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Abstract. NetFlow data is a well-known network log format used by many network analysts and researchers. The advantages of using this format compared to pcap are that it contains fewer data, is less privacy intrusive, and is easier to collect and process. However, having less data does mean that this format might not be able to capture important network behaviour as all information is summarised into statistics. Much research aims to overcome this disadvantage through the use of machine learning, for instance, to detect attacks within a network. Many approaches can be used to pre-process the NetFlow data before it is used to train the machine learning algorithms. However, many of these approaches simply apply existing methods to the data, not considering the specific properties of network data. We argue that for data originating from software systems, such as NetFlow or software logs, similarities in frequency and contexts of feature values are more important than similarities in the value itself. In this work, we, therefore, propose an encoding algorithm that directly takes the frequency and the context of the feature values into account when the data is being processed. Different types of network behaviours can be clustered using this encoding, thus aiding the process of detecting anomalies within the network. From windows of these clusters obtained from monitoring a clean system, we learn state machine behavioural models for anomaly detection. These models are very well-suited to modelling the cyclic and repetitive patterns present in NetFlow data. We evaluate our encoding on a new dataset that we created for detecting problems in Kubernetes clusters and on two well-known public NetFlow datasets. The obtained performance results of the state machine models are comparable to existing works that use many more features and require both clean and infected data as training input.
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1 Introduction

NetFlow is a well-known format, introduced by Cisco [10] in 1996, that a network administrator can use to analyze the traffic that is occurring in the network. Each flow contains network statistics of a connection between two hosts. These
statistics can be used to compute performance statistics and to infer whether any strange behaviours are occurring within the network. The use of NetFlow over deep packet inspection for network analysis comes with several advantages; NetFlow contains less data, is less privacy intrusive as it is not possible to inspect every single packet and it is easier to collect and process. However, since NetFlow contains less data, it also makes it harder to infer malicious network behaviour as we might be losing essential information looking only at the statistics of a communication between two hosts.

Several NetFlows datasets are available online that contain both benign and malicious flows [11,14,18,19]. The datasets can be used to train and evaluate machine-learning algorithms for intrusion and attack detection. Before a machine learning algorithm is applied to a dataset, the usual practice is to investigate and pre-process the dataset. This process helps remove any properties that could influence the final model learned from the data. Additionally, this process can help find the most important features for learning accurate models. There are several techniques that can be applied during the pre-processing steps; normalisation of the numerical features [13,20,28], feature selection [23,25,30], encoding numerical features [9,15,22] and extracting aggregated features from existing dataset [6,12,20,21].

Thus, there exists a plethora of preprocessing techniques that can be applied to NetFlow datasets. Most of these treat the NetFlow data like a traditional data source and encode the number of transferred bytes and flow duration as standard numerical features. We argue that this is incorrect as data generated by software is not standard. For instance, there exists no noise in the number of bytes and similarly sized flows can have very different meaning. We therefore propose a new encoding inspired by Word2Vec [17] that treats every unique feature value as a different word. The similarities between these words is determined by their context and frequency. We consider frequency especially important for NetFlow data, as we commonly observe flows with a specific number of bytes occur very often. Although we cannot know the meaning of these flows since we do not know the flow content, we can infer that their meaning is different from flow values that occur much less frequently, even when they differ by only a single byte. We consider similarly frequent flows to be similar only when they occur in similar contexts. As context, we use the feature values of the flows before and after along the same connection.

We create a new encoding algorithm to encode NetFlow data. The result is a matrix that can be used to compute distances between flow feature values based on context and frequency. We cluster these values into groups of similarly behaving values. For each network connection, we then build sliding windows of these groups and provide these to a state-machine learning algorithm [27] to learn a behavioural model for flow sequences. In contrast to many existing works that process NetFlow using machine learning [6,7,9,12,13,15,21,24,29,30], this algorithm requires only benign data as input (unsupervised) and can thus be used to detect unseen attacks. State-machines are key models for the design of soft-
ware systems. They have frequently been used to model the kinds of sequential patterns present in software data including network traffic [22].

