Machine Learning-based Early Attack Detection Using Open RAN Intelligent Controller

Bruno Missi Xavier[†‡], Merim Dzaferagic[‡], Diarmuid Collins[‡], Giovanni Comarela[†],
Magnos Martinello[†] and Marco Ruffini[‡]
[†] Federal University of Espírito Santo, Espírito Santo, Brazil
[‡] Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
Email: bruno.xavier@ifes.edu.br

arXiv:2302.01864v1 [cs.NI] 3 Feb 2023

***Abstract*—We design and demonstrate a method for early detection of Denial-of-Service attacks. The proposed approach takes advantage of the OpenRAN framework to collect measurements from the air interface (for attack detection) and to dynamically control the operation of the Radio Access Network (RAN). For that purpose, we developed our near-Real Time (RT) RAN Intelligent Controller (RIC) interface. We apply and analyze a wide range of Machine Learning algorithms to data traffic analysis that satisfy the accuracy and latency requirements set by the near-RT RIC. Our results show that the proposed framework is able to correctly classify genuine vs. malicious traffic with high accuracy (i.e., 95%) in a realistic testbed environment, allowing us to detect attacks already at the Distributed Unit (DU), before malicious traffic even enters the Centralized Unit (CU).**

***Index Terms*—machine learning; mobile networks; 4G and 5G**

I. Introduction

The growing number of services that run on top of cellular networks pose new challenges in ensuring service availability. The common approach to service availability improvement involves network planning, resource allocation optimization, and network densification. However, the source of service outages is often not related to the network configuration but originates from different types of malicious service attacks [1]–[4]. These security threats affect user satisfaction and result in financial losses.

As highlighted by the authors of [5], security and privacy in cellular networks can be achieved at the air interface, the operator's internal network, and the inter-operator links. Depending on the type of attack (e.g., passive in which the attacker only listens to the traffic, active in which traffic is being modified or injected into the communication), detecting the threat can be a challenge. Passive attacks often result in privacy breaches [6], while active attacks result in service disruptions [7]. The focus of our work is on the early detection of active attacks in cellular networks.

Recent publications have taken advantage of the processing power and programmability available in the new generation of switches to introduce new Intrusion Detection System (IDS) and Deep Packet Inspection (DPI) paradigms. Both approaches heavily rely on the use of Machine Learning (ML) techniques to allow the identification of the traffic [8]–[11], to detect and to mitigate the volumetric Distributed Denial-of-Service (DDoS) attacks [12]–[14] inside communication networks. In cellular networks, it is very important to identify the malicious flow as early as possible to prevent it from reaching the Software-Defined Networking (SDN) architecture [15] or interrupting services on the edge of the network (e.g., mobile base station).

As highlighted by the authors of [16], the volumetric DDoS attacks cannot be handled by the victim alone, and require help from the network. In terms of cellular networks, the traditional approach relies on the core network to deal with the malicious flows [17]. However, the fifth (5G) and sixth (6G) generations of cellular networks will move from inflexible and monolithic networks to agile and disaggregated architectures based on softwarization [18]. These changes provide a range of new and efficient methods for early detection and localization of the source of an attack, allowing the operator to cut off the malicious flow before it spreads through the network.

Besides the softwarization and disaggregation, the OpenRAN Alliance [18] introduces openness and, more importantly, intelligence that reaches the edge of the network. The research in this area mainly focuses on optimizing radio resources and the dynamic reconfiguration of network entities to match the communication requirements [18], [19]. However, security implications will play a major role in making the architecture a future-proof alternative to traditional Radio Access Network (RAN) deployments [19].

Instead of the common approach of using the core network for DPI, we are carrying out early active attack detection in the RAN. For that purpose, we leverage the new OpenRAN architecture to collect air interface measurements and ML to perform traffic classification (i.e., attack detection). This allows us to detect the attack early on and stop it before it progresses through the network. Our main contributions include:

- We developed a near-Real Time (RT) RAN Intelligent Controller (RIC) that allows us to collect measurements from open-source base stations (i.e., *srsRAN*) and dynamically adjust their configuration;
- We identify the most important features on the physical and Medium Access Control (MAC) layer for detecting different types of Denial-of-Service (DoS) attacks;
- We designed a ML model that allows us to classify different types of DoS attacks with high accuracy based on the air interface measurements collected by the near-RT RIC (i.e., physical and MAC layer measurements).




