 ms Oscilloscope reaches a 94% recall and 93% precision value when analyzing all events in our generated data set containing more than six hours of traces. Afterwards, we discuss Oscilloscope’s detection speed and perform some micro benchmarks. Finally, we evaluate our buddy concept with control-plane data from the real Internet.

7.1 Oscilloscope’s accuracy

The core function of Oscilloscope is its ability to detect hijacks and differentiate them from normal network events. Performance is mainly affected by two system parameters: the detection threshold (§ 4.1) and the number of repetitions of the validation step (§ 5.3). In the following experiments, we quantify how these affect Oscilloscope’s precision (i.e., the rate of true positives among the detected events) and recall (i.e., the rate of true events correctly detected).

7.1.1 Recall vs. magnitude of the RTT change

Setting the change detection threshold defines the detectable events (i.e., achievable recall). Intuitively, hijacks that induce




Figure 8: Oscilloscope’ recall for different change detection threshold values, binned by the RTT change induced by the interception event. Oscilloscope reliably detects hijack events with RTT changes larger than the change detection threshold.

RTT changes smaller than the threshold are hard to detect.

Setup. For each interception event in our dataset (§ 6.2), we run Oscilloscope with change detection threshold values of {1, 3, 5, 10}ms and compute the ratio of true events detected by Oscilloscope (i.e., the recall).

Results. Figure 8 shows the recall for the different threshold values, binned to the magnitude of the hijack-induced RTT change. As expected, the recall drops when the RTT change gets close to the threshold. The detection becomes unreliable for the smallest changes (1-5 ms) (57% detected with a threshold value of 1 ms). This is expected as the RTT change is smaller than the average RTT signal noise, and Oscilloscope cannot detect these hijacks.

Interestingly, in some cases, a threshold of 1 ms fails to detect hijacks inducing more than 20 ms RTT changes. Closer inspection reveals that these cases have only one buddy prefix available. At the same time, this buddy is blacklisted for buddy comparisons due to a wrongly detected hijack event at a previous point in the trace (compare § 5.2). Thus when the actual hijack occurs, Oscilloscope does not find any buddy prefix for the validation and hence does not report the hijack.

Conclusion. Oscilloscope reliably detects hijack events when they induce RTT changes larger than the detection threshold. However, setting a threshold lower than the typical RTT noise is not useful (it does not help to detect events inducing very low RTT changes) and can even be harmful (Oscilloscope fails to detect events that can be caught with a larger threshold).

7.1.2 Precision and recall vs. number of validations

Detecting RTT changes is relatively easy, but differentiating hijacks from normal network events is more challenging. For




Figure 9: Precision and recall values for different change detection thresholds and different numbers of validation steps. Performing the validation twice largely improves the precision without hurting the recall much. The third validation has little effect. The best performance is obtained for a threshold of 3 ms, which is small but larger than the RTT signal noise.

this purpose, Oscilloscope relies on buddy prefixes to validate that an event is a true hijack (§ 5). One can perform the validation steps multiple times; Oscilloscope will report a hijack only if all validations agree that the event is indeed a hijack. Thus, performing more validations will tend to decrease the recall while improving the precision.

Setup. We run Oscilloscope for all events in our dataset with different change detection threshold values (1 to 10 ms) and one, two, or three validation repetitions; we compute the resulting precision and recall values.

Results. Figure 9 shows precision and recall values for the different settings. Looking first at the precision, we observe a significant improvement from one to two validations (up to 20%), then a smaller gain with a third one. This matches our expectations: since multiple validations must agree to identify an event as a hijack, more validations reduce the number of false positives (*i.e.*, improve precision). Conversely, the recall degrades with more validations. This is also expected since true events have more chances of being wrongly discarded as “non-hijack.” Yet, the recall loss is small (less than 2%).

Let us now look at the performance when varying the detection threshold. Generally, smaller threshold values detect more events that either result in true or false positives during the validation step. As a result, smaller thresholds degrade precision and improve recall. However, as discussed in § 7.1.1, threshold values smaller than the noise level (1-2 ms) yield more false positives and limit the buddy prefixes available for validation, thus hurting the recall as well.

Validation stage	Precision	Recall
With 3 buddies	93.77%	94.26%
With 2 buddies	92.19%	94.18%
With 1 buddy	88.31%	94.24%
No validation	6.11%	96.44%

Table 1: Precision and recall values for a different number of buddies that have to agree to report a hijack.

One may notice a tipping point around 5 ms. We explain this by the design of our emulation setup, where we use a link delay of 5 ms as a default value (§ 6.1). Our dataset is thus biased towards events inducing a 5 ms RTT change.

Conclusion. Overall on our dataset, the best performance is obtained with a threshold of 3 ms and two validations. This results in a 94% recall and 93% precision. A third validation trades slightly better precision for slightly worse recall.

7.1.3 Precision and recall vs. number of buddies

When an event is detected, Oscilloscope looks for three buddies to validate whether the event is indeed a hijack. However, we do not always have three buddies available. Thus, we now look at the impact of using fewer buddies on the precision and recall of Oscilloscope. Validating with more buddies is expected to decrease the recall while improving the precision. **Setup.** We run Oscilloscope for all events in our dataset with a 3 ms change detection threshold and two validation steps; we compute the resulting precision and recall values depending on the number of buddies used for the validation.