To evaluate our algorithm, we used it to pre-process NetFlow data from three different datasets. We apply our encoding to only the duration and the number of bytes. We include the protocol as a discrete feature and all other features including the used ports are ignored. Although ports can be useful for detecting network intrusions, they frequently contain spurious patterns due to the data collection setup. Our experiments include a new dataset we created for detecting anomalies in a Kubernetes cluster. Across all datasets, our encoding and machine learning setup show good performance, sometimes outperforming supervised approaches that use more features.

1.1 Our Contribution

Our contributions in this work are summed up as follows:

- We provide a new encoding algorithm that can be used to pre-process NetFlow data. The algorithm extracts context and frequency information from NetFlow data and uses these to build clusters of flow types.
- We show an application of our encoding algorithm by learning state machine models from the encoded NetFlow data in an unsupervised manner and using it for anomaly detection.
- We provide a new NetFlow dataset that researchers can use to evaluate anomaly detection methods.
- We show that using only three features, our approach can achieve an $F_1$ score between 0.82 and 0.99, outperforming some of the existing works.

1.2 Threat Model

In this work, we have considered a particular threat model for our anomaly detection approach using state machine models. We briefly describe the goals and the capabilities of the adversary.

Goals of the Adversary We have considered an adversary that has the following goals: the adversary wants to infiltrate a targeted network and infects machines in the network with malware, or the adversary wants to take down a network by launching different types of attacks against the targeted network.

Capabilities of the Adversary Assuming that the adversary knows that an anomaly detection system is deployed on the targeted network, the adversary can modify their traffic such that it mimics the normal network traffic of the targeted network and avoids the detection by the anomaly detection system. We impose a constraint that the adversary does not know what kind of models were used within the anomaly detection system.
1.3 Outline of Paper

The rest of this paper is structured as follows: we first provide the intuition behind our encoding in Section 2. Then we list some related works in Section 3. In Section 4, we describe our NetFlow encoding algorithm. Then in Section 5, we describe our procedure in how we evaluate our new algorithm and the results of our evaluation. Finally, we conclude this paper in Section 6.

2 Encoding Intuition

We believe that the context and frequency of a unique feature value contain information on what type of network behaviour is occurring in a flow. We will now illustrate this with an example. Say we have NetFlow data and we have extracted the frequency of the following byte values: 37, 39, 80, 81 and 37548. The frequencies of the byte values are presented in Table 1. From these byte values, we see that byte values 80 and 81 differ only by one byte in size but there is a large difference in their frequencies. This likely means they are generated by different kinds of software and therefore should be treated differently by machine learning methods.

Using a NetFlow preprocessing technique such as the one that is used in [9], the space of the byte values can be divided into three regions; 37 and 39, 80 and 81 and 37548. Though there is a large difference between the frequencies of byte values 80 and 81, they are still put within the same region. This leads to machine-learning methods treating these two values as similar. Using our encoding algorithm, we would create different separations within the space of the byte values: All byte values with a very low frequency are put together into one region, while byte values 80 and 81 are put into their own region.

Table 1: Frequencies of byte values 37, 39, 43, 80 and 81. Frequencies of the byte values are extracted from a subset of data from the UGR-16 dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Byte Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>24771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37548</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Related Works

In this section, we list some works that are related to the work done in this paper. We present some of the pre-processing techniques that have been used to process NetFlow data.
One approach to pre-process NetFlow data is to normalise the (non-categorical) numerical feature data using the Z-score method [13,26,28], a method that scales the data for a numerical feature to a value between 0 and 1. The normalisation removes the large differences in the feature data as these could have a large impact on model prediction results. With the normalisation, each feature would have an equal impact on the model prediction results. As this method tries to give each feature an equal impact on the model prediction results, you might lose information on the network behaviour that has occurred in the flow; the normalisation is done by first finding the mean of the feature values for a given feature. This assumes that there is an average behaviour shared between all hosts in the network. This might not be true, especially when there are many different users on the network; each user would behave differently and the behaviour would occur in a particular context. Thus using this method, the context of the behaviour will be lost and therefore lose some behavioural information.