Fig. 1. Data collection and ML model training and inference framework.

TABLE I
PHYSICAL AND MAC LAYER FEATURES USED IN OUR EXPERIMENTS.

Layer	Down link	Up link	Feature	Short Description
PHY	✓		cqi	Channel Quality Indicator
	✓	✓	mcs	Modulation and Coding Scheme
		✓	pusch sinr	Noise ration interference in the Physical Uplink Shared Channel
		✓	pucch sinr	Noise ration interference in the Physical Uplink Control Channel
MAC	✓	✓	brate	Bitrate (bits/unit measure)
	✓	✓	pkt ok	Number of packets successfully sent
	✓	✓	pkt nok	Number of packets dropped

II. ARCHITECTURE / FRAMEWORK

Our traffic classification framework was built around two main constraints: (1) latency requirement imposed by the near-RT RIC; and (2) low resolution of the features from the physical and MAC layers needed to describe the network traffic. Both constraints limit the choice of the ML classifiers, i.e., the goal is to train a model that can accurately classify the traffic within the defined latency requirements based on a limited set of features available in the physical and MAC layers. We have developed our own control plane (i.e., near-RT RIC) that allows us to collect measurements and to control the *srsRAN* virtual Base Station (BS). The framework is implemented as an *xApp* running on the near-RT RIC. Fig. 1 shows the required steps to deploy an online ML classifier within the proposed architecture.

The first step in the process is to identify the frequency of the measurement collection and the type of measurements needed to perform the traffic classification. These steps are implemented in the *Learning Plane*. Additionally, the *Learning Plane* is responsible for storing the data from the *Operational Plane*. The training of the initial ML model is done offline once enough data is collected from the *Operational Plane*. The first step in the training process is feature extraction. The *Feature Extractor* component identifies the useful measurements and performs the data pre-processing before the training starts. Then, the *ML Model Training* component trains the new model on the same time scale that was chosen for the measurement collection. The *ML Model Training* component also ensures that the new model conforms to the processing requirements set by the near-RT RIC. Once the model is trained, and the target accuracy is achieved, the model can be deployed on the *Prediction Plane*.

The *Prediction Plane* performs multiple tasks: (i) pulls measurements from the *Operational Plane*; (ii) shares the collected measurements with the *Learning Plane* for further model refinement; (iii) feeds data to the *Online ML Classifier* for traffic classification; and (iv) depending on the traffic class sends commands to the BS in order to continue or terminate the service. The communication between the various components in our architecture is done through the *Databus* of our control plane. The *Databus* is implemented as a *ZMQ* broker[1].

The *Operational Plane* consists of the *srsRAN* BS, the core network and our custom built RIC agent. The RIC agent allows us to share data and read commands with/from the *Databus* of the near-RT RIC. Once the User Equipment (UE) connects to the BS, the RIC agent starts collecting measurements and sending them as asynchronous messages via the *Databus* to the *Prediction Plane*. The *Prediction Plane* performs the traffic classification and, if needed, sends control messages to the RIC agent. The RIC agent interprets these control messages and controls the operation of the BS accordingly (e.g., forward, prioritize, or drop packets from the UE).

As highlighted earlier, only the initial model is trained offline. The *Learning Plane* continuously collects data during the prediction phase and refines the initial model. In terms of ML, attacks are rare events, and as such they are hard to predict. Therefore, as we will present in Section IV, besides inference time, we mainly rely on the $F1$-Score to express the model performance. As a reminder the $F1$-Score is computed as:

$$F1 = \frac{2RP}{R+P} \tag{1}$$

where R represents recall and P represents precision. This allows us to ensure that the model is penalised equally for being biased towards positive predictions as well as missing predictions. Once the $F1$-Score improves significantly, the new model gets deployed to the *Prediction Plane*.

A. Feature Extraction

The traditional approach to identify malicious data flows is to extract features from packet headers. In cellular networks, this is usually performed in the core network. However, our goal is to identify and stop these data flows at the source, i.e., the edge of the network. This introduces additional challenges related to the features being less expressive (i.e., measurements collected from the physical and MAC layers don't contain packet headers). During the initial ML model training phase, the data collected from the BS gets labeled, and the feature extraction process starts. Table I describes the features used in the classification process. All presented features are used to describe the quality of the signal and the traffic volume.