Results. Table 1 summarizes the precision and recall values depending on how many buddies are used for the validation.

Similarly, as in § 7.1.2, the recall is only marginally affected by the number of available buddies. If the event is indeed a hijack, buddies often validate this correctly (*i.e.*, they do not wrongly discard the event). Interestingly, the recall is only slightly better *without validation at all* and does not reach 100%. This is because some hijack events induce RTT changes that are too small to be detected, given our detection threshold. Conversely, more buddies logically yield better precision (*i.e.*, fewer false positives).

Conclusion. Oscilloscope achieves good precision and recall (around 90%) even with only one buddy for the validation. Using more buddies results in a slight increase in precision (a few %) for a negligible decrease in recall.

7.2 Classification delay

Oscilloscope is meant to detect hijacks at runtime. Thus, it is important to quantify how fast potential hijacks are detected, validated, and reported to the operator. The time required for a hijack to propagate through the network is beyond our

control and independent of Oscilloscope. The delay from detecting an event in the combined RTT signal until the event is reported (or not) by Oscilloscope is more relevant. The delay is affected by the type of the observed event and the number of buddies and validation steps. Intuitively, it increases with a higher number of performed validation steps.

Setup. We run Oscilloscope for all events in our dataset with a 3 ms change detection threshold and one, two, or three validation repetitions; we measure the time delay from detecting a change in the RTT signal until the final event classification by Oscilloscope.

Results. Figure 10 shows the CDF of the classification delays for different events and validation repetitions. These delays are in the scale of seconds since Oscilloscope performs the change detection process once per second. The first observation is that the detection delay is at least 5 s, which comes from Oscilloscope’s design decision of waiting for four consecutive change detections before starting the validation (§ 4.1).

The blackhole events are the easiest to detect, with more than 80% classification completed after five seconds. Since no validation step is performed for these events, the number of validation repetitions naturally has no effect. For the interception events, around 50% are classified after 5 s; that corresponds to cases where Oscilloscope could quickly find buddy prefixes carrying enough traffic for the validation step(s). Cases with higher delays are unavoidable given the data-driven nature of Oscilloscope: when there is no traffic, there is no data to work with; one must wait for the data. With two or three validation steps, around 80% of interception events are classified within 20 s. The “non hijack” events represent cases where Oscilloscope initially triggers, initiates the validation, and classifies the event as normal routing changes.

Finally, the expected trend when varying the number of validations is most sensible for the tail: for about 70% of events, the classification delay varies by less than 1 s.

Conclusion. By design, the classification and reporting of an event by Oscilloscope takes at least 5 s. This choice limits the validation step from excessive triggering due to random noise in the RTT signals. Most events are classified within 5 s and 80% to 100% of them within 20 s (depending on the event type and the number of validation repetitions). We argue that this is a reasonable delay for detecting hijacks that would otherwise remain unnoticed.

If faster detection is desired, one may adapt the design by (i) reducing the size of Oscilloscope’s long-term window and/or (ii) increasing the detection frequency (limited by the computational load – § 7.3). However, this will only help in cases where active buddy prefixes are available for validation. As discussed above, in our dataset, around 50% of interception event classifications are delayed by the lack of available RTT samples from buddies.




Figure 10: Delay between the detected change in the RTT signal and the classification of the event by Oscilloscope. Most events are classified within the best possible delay (around 5 s); the rest are delayed by the lack of RTT samples from active buddies to perform the validation step(s).

7.3 Computational overhead

Running Oscilloscope requires performing three types of computations: (i) extract the minimum RTT values from the combined signals, (ii) compare the short- and long-term minimum to detect changes, and (iii) perform the statistical tests to compare the RTT samples between buddies. These computations must be sufficiently fast to run online; in particular, they must scale to the amount of traffic that Oscilloscope would have to monitor in a large AS.

Setup. Our implementation of Oscilloscope is written in Python, similar to common software of programmable control-plane devices. We time our implementation execution for three classes of traffic load, quantified as the average number of RTT samples to process per second.

- low – 600 RTT sample/s
- medium – 3000 RTT sample/s
- high – 5000 RTT sample/s

We measure the timing of the operations mentioned above, labeled as **minimum**, **change**, and **validation**, respectively.

Results. Table 2 summarizes the results for each operation and traffic load. All times are in μ s.

As expected, the computation of **minimum** is the one most affected by the increasing traffic load, as there are more signals to track, thus, more operations to perform. However, even under high load, this always took less than 250μ s in our experiments. The computation is efficient as Oscilloscope can compute the minimum RTT values without storing all the samples, which is an asset of its design. Storing a small number of sample values is only required when the validation step(s) triggers. The **change** operation compares two minimum values; as expected, this operation is independent of the traffic load. Finally, the **validation** operation performs the statistical tests comparing RTT samples among buddies. We observe that higher loads lead to higher computation times (two to three times more between low and high loads). This is

operation	load	min	median	max
minimum	high	0.71	44.1	244.37
	medium	0.71	26.7	304.69
	low	0.71	2.62	111.10
change	high	0.23	0.71	16.45
	medium	0.235	0.95	16.68
	low	0.23	0.95	26.22
validation	high	1044.98	1152.75	3357.64
	medium	382.18	1146.07	2597.33
	low	347.85	459.19	2586.60

Table 2: Only the time to find the short- and long-term **minimum** is highly influenced by the load (median values). The **validation** operation takes the longest. All values in μs .

explained by the number of statistical tests that are effectively performed: Oscilloscope always looks for three buddies in the validation step. However, with low traffic, there are not always enough active buddies available, thus resulting in fewer tests being performed and lower computation times.

