

> A peer reviewed international journal ISSN: 2457-0362

www.ijarst.in

# PACKET DROPPING ATTACKS DETECTION

# **USING HLA**

<sup>1</sup>Mr.G Venu Gopal Rao, <sup>2</sup>Mr.Repakula Naresh,

<sup>1,2</sup> Assistant Professor, Dept. of CSE,

Malla Reddy Engineering College (Autonomous), Secunderabad, Telangana State

#### Abstract

To improve the detection accuracy, we propose to exploit the correlations between lost packets. Furthermore, to ensure truthful calculation of these correlations, we develop a homomorphic linear authenticator (HLA) based public auditing architecture that allows the detector to verify the truthfulness of the packet loss information reported by nodes. This construction is privacy preserving, collusion proof, and incurs low communication and storage overheads. To reduce the computation overhead of the baseline scheme, a packet-block-based mechanism is also proposed, which allows one to trade detection accuracy for lower computation complexity. Through extensive simulations, we verify that the proposed mechanisms achieve significantly better detection accuracy than conventional methods such as a maximum-likelihood based detection.Link error and malicious packet dropping are two sources for packet losses in multi-hop wireless ad hoc network. In this paper, while observing a sequence of packet losses in the network, we are interested in determining whether the losses are caused by link errors only, or by the combined effect of link errors and malicious drop. We are especially interested in the insider-attack case, whereby malicious nodes that are part of the route exploit their knowledge of the communication context to selectively drop a small amount of packets critical to the network performance. Because the packet dropping rate in this case is comparable to the channel error rate, conventional algorithms that are based on detecting the packet loss rate cannot achieve satisfactory detection accuracy.

Keywords: - DoS attack, HLA, Nodes, Sender

# 1. INTRODUCTION

In a multi-hop wireless network, nodes cooperate in relaying/routing traffic. An adversary can exploit this cooperative nature to launch attacks. For example, the adversary may first pretend to be a cooperative node in the route discovery process. Once being included in a route, the adversary starts dropping packets. In the most severe form, the malicious node simply stops forwarding every packet Received from upstream nodes, completely disrupting the path between the source and the destination. Eventually, such a severe denial-of-service (DoS) attack can paralyze the network by partitioning its topology. Even though persistent packet dropping can effectively degrade the performance of the network, from the attacker's standpoint such an



A peer reviewed international journal ISSN: 2457-0362 www.ijarst.in

"always-on" attack has its disadvantages. First, the continuous presence of extremely high packet loss rate at the malicious nodes makes this type of attack easy to be detected. Second, once being detected, these attacks are easy to mitigate. For example, in case the attack is detected but the malicious nodes are not identified, one can use the randomized multi-path routing algorithms to circumvent the black holes generated by the attack, probabilistically eliminating the attacker's threat. If the malicious nodes are also identified; their threats can be completely eliminated by simply deleting these nodes from the network's routing table. A malicious node that is part of the route can exploit its knowledge of the network protocol and the communication context to launch an insider attack an attack that is intermittent, but can achieve the same performance degradation effect as a persistent attack at a much lower risk of being detected. Specifically, the malicious node may evaluate the importance of various packets, and then drop the small amount that is deemed highly critical to the operation of the network. For example, in a frequency-hopping network, these could be the packets that convey frequency hopping sequences for network-wide frequencyhopping synchronization in an ad hoc cognitive radio network; they could bathe packets that carry the idle channel lists (i.e., whitespaces) that are used to establish a network-wide control channel. By targeting these highly critical packets, the authors in have shown that an intermittent insider attacker can cause significant damage to the network with low probability of being caught. In this paper, we are interested in combating such an insider attack. In particular, we are interested in the problem of detecting the occurrence of selective packet drops and identifying the malicious node(s) responsible for these drops. Detecting selective packetdropping attacks is extremely challenging in a highly dynamic wireless environment. The difficulty comes from the requirement that we need to not only detect the place (or hop) where the packet is dropped, but also identify whether the drop is intentional or unintentional. Specifically, due to the open nature of wireless medium, a packet drop in the network could be caused by harsh channel conditions (e.g., fading, noise, and interference, a.k.a., link errors), or by the insider attacker. In an open wireless environment, link errors are quite significant, and may not be significantly smaller than the packet dropping rate of the insider attacker. So, the insider attacker can camouflage under the background of harsh channel conditions. In this case, just by observing the packet loss rate is not enough to accurately identify the exact cause of a packet loss. The above problem has not been well addressed in the literature. As discussed in Section 2, most of the related works preclude the ambiguity of the environment by assuming that malicious dropping is the only source of packet loss, so that there is no need to account for the impact of link errors. On the other hand, for the small number of works that differentiate between link errors and malicious packet drops, their detection