[1]https://zeromq.org

The channel quality is measured by the UE and reported back to the BS as the Channel Quality Indicator (CQI). The CQI index is a scalar value from 0 to 15 measured on the physical layer. The Modulation and Coding Scheme (MCS) is also a scalar that is determined based on the reported CQI. However, the mapping also depends on the amount of information that is being sent between the UE and BS. The range of values for the *MCS* is between 0 and 28, meaning that there is no direct mapping between the *CQI* and *MCS*. The Physical Uplink Shared Channel (PUSCH) Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratio (SINR) and Physical Uplink Control Channel (PUCCH) SINR metrics indicate how much the desired signal is stronger compared to the noise and interference in the two channels, i.e., PUSCH and PUCCH. These metrics provide information about the relationship between the channel conditions and the achieved throughput.

Unlike the physical layer measurements mentioned above, the MAC layer statistics contain the amount of data and packets exchanged between the UE and BS, providing information about the traffic patterns of the services exchanging information through the network. These measurements include data rate (*brate*), the number of delivered packets (*pkts ok*) and the number of dropped packets (*pkts nok*).

B. ML Model Training

Once a large enough dataset is collected and the features extracted, we start the ML model training phase. Unlike the work presented in [8], [10], [11], in which the authors focus on traffic classification with limited computational resources, we do not struggle with those limitations. However, unlike the models presented in those papers, our model does not have access to the intrinsic (i.e., packet headers) and extrinsic features (i.e., inter-packet arrival time). It restricts us to works under the limitations highlighted in Section II (i.e., low latency and low resolution of the available features).

The near-RT RIC imposes a $1s$ latency threshold. In other words, the overall latency, including measurement collection, network delay between the BS and the controller, and the processing delay on the *databus* and the *xApp* has to be lower than $1s$. Please notice that the latency requirement is for the whole control loop, i.e., both ways: measurements traveling from the BS to the RIC and control messages traveling in the other direction. Even though the scope of the paper does not include a detailed analysis of best traffic classification models, in Section IV, we included an analysis of the accuracy and performance of the most popular ML models that provide a suitable choice for the online classification under the mentioned restrictions.

C. Online ML Classifier

The traffic classification starts once the *ML Model Training* Component converges to a state which achieves the required accuracy within the defined latency bounds. The *Online ML Classifier* pulls measurements from the *Databus* and performs the traffic classification for each UE connected to the BS. Once the traffic class is identified, a command is being sent to the BS based on predefined policies (e.g., forward, prioritize, or drop packets from the UE). Additionally, it shares the measurements with the *Learning Plane* for further model refinement.




Fig. 2. Experimental setup architecture describing the interfaces and communication between all components.

III. Proposed Approach

This section describes the implementation decisions and the interaction between the control components with the *srsRAN* architecture (Section III-A). Sections III-B and III-C provide details about the traffic categories and the experimental setup.

A. Experimental Setup

As shown in Fig. 2, our experimental setup consists of three main components: (1) RAN and core network; (2) near-RT RIC; and (3) non-RT RIC. The system is implemented in the OpenIreland research testbed infrastructure [20].

1) ***RAN and Core Network****:* For the purpose of our experiments we used Ettus Research Universal Software Radio Peripherals (USRPs) and the *srsRAN* open-source 4G and 5G software radio library. The *srsRAN* software was modified, and we developed our own library, i.e., *RIC Agent*, that is compiled with the *srsRAN* software allowing us to share measurements with the *Databus* in the control plane and read/execute commands coming from the *xApps*.

Our experimental network consists of 3 USRPs - 2 acting as UEs and 1 acting as a BS. These USRPs are connected to Virtual Machines (VMs) running on a Dell PowerEdge R440 server. One additional VM acts as the core network.

2) ***Near-RT RIC****:* We developed a near-RT RIC, that communicates with the RAN, allowing us to read measurements from the BSs and send commands based on the algorithms implemented in the *xApps*. The implementation consists of three main components: (1) the previously mentioned *RIC Agent* that is compiled with the *srsRAN* software; (2) a *Databus* that is implemented as a *ZMQ* broker, allowing us to exchange measurements and commands between the *xApps* and BSs; and (3) the *xApps* that allow us to implement control mechanisms that take measurements as inputs and make decisions based on optimization algorithms, ML models or predefined policies.