Conclusion. As expected, the traffic load severely impacts only the **minimum** operation. However, it takes less than $250\mu\text{s}$ even for a (high) load of about 5000 RTT samples per second. The validation step is the most computationally expensive, reaching $\sim 3\text{ms}$. Altogether, the total computation time is in the order of ms; in comparison, Oscilloscope runs every second, three orders of magnitude higher. Thus, we conclude that the computational overhead of Oscilloscope is limited and, in particular, it is not a limitation for running the system online, even under high traffic loads.

7.4 Availability of buddies

Oscilloscope relies on the availability of buddies (see § 5.1) to reliably identify hijacks from the RTT signals. For each prefix, Oscilloscope searches for three buddies during its validation step. As shown in § 7.1.3, the detection accuracy remains good even with only one buddy available, but the precision drops when there is none. Hence, to evaluate the usability of Oscilloscope in an actual deployment, it is crucial to assess how likely prefixes are to have buddies in the real Internet.

Assessing whether prefixes are buddies in the data plane is challenging. We can, however, efficiently assess buddyhood in the control plane by parsing BGP announcements. In most cases, prefixes will be buddies in the data plane when there are buddies in the control plane, as ASes do not have per-prefix routing policies implemented (e.g., static routes). In § 5.1, we explain that Oscilloscope splits its prefix space into /24 prefixes for its buddy assumptions (i.e., to match the smallest possible BGP hijack). We can only make statements about the actual prefix sizes in an analysis based on control-plane data. Therefore, the following evaluation considers the prefix sizes observed in BGP advertisements rather than /24.




Figure 11: Number of buddies per prefix seen by 44 RIPE RIS and RouteViews BGP collectors. The different lines indicate the “minimum”, “median”, and “maximum” numbers of buddies seen by the various monitors.

Setup. We use BGPstream [39] to collect recent RIB dump available from 44 RIPE RIS and RouteViews BGP collectors. Each collector gathers and reports on the best routes from multiple collaborative ASes (BGP peers), so-called monitors. We define prefixes as buddies from one monitor’s point of view if they originate from the same AS and their announcements contain the same AS path. For each prefix, we count the number of such buddy prefixes seen by the monitor. Since all RIRs deploy RIPE RIS and RouteViews monitors, we expect them to capture the level of buddyhood in a large part of the Internet. Note that two buddies might share part of their prefix size, e.g., if one AS advertises a /16 prefix and a /20 prefix which is a sub-prefix of the /16 one.

Results. Figure 11 shows a complementary CDF of the number of buddies found per prefix. The different lines show the minimum, median, and maximum numbers of buddies seen by the various monitors. In the “worst-case” (i.e., min. line), about 55% of prefixes have at least three buddies, and about 57% have at least one. We observe a significant variation between the monitors: the median monitor sees about 79% of prefixes with at least three buddies; the value goes to 92% for the “best” monitor.

Conclusion. Our analysis shows that a majority of prefixes have at least three buddies. However, the different monitors see a significant variation in the buddies. Thus, one cannot generalize: buddyhood strongly varies between ASes.

Furthermore, there remains a large portion (between 5 to 45%) of prefixes for which the monitors do not see buddies. “Partial buddies” (only routed in the same way in parts of the Internet) can also be helpful for Oscilloscope; the partial buddyhood is significantly larger (not shown in the plot). But for prefixes without buddies, Oscilloscope cannot reliably validate RTT events as interception hijacks. This is an inherent limitation of Oscilloscope’s data-driven design.

8 Discussion

This section discusses advanced aspects of Oscilloscope regarding deployability and performance under special cases.

Does Oscilloscope replace existing systems? No, we aim not to replace existing RPKI and monitor-based solutions but to complement them. For instance, Oscilloscope cannot detect attacks where the RTT remains unchanged or the hijacker intercepts *all* the IP prefixes in the same buddy group. In these cases, one has to resort to monitor-based solutions. Oscilloscope also does not prevent hijacks, making crypto-based solutions still beneficial (yet challenging to deploy).

Can Oscilloscope detect pre-existing hijacks? If an operator suspects that a specific IP prefix might be hijacked (e.g., based on insights from the control plane), we can manually trigger the validation step, which will compare samples between buddy prefixes and verify the hijack.

Can a hijacker hide from Oscilloscope? A hijacker may try to evade detection by tweaking the RTT signal or generating short-time hijacks. *RTT Signal:* It is hard (or impossible in some cases) to evade detection by merely tweaking the RTT signal. First, if the hijacking path has a higher RTT than the legitimate one, there is no way a hijacker can beat the speed of light to pretend the RTT is unchanged. Second, a hijacker that induces a lower RTT may hold packets back but guessing the legitimate RTT distribution would be out of reach since the hijacker has no visibility into those distributions. More precisely, usually, the attacker does not know what the RTT before the hijack was, as the attacker is (by definition) *not* on the legitimate path. *Short-time hijacks:* The attack should last long enough to propagate the announcement to the victim AS. In the meantime, the RTT signal of the intermediate ASes would be affected and could be detected by Oscilloscope. High-frequency short-time attacks may be filtered by BGP Flap Damping [41].