A peer reviewed international journal ISSN: 2457-0362

www.ijarst.in

algorithms usually require the number of maliciously-dropped packets to be significantly higher than link errors, in order to achieve acceptable detection accuracy.

## 2. RELATED WORK

### Existing system

The most of the related works preclude the ambiguity of the environment by assuming that malicious dropping is the only source of packet loss, so that there is no need to account for the impact of link errors. On the other hand, for the small number of works that differentiate between link errors and malicious packet drops, their detection algorithms usually require the number of maliciously-dropped packets to be significantly higher than link errors, in order to achieve acceptable detection accuracy. Depending on how much weight a detection algorithm gives to link errors relative to malicious packet drops, the related work can be classified into the following two categories. The first category aims at high malicious dropping rates, where most (or all) lost packets are caused by malicious dropping. The second category targets the scenario where the number of maliciously dropped packets is significantly higher than that caused by link errors, but the impact of link errors is non-negligible.

#### **Proposed system**

In this paper, we develop an accurate algorithm for detecting selective packet drops made by insider attackers. Our algorithm also provides a truthful and publicly verifiable decision statistics as a proof to support the detection decision. The high detection accuracy is achieved by exploiting the correlations between the positions of lost packets, as calculated from the auto-correlation function (ACF) of the packet-loss bitmap—a bitmap describing the lost/received status of each packet in a sequence of consecutive packet transmissions. The basic idea behind this method is that even though malicious dropping may result in a packet loss rate that is comparable to normal channel losses, the stochastic processes that characterize the two phenomena exhibit different correlation structures (equivalently, different patterns of packet loss is purely due to regular link errors, or is a combined effect of link error and malicious drop. Our algorithm takes into account the cross-statistics between lost packets to make a more informative decision, and thus is in sharp contrast to the conventional methods that rely only on the distribution of the number of lost packets.



### 3. IMPLEMENTATION



#### **Fig:-1 System Architecture**



#### Fig:-2 Block Diagram

Register: - Sender will Register in to and Make Account in the System

Login: - The Registered users will login to Send Files from one node to other

File Upload: - We Can Upload File in to the System & Send that Data

**Send to Neighboring Nodes: -** The Data will that Sharing in network will be from one node to the next near neighboring node

Revive Feedback: - Sender will receiver Feedback from the users

Send ADR: - The Sender will send Address to the receiver to access the file



### 4. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

То	cloudtechnologiesproje 🔻		
Public-Key	_		
Private-Key		Generatekeys	
		Modified ElGamal Signature	
Message			Send
	Generate HashValue	Generate Signature	

#### Fig:-3 Key generation



# Fig:-4 Sending Data



# Fig: - 5 Verification

Send Yo	ar Data Via f-c-b-d-sink	message	Packent Sent to Nodec
	packet 1. Received packet 2. Received packet 3. Received packet 3. Received packet 5. Received packet 5. Received packet 8. Received packet 8. Received Completed_1	Formard	(
	Completed_I		

**Fig:-6 Packets Revising** 



		Error
Public Key	Get PublicKey	Identified Packets a
200 akaudataa ePaza la)	ofice co cgc# 4*\$E	<b>•</b>
	Verification	
	FeedBack	3
Decrypt	Save	