3) ***Non-RT RIC****:* Unlike the near-RT RIC, we did not develop a non-RT RIC. For the purpose of our experiments the non-RT aspects were performed through offline learning and

hyperparameter tuning. Once the accuracy and classification delay of the ML model fell within the requirements set by the near-RT RIC, we deployed the model as an *xApp*.

A closer look at Fig. 2 reveals that the total delay of the control loop T_d depends on the round trip transmission delay (i.e., network delay) between all nodes hosting different parts of the architecture t_n, the processing time at the *Databus* δ_d, and the inference time on the near-RT RIC δ_i. This can be expressed with Equation 2:

$$T_d = t_n + 2\delta_d + \delta_i \quad (2)$$

The round trip network delay t_n can be expressed as:

$$t_n = 2\delta_{bd} + 2\delta_{dr} \quad (3)$$

where δ_{bd} is the transmission delay between the BS and the *Databus*, and δ_{dr} is the tranmsision delay between the *Databus* and the near-RT RIC.

To understand the control loop delay margins required to satisfy the near-RT control requirements, we provide delays for all involved components. The delay of the *Databus* is $\delta_d = 45\mu s$ and the round trip network delay of our setup is $t_n = 670\mu s$. This results in a total control loop delay $T_d = 760\mu s + \delta_i$. Please notice that our round trip network delay is very low (i.e., $< 1ms$) due to the setup being physically collocated. In Section IV, we will further investigate the inference time δ_i to compute the margin for the overall round trip network delay.

B. Traffic Categories

In order to collect a realistic dataset, we used well known tools to generate traffic in our network. We considered two traffic categories, i.e. *Benign* and *Attack*. Each traffic category was represented by the following network applications:

- *Benign*: *Web Browsing* and *Voice over IP (VoIP)*;
- *Attack*: *DDoS Ripper*, *DoS Hulk* and *Slowloris*.

1) ***Web Browsing****:* Web Browsing is characterized by the variable amount of data transmitted to the web server and received by the client. Since the majority of internet applications use Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), in order to generate *Web Browsing* traffic, we access the most visited websites online[2], and navigate through them randomly.

2) ***VoIP****:* VoIP traffic has strict Quality of Service (QoS) requirements. It relies on User Datagram Protocol (UDP) due to the lower tolerance to delays than packet drops. A typical voice call requires between 20 kbps and 170 kbps guaranteed priority bandwidth. To simulate the voice application, we rely on *SIPp*[3], which is an open-source traffic generator widely used to test VoIP services in the real environment.

3) ***DDoS Ripper****: DDoS Ripper* explores the webserver vulnerability flooding it with requests that result in cutting off targets or surrounding infrastructure. It opens as many connections with the server as possible and keeps them alive, sending a high volume of trash headers. This packet flooding causes an unexpected traffic jam preventing legitimate traffic from reaching its destination. Our code is based on the *PyPI DDoS Ripper*[4].

[2]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_most_visited_websites

[3]http://sipp.sourceforge.net/

[4]https://pypi.org/project/ddos-ripper/

TABLE II
NUMBER OF SAMPLES PER TRAFFIC CLASS FOR BOTH DATASETS.

Class	**1 UE**	**2 UEs**
Web Browsing	32,135	300,798
VoIP	69,802	121,975
DDoS Ripper	33,083	86,246
DoS Hulk	34,980	78,339
Slowloris	26,078	492,145
Benign	101,937	422,773
Atack	94,141	656,730

4) ***DoS Hulk****:* This attack relies on obfuscating the traffic as a benign request. However, it sends an unbearable load of TCP SYN messages and a flood of HTTP GET requests through a multi-thread agent. Therefore, this attack requires a considerable throughput. Our DoS Hulk script relies on *PyPI*[5].

5) ***Slowloris****: Slowloris* is a type of attack that opens multiple connections to the webserver and keeps it open as long as possible. It requires a very low bandwidth to periodically send subsequent HTTP headers for each opened connection. This traffic pattern resembles benign communication by using the legitimate packet headers to keep connections alive. We based our *Slowloris* Python script on the *PySloloris*[6] development.