Another approach to pre-process NetFlow data is to use different methods to rank and select features for the learning of the model [23,25,30]. These methods reduce the number of features that are used for the learning of the model and only the features that provide the most contribution to the model prediction results are used. However, these methods do not explicitly use the frequencies and context of the feature values to create an encoding for each flow.

Besides the normalisation approach and the feature selection approach, there also exist methods that can be used to encode numerical feature values [9,15,22]. These methods split the space of the numerical feature into different bins and encode each feature value based on the bin that which it belongs, ignoring their frequency and context.

Furthermore, it is also possible to compute aggregated features from the existing features of the NetFlow data and use these aggregated data to learn a model [6,12,20,21]. Computing these aggregated can be used to derive new information from the dataset that could aid with the learning of a more accurate model. In our work, we also compute new aggregated features that can be used to derive the context in which a particular feature value occurs and use the new features to learn a model. Compared to the work that is done in [6,12,20,21], we do not compute as many aggregated features and there is no overlap in the aggregated features that we have computed. Furthermore, [6,12,20,21] do not explicitly use the frequencies of the feature values as an aggregated feature and no encoding is applied to the feature data.

4 Encoding Algorithm

In this section, we describe our encoding algorithm for NetFlow data. We explain the intuition behind our encoding algorithm and how our algorithm creates an encoding for a NetFlow dataset.
4.1 Computing the Context

Our idea to compute the context for the values of a given NetFlow Feature is inspired by the work of Word2Vec, especially the Count Bag of Words (CBOW) method [17]. For each value \( v \) of a given non-categorical NetFlow feature \( f \), we want to compute the context in which \( v \) occurs in by computing the frequency of the values that occurred before \( v \) and the frequency of the values that occurred after \( v \). The intuition is that the frequencies of the previous/next values capture the behaviour of a given feature value \( v \) within a network. Using the frequencies of the previous/next values, we generate a vector for each feature value \( v \). Using the (Euclidean) distances between vectors of the feature values, we can define the context in which a feature value \( v \) occurs; the smaller the distance between two vectors, the more similar the context in which two feature values occur. This provides us with the ability to create different groups using the context.

4.2 Creating the Encoding

As we can use the distances of the vectors to define the context of each unique feature value \( v \), we can use these vectors to group similar (unique) feature values together. The encoding for the feature values can be created by clustering the vectors of the feature values and using the cluster number that a \( v \) was assigned to as the encoding for \( v \). Similar feature values that occur in a similar context would therefore be assigned to the same cluster and would get the same encoding.

4.3 Implementation of Our Encoding Algorithm

As we are clustering the vectors to create the encoding, the length of the vectors must be equal for all feature values. As each feature value \( v \) would have a different set of previous/next values, we need to have a generalised structure for the vector. During the implementation of our encoding algorithm, we have experimented with different methods in how to construct the vectors for each feature value \( v \) of a given NetFlow feature \( f \).

For our first method, we used a method that is similar to Word2Vec; we used a vector to store the frequency of all possible previous/past values, including the frequency of \( v \) itself. For the second method, we applied a time series differencing method to the values before computing the frequencies. The main issue with these two methods is that we are creating very large vectors to store the frequencies and we do not have control over the size of the vectors.

To resolve this issue, we have decided to divide the space of the previous and next values into ten bins each using percentiles. This way we have a much smaller vector for each feature value \( v \). For this method, we check which bin a previous/next value falls into and increment the frequency of the corresponding bin. We have included two entries in the vector to store the previous self-frequency and the next self-frequency. The self-frequency refers to the frequency in which \( v \) has itself as its previous/next value. With this third method, we reduced the size of the vector and the structure is generalised for each unique feature value.
Furthermore, we also have control over the sizes of the vectors that we create for the unique value values.

Figure 1 provides a high-level overview of our data processing pipeline. For the clustering of the vectors, we have used the KMeans Clustering implementation that is provided by Scikit-learn machine-learning package [5]. We opted to use KMeans clustering to cluster the vectors as we can fix the number of clusters that can be created and thus we can fix the size of our encoding.

![Figure 1: High-level overview of our data processing pipeline. The pipeline shows how the encoding is created for the given NetFlow input data using our encoding algorithm.](image)

5 Evaluation & Results

In this section, we describe how we applied our encoding algorithm to learn a state machine model for anomaly detection. Furthermore, we also provide a comparison of the performance results of our state machine model against existing works that use the same datasets.