Can Oscilloscope detect a hijack towards one of its prefixes for which we currently do not observe any RTT samples? In its current form, Oscilloscope is entirely data-driven and cannot detect hijacks for which we do not collect corresponding data-plane signals, i.e., RTTs. However, that also means that the hijack is less severe as it does not affect any actual traffic.

How can an operator regulate the number of alerts that Oscilloscope produces? As we show in § 7, the operator could, for example, increase the change detection threshold, improving the precision and removing some of the noise/false positives, i.e., reported events often indicate a real hijack. Another promising approach extends one of the previous discussion points. An operator could combine Oscilloscope's reports with observations from a control-plane-based detection system. For both systems, we can filter out reports with low confidence unless both systems raise them. For example, if Oscilloscope reports a hijack validated with a single buddy prefix only.

What happens with false buddy prefixes, i.e., they do not follow the same forwarding path? So far, we assumed that Oscilloscope's validation step discards results if not all performed tests agree. However, our analysis in § 7.4 shows that large buddy groups are common. As a result, Oscilloscope could base its decision on a majority vote instead, which will filter out isolated, false buddies.

Does buddyness hold within a single AS? We show in § 7.4 that many IP prefixes propagate along the same AS path over the Internet. Many intra-domain Traffic-Engineering mechanisms, e.g., OSPF [37], RIP [34], MPLS auto-bw [55], split traffic across different physical paths using hash-based mechanisms. While such mechanisms may induce different RTTs for distinct flows within a single IP prefix [40], multiple prefixes exhibit the same distribution and thus would be correctly handled by Oscilloscope. We believe that Oscilloscope should be complemented with a buddy-tracking system (left as future work) that identifies IP prefixes that exhibit a similar RTT distribution and time-correlated RTT changes. This paper focuses on understanding whether one could extract and combine RTT signals assuming buddies exist.

Does Oscilloscope need to be deployed in multiple ASes to work correctly? No, it is enough to deploy Oscilloscope in a single AS. It is only designed to report hijacks that affect prefixes originated by this AS. Oscilloscope extracts all the required information locally. For example, RTT samples from flows that start/end in the local AS or BGP data from local routers (i.e., to build *combined signals*). However, aggregating reports from multiple Oscilloscope instances deployed in different ASes could help reduce false positives or detect large-scale hijacks that might affect prefixes from multiple ASes at once.

9 Conclusion

In this paper, we show that one can leverage data-plane signals to mitigate a long-standing security problem of inter-domain routing: detecting BGP hijacks. We believe it is a first step towards the general question of classifying large-scale Internet events by fully integrating data- and control-plane analysis methods. It opens and calls for further investigation, e.g., applications of ML to classify the different signals.

References

- [1] Chris Amin. RIS Live BGP Message Stream. https://labs.ripe.net/Members/chris_amin/ris-live-bgp-message-stream/. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [2] Brice Augustin, Xavier Cuvellier, Benjamin Orgogozo, Fabien Viger, Timur Friedman, Matthieu Latapy, Cl  mence Magnien, and Renata Teixeira. Avoiding traceroute anomalies with Paris traceroute. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, 2006.
- [3] Karan Balu, Miguel L. Pardal, and Miguel Correia. DARSHANA: Detecting route hijacking for communication confidentiality. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Network Computing and Applications (NCA)*, 2016.
- [4] Henry Birge-Lee, Liang Wang, Jennifer Rexford, and Prateek Mittal. SICO: Surgical Interception Attacks by Manipulating BGP Communities. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2019.
- [5] Randy Bush and Rob Austein. The Resource Public Key Infrastructure (RPKI) to Router Protocol, Version 1. RFC 8210, 2017. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8210>.
- [6] Kevin Butler, Toni R Farley, Patrick McDaniel, and Jennifer Rexford. A survey of BGP security issues and solutions. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2009.
- [7] Matthew Caesar and Jennifer Rexford. BGP routing policies in ISP networks. *IEEE network*, 2005.
- [8] CAIDA. BGPSStream Data Providers. <https://bgpstream.caida.org/data>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [9] CAIDA. CAIDA AS Rank. <http://as-rank.caida.org/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [10] CAIDA. CAIDA AS Rank V2.1. <https://api.asrank.caida.org/v2/docs>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [11] CAIDA. The CAIDA AS Relationships Dataset, <2019-08-01>. <http://www.caida.org/data/active/as-relationships/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [12] CAIDA. The CAIDA UCSD IXPs Dataset, <2020-01>. <https://www.caida.org/data/ixps/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [13] Xiaoqi Chen, Hyojoon Kim, Javed M. Aman, Willie Chang, Mack Lee, and Jennifer Rexford. Measuring TCP Round-Trip Time in the Data Plane. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Secure Programmable Network Infrastructure (SPIN)*, 2020.
- [14] Ying-Ju Chi, Ricardo Oliveira, and Lixia Zhang. Cyclops: the AS-level connectivity observatory. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2008.
- [15] Lixin Gao and Jennifer Rexford. Stable Internet routing without global coordination. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 2001.
- [16] T  ma Gavrichenkov and Artyom Gavrichenkov. Breaking HTTPS with BGP Hijacking. In *Proceedings of the Black Hat conference*, 2015.
- [17] Phillipa Gill, Michael Schapira, and Sharon Goldberg. A Survey of Interdomain Routing Policies. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2014.
- [18] Sharon Goldberg, Michael Schapira, Peter Hummon, and Jennifer Rexford. How Secure Are Secure Interdomain Routing Protocols. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2010.
- [19] Dan Goodin. How 3ve’s BGP hijackers eluded the Internet—and made \$29M. <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2018/12/how-3ves-bgp-hijackers-eluded-the-internet-and-made-29m/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [20] Dan Goodin. Russian-controlled telecom hijacks financial services’ Internet traffic. <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2017/04/russian-controlled-telecom-hijacks-financial-services-internet-traffic/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [21] The Tcpdump Group. TCPDUMP. <https://www.tcpdump.org/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [22] Stephen Hemminger. NetEm - Network Emulator. <https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man8/tc-netem.8.html>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [23] Rahul Hiran, Niklas Carlsson, and Nahid Shahmehri. Crowd-based Detection of Routing Anomalies on the Internet. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*, 2015.
- [24] Thomas Holterbach, Tobias B  hler, Tino Rellstab, and Laurent Vanbever. An Open Platform to Teach How the Internet Practically Works. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2020.