To ensure that the network traffic behaves according to real world patterns, our approach is based on the techniques recommended by [21].

C. Dataset Collection

In order to train and validate our traffic classification *xApp*, we collected two datasets. The first was collected by running the traffic generator scripts on one UE, randomly switching between the different types of traffic patterns. These experiments require only 2 USRPs were used, i.e., one UE and one BS. The dataset was collected by the near-RT RIC.

The second dataset was collected by randomly switching between different types of traffic on two different UEs. This setup involves 3 USRPs, i.e., two UEs and one BS. Again, the near-RT RIC was used to collect the measurements on the BS. In this case, the dataset includes the BS measurements, the traffic label and the label predicted by the *Online Classifier*.

Table II shows the number of samples collected for the abovementioned scenarios. Section IV provides details about fitting and evaluating the ML models in the training phase, and details about the performance of the *Online ML Classifier*.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we investigate the possibility to perform attack detection based on the limited features available in the RAN. The performance of the *xApps* is evaluated based on the classification accuracy and the inference delay for the most popular ML algorithms used for traffic classification.

As previously highlighted, the *xApp* has to identify the traffic class within the acceptable delay constraints defined by the near-RT RIC, while still maintaining a high level of accuracy. Our evaluation considers six different ML classifiers,

[5]https://pypi.org/project/hulk/

[6]https://pypi.org/project/pyslowloris/

TABLE III
ACCURACY, FITTING AND INFERENCE TIME FOR ALL TESTED MODELS.

	Accuracy	Fitting (sec)	Inference (ms)
SVM	0.64	1,952.220	3.02
k-NN	0.90	0.793	2.10
Decision Tree	0.93	0.627	1.25
Random Forest	0.95	0.783	2.86
AdaBoost	0.87	19.615	3.05
MLP	0.56	15.720	1.29

TABLE IV
SUMMARY OF THE ONLINE CLASSIFICATION RESULTS.

Application	Precision	Recall	F1-score
Web Browsing	0.93	0.96	0.94
VoIP	0.97	0.95	0.96
DDoS Ripper	0.94	0.87	0.90
DoS Hulk	0.87	0.95	0.91
Slowloris	0.97	0.95	0.96
Benign	0.94	0.96	0.95
Attack	0.98	0.96	0.97

i.e., Support Vector Machine (SVM), k-Nearest Neighbors (k-NN), Decision Tree, Random Forest, Adaptive Boosting (AdaBoost) and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP). We use the dataset collected by connecting one UE to the BS for training. Therefore, the first column of Table II shows the number of samples used for the training of the classifiers for each traffic class. We use the second dataset (i.e., second column in Table II) for validation and testing purposes.

Due to the nature of real network traffic, different traffic classes can exhibit similar properties during short periods of time. Our analysis showed that in such scenarios, traffic classification models based on decision rules have an advantage due to the higher tolerance to outliers. Additionally, they have a lower inference delay - δ_i due to lower computational requirements. Table III shows the classification accuracy achieved by different ML algorithms. The Random Forest and Decision Tree algorithms outperformed the others with an accuracy of 0.95 and 0.93, respectively. As shown in Table III, the accuracy of the the other algorithms is considerably lower with the minimum being 0.56 for MLP.

A closer inspection of Table III reveals that the inference time - δ_i of all tested classifiers falls within the acceptable bound set by the near-RT RIC. It ranges from $1.25ms$ for the Decision Three to $3.05ms$ for the AdaBoost classifier. Due to the high accuracy discussed above and the fact that the inference time of all tested classifiers is acceptable, the Random Forest is the best choice for our use-case. We argue that the Decision Tree classifier would be the second choice considering that its inference time is much lower, with the accuracy being lower by 2%.

Considering the analysis presented above, we deployed the Random Forest classifier as an *xApp* to the near-RT RIC. The chosen model consists of 100 decision trees with a maximum depth of 15. The minimum number of samples required to split an internal node is 5, and the minimum number of samples required to reach a leaf node is 1. The experiments were executed in our testbed with the setup described in




Fig. 3. Confusion matrices for the individual classes (left), and the binary problem (right).

