

# Towards Best Practices for Active Network Measurement

Christos Papadopoulos (Colorado State University)

and

John Heidemann (USC/ISI)

*Feb 13, 2009*

*AIMS Workshop, San Diego CA*



**USC Viterbi**  
School of Engineering



**Colorado  
State**  
University

# If You Run Active Experiments then You've Seen This:

*To Colorado State University Team:*

*Your activity is not acceptable and will not be tolerated.*

*Please keep your activities from attempting to access or scanning our networks.*

*Additional attacks or scans will be reported to the authorities.*

What was the “attack”?

We pinged their network once every 11mins..



# The Aegis of Research is not Enough..

.....

*If our IP is not removed from your list by the deadline.....that would be a very bad thing.*

*A very bad thing indeed.*

*I will leave it at that. I have about hit my limit with spam.....the "important research".....and all the other crap that is going on on the internet....You bastards have directed a probe directed to our static IP address....and I am flipping ticked off about it....big time.*

...

This person appears to know that our pings were part of a research project.

We still got no sympathy.



# ..nor is Being Very Careful!

## NANOG list, Jan 12 this year:

*I'm not entirely certain what is going on but has anyone noticed some strange announcements for 174.128.31.0/24?*

....

*Interestingly enough, ARIN indicates this is a part of range they have assigned for reachability testing.*

*<http://ws.arin.net/whois/?queryinput=174.128.31.0>*

## Follow-ups:

*-> I would think that it would only be polite to notify people about what is going on so that other people do not waste their time looking for phantom issues.*

*-> ... having the courtesy to notify next time would be very much appreciated. I was headed into a family member's funeral when I received the hijack notification. I took the 15 minutes to do some quick investigation, fire off a few emails informing my colleagues of the issue and "arrived" at the funeral a bit late. Perhaps in the future it would be better not to play with my toys without asking my permission first?*

**-> The thread generated 96 messages!**  
**Pretty high, even for Noisy NANOG™**



# Solving the Meeting Problem

- Network operators dealing with our experiments **lose** money sorting experiments from attacks
- Academics running such experiments **gain** knowledge and publications
  - .. but lose goodwill when mistaken for attackers
- The level of clue among network operators varies a lot
  - .. some network operators are really small-business people
- The level of clue among academics running experiments **should** be high
- Therefore, we believe it is **OUR** job to design experiments carefully and inform the network operators in a timely manner



# Some Current Community Efforts

- RFC 1262: Guidelines for Internet Measurement Activities (1991) (Vint Cerf)
- Issues and etiquette in use and sharing measured data (Allman 2007)
- Planetlab documents
- CAIDA, Wisconsin, ISI measurements and web documentation
- Legal issues (Paul Ohm 2007, KC's pamphlet)
- Predict MOA's
- etc..



# Learning from Other Communities

- the medical community's has decades of best practices in human-subjects research
  - The Belmont Report (1979, now a historical document) and HHS regulations
  - Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)
- some principles from Belmont
  - risk-benefit criteria
  - subject selection
  - informed consent of subjects
- but we need to figure out how we're *alike* and *different*
  - and *our* best practices and standards for IRBs



# Current Practices not Enough

- RFC 1262 is too brief, too generic and too old – little beyond calling to “Do the Right Thing”
- There is no easy/standard way for operators to learn about our experiments
  - We currently rely on researcher expertise, good will and coziness with network operators
  - ..and fail all too frequently
- There are virtually no guidelines for newcomers into Internet-wide active experiments
- There is no way to find out if anyone else is doing the same experiment to avoid duplication
- We generally do not involve nor provide guidance to IRBs





# Important Questions

- Is my experiment appropriate?
- Is my experiment necessary?
  - Can I do it without active measurement (in a lab)?
- Is my experiment harmful?
  - How disruptive will it be to others?
  - How should I notify others?
- Where is the balance?
  - How can I manage complaints?
  - Is the balance positive?
- much more...
- *We don't have answers to these and many other such questions.*



# Secondary Issues: Anonymization

- What is the appropriate anonymization strategy for my experiment?
- Are there tools and guidance available to help me?
- Has anyone developed such tools and are they willing to share?
- Do I need to talk to a lawyer?



# More Secondary Issues

- What is the appropriate etiquette for passive measurements?
- How should I secure my collectors?
- What should I expect the provider to disclose about the data I am capturing?
- What are the guidelines for reporting results?



# Proposal: Two Prong Approach

- **First: Need updated Best Practices document**
  - Should be a community effort
- **Second: Centralized Database of current and planned academic experiments**
  - Make it trivial for interested parties to get information about current and planned experiments

# Best Practices Document

- What should be included?
  - What sections should it cover?
  - What should be in these sections?
- What existing documents should we tap?
- What legal issues should it address?
- How do we get network operators to contribute?
- What is the right process to publicize the draft and who should approve it?
  - Should we push it through the RFC process?



# Blog

- Need something more than a passive document
- A Blog can be a centralized location for quick and hopefully painless answers
- So with apologies to John Stuart, let us propose..

# PeskyAcademics.com

- Blog with search facilities to find academic experiments quickly
- Academics (and others?) register all current and planned experiments
- Entries vetted so hackers cannot register bogus experiments
- Users search based on IP address and possibly other fields
- Result has a link to the experiment with explanations and contact information



# Other Possible Features

- Mailing list announcing new experiments with information and opt-out links
- “Do not call list” that can be proactively distributed to researchers
- Announcements/updates of experiments
- Help operators with technical issues, e.g., how to quiet alerts
- Track top queries to determine peskiness
- What else?





# Downsides?

- Would public disclosure hurt any experiments?
- How do we avoid an inrush to the “do not call” list?
- Are there any security concerns? Any unintentional benefits to hackers?
- Other downsides?



# Publicity

- Publicity will be hard, but proportional to usefulness
- Publicize the blog (and BP document) with operators and academics so advertise everywhere (mailing lists, NANOG, conferences, etc.)
- Provide links on the blog that showcase research results to educate and encourage operator tolerance

# Good for the Community Too

- Easy way for academics to find each other
  - Informs others of what type of data is being collected and how to get it
  - (Segway into Predict?)
  - Avoids duplicate efforts, encourages collaboration
- Showcases academic activities to funding agencies



# In Summary

- We believe that a Best Practices document is well overdue
  - RFC?
- Document alone is not enough: need an active entity to track experiments
  - Blog?
- We are calling on the community to do both