- [25] Xin Hu and Z Morley Mao. Accurate real-time identification of IP prefix hijacking. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*, 2007.
- [26] Geoff Huston. BGP in 2019 - The BGP Table. <https://blog.apnic.net/2020/01/14/bgp-in-2019-the-bgp-table/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [27] Daniel Jubas. Detecting BGP Interception Attacks using RTT Measurements. <https://www.cs.princeton.edu/~jrex/papers/rtt-change-point.pdf>. Student thesis (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [28] Dave Katz and David Ward. Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD). RFC 5880, 2010. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5880>.
- [29] Ethan Katz-Bassett, Colin Scott, David R. Choffnes, Ítalo Cunha, Vytautas Valancius, Nick Feamster, Harsha V. Madhyastha, Thomas Anderson, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. LIFEGUARD: Practical Repair of Persistent Route Failures. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2012.
- [30] Stephen Kent, Charles Lynn, and Karen Seo. Secure border gateway protocol S-BGP. *IEEE Journal on Selected areas in Communications (J-SAC)*, 2000.
- [31] Mohit Lad, Daniel Massey, Dan Pei, Yiguo Wu, Beichuan Zhang, and Lixia Zhang. PHAS: A Prefix Hijack Alert System. In *Proceedings of the USENIX Security Symposium*, 2006.
- [32] Matt Lepinski and Kotikalapudi Sriram. BGPsec Protocol Specification. RFC 8205, 2017. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8205>.
- [33] J. Li, T. Ehrenkranz, and P. Elliott. Buddyguard: A buddy system for fast and reliable detection of IP prefix anomalies. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols (ICNP)*, 2012.
- [34] Gary S. Malkin. RIP Version 2. RFC 2453, 1998. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2453>.
- [35] Christian McArthur and Mina Guirguis. Stealthy IP Prefix Hijacking: Don't Bite Off More Than You Can Chew. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, 2009.
- [36] Alexandros Milolidakis, Tobias Bühler, Marco Chiesa, Laurent Vanbever, and Stefano Vissicchio. Smart BGP hijacks that Evade Public Route Collectors. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC, poster)*, 2021.
- [37] John Moy. OSPF Version 2. RFC 2328, 1998. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2328>.
- [38] Wolfgang Mühlbauer, Steve Uhlig, Bingjie Fu, Mickael Meulle, and Olaf Maennel. In Search for an Appropriate Granularity to Model Routing Policies. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2007.
- [39] Chiara Orsini, Alistair King, Danilo Giordano, Vasileios Giotsas, and Alberto Dainotti. BGPStream: a software framework for live and historical BGP data analysis. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, 2016.
- [40] Waleed Reda, Kirill Bogdanov, Alexandros Milolidakis, Hamid Ghasemirahni, Marco Chiesa, Gerald Q. Maguire, and Dejan Kostić. Path Persistence in the Cloud: A Study of the Effects of Inter-Region Traffic Engineering in a Large Cloud Provider's Network. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2020.
- [41] Yakov Rekhter, Susan Hares, and Tony Li. A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4). RFC 4271, 2006. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4271>.
- [42] NCC Ripe. RIPE Atlas platform. <https://atlas.ripe.net/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [43] Brandon Schlinder, Kyriakos Zarifis, Ítalo Cunha, Nick Feamster, and Ethan Katz-Bassett. PEERING: An AS for Us. In *Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets)*, 2014.
- [44] Satadal Sengupta, Hyojoon Kim, and Jennifer Rexford. Continuous In-Network Round-Trip Time Monitoring. In *Proceedings of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM)*, 2022.
- [45] Pavlos Sermpezis, Vasileios Kotronis, Petros Gigis, Xenofontas Dimitropoulos, Danilo Cicalese, Alistair King, and Alberto Dainotti. ARTEMIS: Neutralizing BGP hijacking within a minute. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 2018.
- [46] Xingang Shi, Yang Xiang, Zhiliang Wang, Xia Yin, and Jianping Wu. Detecting Prefix Hijackings in the Internet with Argus. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, 2012.
- [47] Aftab Siddiqui. What Happened? The Amazon Route 53 BGP Hijack to Take Over Ethereum Cryptocurrency Wallets. <https://www.internetsociety.org/blog/2018/04/amazons-route-53-bgp-hijack/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [48] Sidney Siegel and N. John Castellan. *Nonparametric Statistics for The Behavioral Sciences*. McGraw-Hill, second edition, 1988.