Section III-A. Even though the real testbed setup exhibits variations in the channel quality, and therefore achievable throughput, the deployed classifier was able to achieve the same classification accuracy that was achieved during the offline training and testing phase, i.e., 0.95.

Table IV provides details about the precision, recall and $F1$-Score for all traffic classes used in our experiments. These metrics show that the proposed model can predict different traffic classes based on measurements taken from the physical and MAC layer. Fig. 3 provides further evidence of the network traffic classification quality. For the individual traffic classes the model achieves a 0.93 $F1$-Score (Fig. 3, left).

So far, we focused on identifying the individual traffic classes. However, in many applications, the goal is to distinguish between *Benign* traffic and an *Attack*. The right hand side of Fig. 3 shows the confusion matrix for these two categories. It clearly shows that our classifier correctly identifies 96% of the *Attacks* while achieving a very high 0.96 $F1$-Score. Due to the lack of comparable solutions in the RAN, we compare these results to IDS solutions deployed in the core network. Even though IDS solutions have an advantage due to the availability of packet headers, our Open-RAN approach achieves results comparable to the work in [8] and [11] in which the authors report 97% $F1$-Score and 93% accuracy, respectively. The authors of [8] report that their IDS solution introduces additional $3.7\mu s$ of delay per packet. In contrast, the near-RT RIC does not interfere with the traffic flow, meaning that no additional delay is introduced to the network.

Fig. 4 shows that after $500ms$, more than 90% of the service executions will be classified correctly. This delay is due to the time needed for the traffic to normalize its behavior, i.e., all analyzed traffic patterns exhibit an initial transition phase in which they can't be correctly classified. Please note that in our experiments we collect measurements every $100ms$. This means that after 5 measurements and a negligible network - t_n and *Databus* processing delay - δ_d (see Section III-A), we correctly classify more than 90% of the traffic executions.

As highlighted throughout the paper, real-time traffic classification is important for on-demand resource allocation, dynamic network reconfiguration and, in case of the detection of potential network attacks, it is useful for IDSs. Motivated by the idea of real-time traffic classification, we measured the




Fig. 4. Cumulative Distribution Function showing that the network traffic is in a transition state for the first 500ms, after which we can correctly classify all analyzed traffic classes.

time needed to correctly label each traffic type. Table III shows that the inference time is $\delta_i = 2.86ms$. Once this value is added to the previously computed control loop delay, we get to a total of $T_d = 760\mu s + 2.86ms = 3.62ms$, meaning that there is a high margin for the network delay (i.e., $996ms$) that still allows us to operate within the $1s$ control loop delay as defined by the Open-RAN Alliance. In terms of detecting network attacks it allows us to terminate the service for the malicious UE before any damage is made. Based on the proposed architecture and the availability of measurements, the detection of the attacks can be done at the Distributed Unit (DU), while the attack could be stopped at the Centralized Unit (CU). The BS can indicate the *Radio Resource Control (RRC) Connection Release* procedure to the UE, which will effectively terminate the service for the malicious user, by moving the UE from *RRC_Connected* to *RRC_Idle* state.

V. Conclusions and Future Work

We developed a near-RT RIC and modified the open-source base station implementation from *srsRAN* to perform early DoS attack detection. This framework allows us to collect measurements and control the RAN configuration with delays between $10ms$ and $1s$. In order to comply with these delay requirements, we developed a fast *Databus* with a delay of 45μs and tested the inference delay of various ML algorithms.

In our experiments, we also extract the most important air interface measurements/features required to correctly classify the analysed network traffic. It is important to notice that these measurements don't provide details about the packet headers. For the purpose of testing the proposed architecture, we collected a realistic dataset in our testbed. The real setup allowed us to validate the performance of our ML model in an environment with varying channel conditions. Our results show that the proposed model generalizes well and it was able to correctly classify the traffic with high accuracy.

The results indicate that early DoS attack detection is possible at the edge of the network, allowing us to isolate the malicious users and stop the attack before it does any damage to the rest of the network. Future work on this topic would include the implementation of the Real Time RIC, which operates on even lower delay requirements (i.e. up to $10ms$). This would also affect the type of ML model that could perform the inference.