#### **Fig:-7 Failed Nodes**

#### 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we showed that compared with conventional detection algorithms that utilize only the distribution of the number of lost packets, exploiting the correlation between lost packets significantly improves the accuracy in detecting malicious packet drops. Such improvement is especially visible when the number of maliciously dropped packets incomparable with those caused by link errors. To correctly calculate the correlation between lost packets, it is critical to acquire truthful packet-loss information at individual nodes. We developed an HLA-based public auditing architecture that ensures truthful packet-loss reporting by individual nodes. This architecture is collusion proof, requires relatively high computational capacity at the source node, but incurs low communication and storage overheads over the route. To reduce the computation overhead of the

Baseline construction, a packet-block-based mechanism was also proposed, which allows one to trade detection accuracy for lower computation complexity. Some open issues remain to be explored in our future work. First, the proposed mechanisms are limited to static torques-static wireless ad hoc networks. Frequent changes on topology and link characteristics have not been considered. Extension to highly mobile environment will be studied in our future work. In addition, in this paper we have assumed that source and destination are truthful in following the established protocol because delivering packets end-to-ends in their interest. Misbehaving source and destination will Be pursued in our future research. Moreover, in this paper, as a proof of concept, we mainly focused on showing the feasibility of the proposed crypto-primitives and how second order statistics of packet loss can be utilized to improve detection accuracy. As a first step in this direction, our analysis mainly emphasize the fundamental features of the problem, such as the untruthfulness nature of the attackers, the public verifiability of proofs, the privacy-preserving requirement for the auditing process, and the randomness of wireless channels and packet losses, but ignore the particular Behavior of various protocols that may be used at different layers of the protocol stack. The implementation



A peer reviewed international journal ISSN: 2457-0362

www.ijarst.in

and optimization of the proposed mechanism under various particular protocols will be considered in our future studies.

# 6. REFERENCES

[1] J. N. Arauz, "802.11 Markov channel modeling," Ph.D. dissertation, School Inform. Sci., Univ. Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 2004.

[2] C. Ateniese, R. Burns, R. Curtmola, J. Herring, L. Kissner, Z.Peterson, and D. Song, "Provable data possession at untrusted 0stores," in Proc. ACM Conf. Comput. andCommun. Secur., Oct. 2007, pp. 598–610.

[3] G. Ateniese, S. Kamara, and J. Katz, "Proofs of storage from homomorphicidentification protocols," in Proc. Int. Conf. Theory Appl.Cryptol. Inf. Security, 2009, pp. 319–333.

[4] B. Awerbuch, R. Curtmola, D. Holmer, C. Nita-Rotaru, and H.Rubens, "ODSBR: An on-demand secure byzantine resilient routingprotocol for wireless ad hoc networks," ACM Trans. Inform. Syst. Security, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1–35, 2008.

[5] B. Awerbuch, R. Curtmola, D. Holmer, C. Nita-Rotaru, and H.Rubens, "ODSBR: An on-demand secure byzantine resilient routingprotocol for wireless ad hoc networks," ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur., vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 11–35, 2008.

[6] K. Balakrishnan, J. Deng, and P. K. Varshney, "TWOACK: Preventingselfishness in mobile ad hoc networks," in Proc. IEEEWireless Commun. Netw. Conf., 2005, pp. 2137–2142.

[7] D. Boneh, B. Lynn, and H. Shacham, "Short signatures from theweil pairing," J. Cryptol., vol. 17, no.4, pp. 297–319, Sep. 2004.

[8] S. Buchegger and J. Y. L. Boudec, "Performance analysis of theconfidant protocol (cooperation of nodes: Fairness in dynamic adhocnetworks)," in Proc. 3rd ACM Int. Symp. Mobile Ad Hoc Netw.Comput. Conf., 2002, pp. 226–236.

[9] L. Buttyan and J. P. Hubaux, "Stimulating cooperation in selforganizingmobile ad hoc networks," ACM/Kluwer Mobile Netw.Appl., vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 579–592, Oct. 2003.

[10] J. Crowcroft, R. Gibbens, F. Kelly, and S. Ostring, "Modellingincentives for collaboration in mobile ad hoc networks," presented t the First Workshop Modeling Optimization Mobile, Ad Hoc Wireless Netw., Sophia Antipolis, France, 2003.