- [49] Jared M Smith, Kyle Birkeland, Tyler McDaniel, and Max Schuchard. Withdrawing the BGP Re-Routing Curtain. In *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2020.
- [50] Philip Smith, Rob Evans, and Mike Hughes. RIPE Routing Working Group Recommendations on Route Aggregation. <https://www.ripe.net/publications/docs/ripe-399>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [51] Cecilia Testart. Reviewing a Historical Internet Vulnerability: Why Isn't BGP More Secure and What Can We Do About it? In *Proceedings of the Research Conference on Communication, Information and Internet Policy (TPRC)*, 2018.
- [52] Cecilia Testart, Philipp Richter, Alistair King, Alberto Dainotti, and David Clark. Profiling BGP Serial Hijackers: Capturing Persistent Misbehavior in the Global Routing Table. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, 2019.
- [53] Andree Toonk. How Hacking Team Helped Italian Special Operations Group with Routing Hijack. <https://www.bgpmon.net/how-hacking-team-helped-italian-special-operations-group-with-bgp-routing-hijack/>. (Accessed: 2022-12-30).
- [54] Paul C Van Oorschot, Tao Wan, and Evangelos Kranakis. On interdomain routing security and pretty secure BGP (psBGP). *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security (TISSEC)*, 2007.
- [55] Arun Viswanathan, Eric C. Rosen, and Ross Callon. Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture. RFC 3031, 2001. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3031>.
- [56] Russ White. Securing BGP through secure origin BGP (soBGP). *Business Communications Review*, 2003.
- [57] He Yan, Ricardo Oliveira, Kevin Burnett, Dave Matthews, Lixia Zhang, and Dan Massey. BGPmon: A real-time, scalable, extensible monitoring system. In *Cybersecurity Applications & Technology Conference for Homeland Security (CATCH)*, 2009.
- [58] Kok-Kiong Yap, Murtaza Motiwala, Jeremy Rahe, Steve Padgett, Matthew Holliman, Gary Baldus, Marcus Hines, Taeun Kim, Ashok Narayanan, Ankur Jain, and et al. Taking the Edge off with Espresso: Scale, Reliability and Programmability for Global Internet Peering. In *Proceedings of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM)*, 2017.
- [59] Zheng Zhang, Ying Zhang, Y Charlie Hu, Z Morley Mao, and Randy Bush. iSPY: Detecting IP Prefix Hijacking on My Own. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2008.
- [60] Meiyuan Zhao, Sean W Smith, and David M Nicol. The performance impact of BGP security. *IEEE network*, 2005.
- [61] Changxi Zheng, Lusheng Ji, Dan Pei, Jia Wang, and Paul Francis. A light-weight distributed scheme for detecting IP prefix hijacks in real-time. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review (CCR)*, 2007.
- [62] A. Zimmermann, A. Hannemann, and T. Kosse. Flowgrind - A New Performance Measurement Tool. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, 2010.

A The Stealthy Hijacker

In the following sections, we explain what we understand under “stealthy hijacks” (Appendix A.1), how our Internet simulator works (Appendix A.2), and how we use the simulator to evaluate the impact of stealthy hijacks (Appendix A.3).

A.1 Generating stealthy hijacks

Recently, there have been insights into techniques that smarter hijackers can leverage to evade traditional detection systems. SICO [4] successfully managed to leverage BGP Community Attributes to surgically limit the propagation of the attack to only the intended target and networks along the path. Smith et Al. [49] measured the impact of BGP poisoning, a technique that hijackers can also use to shape traffic paths, and found that only a few ASes implement filters against it. Testart et Al. [52] used Machine learning techniques to identify networks of serial hijacking activity that were previously unnoticed. This concept of stealthy hijackers dates back even in 2009 with the exploit of “Fakeroute” tools [35]; systems can lie to data-plane probes to distinguish hijacks from other routing problems, e.g., by faking the hijack signal with the signal of normal routing failures.

In this work, we develop a smart hijacker to hide from control-plane monitors through BGP poisoning and path shaping. Our insight is that a hijacker, who knows that ISPs provide routing information to the BGP collectors, can shape its hijack announcements, making them invisible to those collectors and, thus, the monitors. Succeeding in such an attack could render most, if not all, current control-plane monitoring solutions ineffective. This includes tools like Artemis [45], Argus [46], BuddyGuard [33], etc.

Through the use of simulations, we measured the impact of our stealthy hijacker. As depicted in Figure 3, compared to a normal hijacker whose attack becomes visible and the number of poisoned networks negligible, our hijacker can evade detection even as we scale the number of monitors.

