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Introduction

Smart Home Definition

- Smart homes include wired and wireless interconnected devices
- Provide services such as voice assistants, security cameras and many more
The number of interconnected smart home devices will reach 72 billion by 2025 [1]
IoT devices are attractive to hackers

Source: HelpNetSecurity
Introduction

Attacks on Smart Home Devices

- IoT devices are vulnerable to various attacks:
  - distributed Denial of Service attacks (DDoS)
  - network scan attacks
  - SQL injections
  - zero-day attacks
  - ransomware attacks

- Reasons:
  - heterogeneity of IoT devices
  - low storage and computation resources
  - generate massive data
• Traditional systems are inadequate because:
  • IoT devices generate a high volume of data
  • a large amount of connected IoT devices

• **Solution**: Software-Defined Networking (SDN)
  • provides centralize network management
  • provides flow-based statistics
  • helps developing flexible solutions

• SDN and Machine Learning
  • helps automated decisions making
  • enhance smart home security via **IoT device classification and DDoS detection**
DDoS Attacks

- DDoS attacks disrupt the normal operation of devices
- DDoS attacks can also disconnect a device from its associated WiFi access point
• we propose a SDN-based architecture consisting of a Faucet controller & Open vSwitch to secure smart homes

• the proposed framework is implemented on GNS3 network simulator to measure its performance

• we proposed a minimum set of flow-based features for both IoT device classification and DDoS detection

• we utilize non-cumulative statistics to increase framework’s accuracy while reducing controller and switch communication overhead
to validate the efficacy and reliability of the proposed features 2 different real-world dataset are used

the minimum dataset size to meet 95% accuracy is identified.

the accuracy of KNN, SVM and RF are investigated in detail with varying polling interval.

the latency for the minimum dataset is identified.
Proposed Testing Environment

Smart Home network

Attacker (Linux) ➔ Ethernet Switch ➔ Access Point (Linux) ➔ Sniffer (Linux)

Ethernet Connection ➔ Wifi Connection

- Google Home
- Amazon Echo
- Nest Cam
- Ring Cam
- Android Phone

Smart home network for benign and DDoS attack data collection
Virtual SDN-based smart home environment using GNS3 simulator
Proposed Testing Environment

Datasets and IoT devices used

- To confirm the robustness of machine learning models:
  - used three datasets: SIOTLAB (our lab), UNSW dataset [5], combined dataset (SIOTLAB and UNSW)

| Device Category               | Device                                                                 |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Switches/Triggers             | WeMo Motion Sensor and Power Switch, TP Link Smart Plug, Chromecast    |
| Camera Systems                | Ring Camera, Nest Camera, Samsung Camera, Netatmo Camera               |
| IoT Hub Devices               | Amazon Echo, LiFX, Hue Bulb, iHome, Google Home                       |
The proposed framework uses the following flow-based and stateless features obtained per polling interval:

- **Protocol percentage**: the percentage of ICMP, TCP, and UDP packets

- **IP diversity ratio**: calculated as the number of unique IP addresses divided by the total number of packets sent by a device

- **Packet size and count**
Proposed Testing Environment

Non-cumulative statistics

- Traditional SDN networks working:
  - switches send cumulative statistics of packets sent and received to controller periodically
  - statistics are accurate at lower polling interval that increases network congestion

- we propose to use non-cumulative statistics to collect accurate statistics:
  - every poll from controller to switch resets flow gauges on controller
  - thus non-cumulative statistics are independent of events that happened before this period
Proposed Secure Home Architecture

Phase I

The proposed architecture has two phases:

Controller Jobs:
1. places device in unverified VLAN
2. collects data from Switch
3. extracts features and feed to classifier

moved to verified VLAN

classifier predicts if device is malicious?

Benign

Moved to verified VLAN

Malicious

Flagged and phase II initiated

Phase I
The proposed architecture has two phases:

1. **Classifier runs again**
   - **malicious?**
     - **No**: Moved to verified VLAN
     - **Yes**: Removed from network

Phase II
Machine Learning algorithms used:
- K-Nearest Neighbors algorithm (KNN)
- Support Vector Machine with linear kernel (LK-SVM)
- Random Forest using Gini impurities (RF)

Hyperparameters are default

Split data into 75% train and 25% test data

Classes are balanced
Result and Discussion

Machine learning algorithms

All models demonstrate accuracy improvement versus increasing polling interval
Result and Discussion

Minimized dataset

- for the combined dataset, KNN shows 95% accuracy for 1820 data points, meeting the low memory requirement

- for 100 trials KNN’s latency on a machine with 1.4 GHz i5 processor & 4 GB RAM is 1.18 ms
## Result and Discussion

### Comparison with existing work

| Existing work       | Maximum Accuracy | Detection type    | Dataset    | Storgae       | Latency          | Feature Count |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| Owusu et al. [2]    | 92.7%            | Classification    | Tor        | No            | No               | 6             |
| Reza et al. [3]     | 97.6%            | Classification    | Custom     | No            | No               | 13            |
| Xu et al. [4]       | 87.8%            | Classification    | Custom     | No            | No               | 21            |
| Hamza et al. [5]    | 97.5%            | DDoS              | UNSW       | Yes (14.2 MB) | Yes (13 ms)      | 20            |
| Doshi et al. [6]    | 99.8             | DDoS              | Custom     | No            | No               | 11            |
| Yang et al. [7]     | 99.8%            | DDoS              | KD99       | No            | No               | 9             |
| Proposed Solution   | 99.9%            | Classification & DDoS | Custom & UNSW | Yes (541 KB) | Yes (1.18 ms) | 6             |
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