Acknowledgment

Financial support from Science Foundation Ireland 17/CDA/4760, 18/RI/5721 and 13/RC/2077_p2 is acknowledged. Financial support from Brazilian agencies: CNPq, CAPES, FAPESP/MCTI/CGI.br (PORVIR-5G 20/05182-3, and SAWI 20/05174-0), FAPES (94/2017, 281/2019, 515/2021, 284/2021, 1026/2022). CNPq fellows Dr. Martinello 306225/2020-4.

References

[1] L. F. Eliyan and R. Di Pietro, "DoS and DDoS attacks in software defined networks: A survey of existing solutions and research challenges," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 122, pp. 149–171, 2021.

[2] M. Zoure, T. Ahmed, and L. Réveillére, "Network services anomalies in nfv: Survey, taxonomy, and verification methods," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 2022.

[3] S. Wang, J. F. Balarezo, S. Kandeepan, A. Al-Hourani, K. G. Chavez, and B. Rubinstein, "Machine learning in network anomaly detection: A survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 152 379–152 396, 2021.

[4] J. R. Rose *et al.*, "Intrusion detection using network traffic profiling and machine learning for IoT," in *2021 IEEE 7th International Conference on Network Softwarization (NetSoft)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 409–415.

[5] I. Bilogrevic, M. Jadliwala, and J.-P. Hubaux, "Security issues in next generation mobile networks: LTE and femtocells," in *2nd international femtocell workshop*, no. POST_TALK, 2010.

[6] M. Nasr, R. Shokri, and A. Houmansadr, "Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning," in *2019 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 739–753.

[7] J. A. Khan and M. M. Chowdhury, "Security analysis of 5G network," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Electro Information Technology (EIT)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 001–006.

[8] B. M. Xavier, R. S. Guimarães, G. Comarela, and M. Martinello, "Map4: A pragmatic framework for in-network machine learning traffic classification," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, pp. 1–1, 2022.

[9] F. Paolucci, L. Marinis, P. Castoldi, and F. Cugini, "Demonstration of p4 neural network switch," in *2021 Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–3.

[10] J.-H. Lee *et al.*, "Switchtree: in-network computing and traffic analyses with random forests," *Neural Computing and Applications*, p. 1, 2020.

[11] D. Barradas, N. Santos, L. Rodrigues, S. Signorello, F. M. Ramos, and A. Madeira, "Flowlens: Enabling efficient flow classification for ml-based network security applications," in *Proceedings of the Network and Distributed Systems Security (NDSS) Symposium*, 2021.

[12] D. Ding, M. Savi, F. Pederzolli, M. Campanella, and D. Siracusa, "In-network volumetric DDoS victim identification using programmable commodity switches," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1191–1202, 2021.

[13] M. Zhang, G. Li, S. Wang, C. Liu, A. Chen, H. Hu, G. Gu, Q. Li, M. Xu, and J. Wu, "Poseidon: Mitigating volumetric DDoS attacks with programmable switches," in *Proceedings of NDSS*, 2020.

[14] Z. Liu *et al.*, "Jaqen: A high-performance switch-native approach for detecting and mitigating volumetric DDoS attacks with programmable switches," in {*USENIX*} *Security Symposium*, 2021.

[15] M. P. Novaes *et al.*, "Adversarial deep learning approach detection and defense against DDoS attacks in SDN environments," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 125, pp. 156–167, 2021.

[16] S. Ramanathan *et al.*, "SENSS against volumetric DDoS attacks," in *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, 2018, pp. 266–277.

[17] M. Iavich *et al.*, "The novel system of attacks detection in 5g," in *International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications*. Springer, 2021, pp. 580–591.

[18] L. Bonati, S. D'Oro, M. Polese, S. Basagni, and T. Melodia, "Intelligence and learning in O-RAN for data-driven nextg cellular networks," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 21–27, 2021.

[19] M. Polese *et al.*, "Understanding O-RAN: Architecture, interfaces, algorithms, security, and research challenges," *arXiv:2202.01032*, 2022.

[20] OpenIreland testbed (CONNECT research centre), funded by Science Foundation Ireland, www.openireland.eu, accessed on 2022-10-17.

[21] I. Sharafaldin *et al.*, "Toward generating a new intrusion detection dataset and intrusion traffic characterization." in *ICISSP*, 2018, p. 108.