A.2 Our Internet simulator

We used a well-tested network simulator developed in a previous literature study to implement our hijacker. In this simulator, benign networks announce only the prefixes they originate. Once an AS receives a new prefix announcement from its neighbors, a) it updates its routing table with the new route towards the prefix, then b) recalculates the best path towards that prefix, and finally, c) propagates the new best route (if any) towards a choice of its neighbors.

Each AS consults its routing table to select the best path and compares the newly received route against the current best route for that received prefix. First, the one with the highest local preference attribute will be preferred, then the one with the shortest AS path length, and finally, the one with the

lowest tie-breaking attribute. Since ISPs are commonly commercial businesses, we model networks to prefer the paths from their customers, as they generate profit, over the paths from their peers that offer no revenue, over the paths from their providers that generate costs [15]. Each AS refers to a random tiebreaker for paths of equal preference and length to choose the best route. In the real Internet, networks usually configure such tie-breaking mechanisms based on their internal organization and inbound traffic engineering goals [7]. In the simulator, though, since we have no visibility of those attributes, we randomly configure them during the topology setup.

Once an AS updates its best path, it propagates it to the rest of its neighbors. We model path propagation according to the Gao-Rexford conditions [15]. Since ASes usually seek to maximize their profit, we model paths received from customers to propagate to every neighbor. In contrast, paths received from providers or peers will propagate only to customer nodes.

Under every circumstance, ASes will drop BGP advertisements containing their ASN in the AS-path attribute, reflecting the BGP loop avoidance mechanism. Furthermore, for backup reasons, they will update their routing entries with the new path even if that is not the new best one. Lastly, they will append their ASN as the last AS in the path before propagating the route further.

Hijacker networks may craft routes from scratch, modify any advertisement they receive, and advertise routes to any of their neighbors. Their goal is not to propagate valid routes and generate profit but rather to hijack traffic going back to the victim’s prefix.

To model the Internet topology, we use CAIDA’s AS relationship datasets [11] which are collected from the RIPE RIS and Routeviews BGP collectors. CAIDA processes those data through a multi-step methodology to produce a sanitized view that provides a well-designed representation of the Internet widely used in related work. Each node represents an ASN with interconnections observed in the BGP routes. The relations of those connections are categorized as i) peer-to-peer, ii) customer-to-provider, or iii) provider-to-customer (if seen in the opposite direction).

We enhance those data with additional peering interconnections from networks at Internet exchange points (IXPs). We compared a sample of the simulated paths with the corresponding real Internet paths observed from a BGP looking glass. Our results indicate that the simulated paths are longer, in comparison, due to missing interconnections at local IXPs. As such, we use CAIDA’s IXP datasets [12] to include possible cases of missing peering interconnections. For each IXP, we first identify its members and then assign them to a peer-to-peer relation if these connections were missing from our simulator. If a different relation existed between the members in question, we would maintain the old ones inferred by CAIDA.

Furthermore, we mark in our simulator the data providers of BGP Stream [8]. Those are the ASes peering with the collection points providing snapshots of their best paths to the public BGP Stream service. We identify those networks by analyzing a day of BGP dumps from the BGPstream service. By extracting the “peer_ASN” attribute from the update dumps, we ended up with 408 unique peers, out of which 320 actively reported paths within 5 minutes. Since the “not-so-active” peers cannot be trusted to report hijacks promptly, we filter them out. We refer to the remaining peers as BGP monitoring locations or monitors in short. Such as the networks M1 and M2 depicted in Figure 2.

A.3 Generating stealthy hijacks

We test the stealthy hijacker using the Internet simulator. We randomly pick one victim and one hijacker network in each experiment. Then the hijacker launches a same-prefix attack for one of the prefixes announced by the victim. As in Figure 2, this will cause part of the Internet to prefer the hijacker (poisoned networks) while the rest will still pick the victim. This is following the hijacker’s goals, who does not seek to maximize the scale of the attack but rather launch it in such a way as to make it undetectable by the monitors. It also benefits the hijacker as attacks of a smaller scale yield less traffic, are easier to intercept back, and are less likely to be noticed by the victim.

When picking a new victim node, we verify that it is not disconnected, *i.e.*, that the victims’ announcement propagates almost the entire Internet. Furthermore, when selecting the hijacker, we verify that a) it has at least one available route back to the victim, b) it has at least two neighbors, and c) it is neither a monitor network nor a direct neighbor of the victim as we assume that those networks can be trusted. We require the hijacker to have at least two neighbors, one to launch the hijack from and the other to intercept the traffic back to the correct origin. Figure 2 depicts such an example. Assume that Bob and Alice are the randomly picked hijacker-victim pair. Alice needs to craft a stealthy hijack announcement that is not visible to the monitor. She does that based on the following methodology.