5.1 State-machine Learning Framework

In this work, we have used our encoding algorithm to pre-process NetFlow data for the learning of state machine models. A state machine or automaton is a mathematical model that is used to model the sequential behaviour of a system.

State machine models can be learned from trace data that are produced by a system. For this work, we have chosen to use Flexfringe [27] as the state-machine learning framework to learn the state machine models in an unsupervised manner for anomaly detection. We have chosen this particular framework as it provides the ability to use different heuristics for the learning of the models.
5.2 Dataset Selection

To evaluate our approach in this work, we have used three different datasets to learn our models and for anomaly detection. For the first dataset, we have used a dataset that we created for the AssureMOSS project [2]. This dataset contains both benign and malicious NetFlows gathered from a Kubernetes cluster running multiple applications [3]. The architecture of the cluster is presented in Figure 2.

For the generation of this dataset, 20 participants were asked to use the applications to generate benign NetFlow data. Furthermore, three different attack scenarios were constructed using a threat matrix proposed by Microsoft [16]. The attack scenarios were launched by ourselves against the cluster, while the participants were using the applications.

For the second dataset, we have selected a well-known data that is used by many works; the CTU-13 dataset [11]. This dataset contains both benign network traffic data that was generated by real users and malicious network traffic data that was generated by different malware. This dataset contains thirteen captures of different malware samples.

For the third dataset, we have selected the UGR-16 dataset [14]. This dataset contains a large volume of NetFlows collected from a Spanish ISP. The benign data were produced by real users and different types of attacks were launched to generate the malicious data.

Fig. 2: Architecture of the Kubernetes Cluster that was used to generate the AssureMOSS dataset

5.3 Feature Selection

For each dataset, we used the same set of features to pre-process the NetFlow data for learning the state machine models; the protocol that was used in a flow, the total number of bytes that were sent in a flow and the duration of the
flow. Using only these three features, our approach does not rely on operating system/network-specific features and our approach can be used on different types of networks. Furthermore, our approach is less privacy intrusive as we are using as few as possible features to train our models.

5.4 Encoding Train & Test Data

In our approach, we have only used benign NetFlow data to learn the state machine models. For the CTU-13 dataset, we have used the split that the authors of the dataset have proposed in [11] to create our train and test set. For the UGR-16 dataset, we created our train set using benign data from the first week of each month in the calibration data and we create our test using both benign and malicious data from the first week of each month from the test data. For the AssureMOSS data, we have selected the benign data from the first half-hour of data to create our training data and the remaining data is used to create the test data.

Once the train and test set has been created for each dataset, the train and test set are concatenated together to create a larger set to be used as input for our encoding algorithm. Once the encoding has been created from this set, the encoding is added to the train and test set as extra columns.

5.5 Creating Traces for Flexfringe

To learn a model with Flexfringe, the tool expects us to provide a list of traces as input. Each trace consists of a list of symbols. To transform the train and test set into the input format of the tool, we have used a sliding window to create the traces for the train and test set. Each flow is transformed into a symbol and it is created by concatenating the encoding of the selected features together to form a single string with the following form: \texttt{PROTOCOL,BYTES,DURATION}.

Note that the protocol feature is already categorical, therefore we do not need to run our encoding algorithm on this feature. However, we did use an integer encoding that converts each protocol to a numerical value. For the creation of traces, we first sort the NetFlow data based on the connections (i.e. combination of source and destination host) and we drop traces that have a length smaller than the size of the sliding window. We drop the short traces as we deem these traces to not provide enough information on the sequential behaviour that is occurring in the network.

5.6 Detecting Anomalies using State Machines

Once we have learned a state machine from the benign training data, we can use the model to compute probabilities for the traces in the test set. We flag a trace as an anomaly when the probability of the given trace is lower than the set threshold. The threshold is set by using the following formula: \( \text{threshold} = \mu_{\text{train}} + \delta \cdot \sigma_{\text{train}} \), where \( \mu_{\text{train}} \) is the average probability of the train traces, \( \delta \)
is a dataset dependent factor and $\sigma_{\text{train}}$ is the standard deviation of the train traces. The intuition behind this formula is to check whether the probability of a trace deviates more than $\delta$ times the standard deviation from the average probability of the traces that were seen during training. If so, then this trace is considered to have a large deviation and will be flagged as an anomaly.