- a) She identifies the neighbors that advertise a route towards Bob’s prefix. These are the neighbors N1 and N2. For the stealthy hijack to be successful as an interception attack, one of those routes needs to be maintained after the attack.
- b) She fetches the best BGP routes towards the prefix of Bob as advertised by M1 and M2 to the BGP collector. This information is publicly available via the monitors.
- c) She fetches the same information but this time for her own prefix. Alice announces a different prefix from her own address space to each of her neighbors (P1, N1, N2). After those advertisements propagate, Alice uses the collector to see how the monitors observe those routes. Alice will use the information extracted from steps b) and c) to craft a smart

announcement individually to each of her neighbors. Note that so far, there is nothing malicious in Alice’s behavior.

d) Using step b), how the monitors observe Bob’s prefix, and step c), how the monitors observe Alice’s prefixes, Alice estimates the “dangerous” monitors who are likely to observe the attack. Since Alice is unfamiliar with the local preferences of other networks, she does this estimation by comparing the length of her routes versus the length of Bob’s route as observed by each monitor. If Alice’s route is shorter or equal to Bob’s route for a monitor, then, because in BGP, shorter paths are preferred, the monitor is marked as dangerous. Note that Alice does this calculation independently for each of her neighbors. For example, for the crafted route { Alice, P1, Bob } that Alice would like to announce to her neighbor N2, Alice marks M2 as a dangerous monitor since her advertisement { N2, Alice, P1, Bob } is shorter than the valid route { N2, M1, N1, P2, Bob }, as seen by M2. For her neighbor N1, Alice would perform the same dangerous monitor calculation. However, as she observes that announcing a crafted route to N1 will break her valid route back to Bob, she will refrain from making that announcement.

e) After discovering the dangerous monitors, Alice will announce a hijack route for Bob’s prefix that is not reportable by the monitors. Since Alice only discovered a single monitor, she poisons her announcement with the ASN of that monitor, *i.e.*, { Alice, M2, P1, Bob }. When M2 receives the poisoned advertisement and sees its ASN inside, it will drop it due to BGP’s loop avoidance algorithm. As such, since no monitor will report the announcement, it will not be considered by control-plane monitoring solutions.

In our simulator, we have marked a total of 320 monitors. Including all of those monitors in the crafted announcement will create an unrealistic route. Instead, when multiple monitors observe the hijack advertisement, we poison with the ASNs of the most common ASes observed between the hijacker and the monitors, either to block the propagation of the hijack to the monitors or to make the hijack less preferable. Since multiple routes exist, blocking the best route may cause the hijack to propagate to the monitor via a different route. Given that the hijacker has a reasonable amount of time, it could shape its announcement to block every path. However, for our simulations, if Alice fails on the first try, we mark the stealthy hijack as a failure, as Bob could potentially notice it. The purpose of this paper is not to find the best way for the hijacker to hijack the victim stealthily but to verify in simulations that such attacks are possible. As mentioned in previous work [18], identifying the best way to hijack the victim is an NP-hard problem.

In total, we perform 2000 simulations randomly picking pairs of Alice and Bob. Alice tries to stealthily hijack Bob in each simulation using the methodology described above. Since, in this methodology, Alice could craft routes of arbitrary length, we limit her announced path length to type-4 hijacks [45]. Crafted type-4 hijack are of the form { Alice, ASA,

ASB, ASC, Bob} where Alice and Bob are the corresponding hijacker and hijacked AS, and the ASNs in between, hops that Alice can modify to craft the stealthy announcement. Alice announces the correct origin, Bob, so her advertisements are RPKI valid. Furthermore, we perform a baseline comparison to the stealthy hijack in each simulation. We configure Alice to announce a naive type-4 hijack to each of her neighbors using path prepending, *i.e.*, { Alice, Bob, Bob, Bob, Bob}. Last but not least, we verify which impact the number of monitors has on the visibility of our stealthy hijacker. We scale the number of monitoring ASes up to a factor of five ($320 \times 5 = 1600$ monitors) following a distribution similar to that of BGPStream. Using [9, 10], we extract the AS ranks of the monitors of BGPStream. Then, for each monitor AS, we add a new monitor from the closest available AS with a ranking similar to the rank of the existing monitor.

Figure 3 depicts the stealthiness of the naive hijacker compared to our stealthy hijacker as we scale the number of monitors. For the results to be comparable, we run 2000 simulations using the same randomization seed for each scale. Furthermore, as we care only for the additional traffic that Alice attracts after launching the hijack, we ignore the networks that were using Alice for their best route towards Bob, to begin with, *i.e.*, before the hijack. From Figure 3, we observe the following:

1. Naive hijackers are likely to generate stealthy attacks based on the relevant positions of the hijacker, the victim, and the monitor networks. As we observe, for the base number of monitors, $\approx 14\%(280/2000)$ of the hijacks were invisible, attracting traffic from $\approx 2.4\%(1580/65724)$ of our typology’s networks. However, as we scale the number of monitors, the naive hijack impact soon becomes negligible, affecting $< 1\%$ of the networks while being invisible.
2. Our smart hijacking methodology for the base number of monitors can more consistently generate stealthy hijacks with a $\approx 31\%(620/2000)$ success rate attracting traffic of $\approx 5.5\%(3600/65724)$ of the Internet. As we scale the number of monitors, we still observe a $\approx 24\%(480/2000)$ success rate, with $\approx 3.8\%(2500/65724)$ of the networks redirecting their traffic to Alice.

Sum-up: Existing monitoring solutions [14, 31, 33, 45, 46, 52, 57] that operate the core of their detection module in the control plane will not identify a smart hijacker that succeeds in a stealthy attack against the monitors. Existing data-plane monitoring solutions [25, 59] relying on connectivity loss or fingerprint extraction will fail to identify the smart hijacker since we retain a route back to the victim. Unless very sensitive, techniques relying on traceroute hops [61] might be outsmarted by an intelligent hijacker able to produce fake IP hops or distinguish the hijack as a common routing problem.