5.7 Results

The performance results of our approach on the AssureMOSS dataset, the CTU-13 dataset and the UGR-16 dataset are shown in Table 2, 3, and 5 respectively. For the CTU-13 and the UGR-16 dataset, we have listed the performance of some of the existing works that used the same dataset. The AssureMOSS dataset is new and has not been used in any existing works yet, therefore we have compared it to two other anomaly detection methods provided by the scikit-learn machine-learning package. For each dataset, we also compared the performance of the different encoding methods that can be used to pre-process the NetFlow data for state-machine learning; the contextual frequency encoding is the encoding that we propose in this work, the percentile encoding creates bins for the selected non-categorical features and the frequency encoding create a unique label for a feature value if the frequency for the value occurred more than one thousand times in the data. Feature values that do not occur more than one thousand times will be put into bins just like percentile encoding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Learning Category</th>
<th>Encoding Accuracy</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
<th>Prec.</th>
<th>Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Forest</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Outlier</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AssureMOSS dataset** Table 2 shows that our state machine models can achieve very high-performance results when we use our encoding algorithm to pre-process the NetFlow data. Our approach of using state machine models has a significantly better performance than an isolation forest and a local outlier factor in the task of detecting anomalies. Both the isolation forest and the local outlier factor were trained using the default configuration. All models were
trained using the same set of features. When comparing the different encoding methods that were used to pre-process the data, we that our encoding algorithm provides the best results.

**CTU-13 Dataset** When looking at the results in Table 3. It is interesting to note that using the frequency encoding provided us with the best results on this dataset. Our encoding algorithm and the percentile encoding achieved similar performance. This result shows that we did not use enough clusters in our encoding algorithm when we were encoding this dataset. The frequency encoding introduces a new unique symbol when a feature value occurs often enough. This can create a larger alphabet of different symbols when compared to the encoding that is created by our algorithm. Investigating the prediction results of the model that used our encoding shows that this reasoning is correct; many of the infrequent feature values were put into a large cluster, making this cluster number (and thus also the symbol) to be seen as a frequent symbol by the state machine model. This caused many malicious flows to get a very high probability of occurring and consequently it does not raise an alarm as it does not exceed the threshold. Furthermore, we have noticed that many of the benign traces that were flagged malicious by our approach are traces that were produced by connections that have just enough flows to produce one single trace. This caused our model to give a low probability to these traces. We expect to achieve better results with our encoding if we increase the number of clusters that can be formed and if we have more traces for the benign connections that have a low number of flows in the test data.

When we compare the results of our approach to existing works that used the same dataset and that have learned their model supervised manner (or an ensemble), we see that we do not perform as well. However, these works use more than three features and information regarding the source ports of the flows is used for the learning of the model. We strongly believe that the source port feature extracted from this dataset should not blindly be used to learn the model as the source port of a flow leaks information on the label of flow; the original authors of the dataset used virtual machines that were running Windows XP to generate the malicious flows of the malware. For this operating system, the default ephemeral ports start at 1025 and end at 5000. When we plot the distribution of the protocols for both benign and malicious data we can see a clear difference in the distributions of the source ports. Figure 3 presents the distribution of the source ports for the benign and malicious flows from all scenarios. From the distribution of the source ports of the malicious data, a large portion of the flows seems to use a source port that is lower than 6000. The top three ports used in the malicious flows are 2077, 1025 and 2079. All these three port numbers fall within the range used by the virtual machines. Thus using the source port number, the model does not try to learn whether it can distinguish malicious flows from benign flows but rather whether it can distinguish flows coming from a virtual machine or not. Thus, using the source port information to train the model would falsely lead to a better performance of the model.
In our approach, we train our models in an unsupervised manner with only benign data and using only three features. Furthermore, we do not use any source port information to train our model. When we use the frequency encoding to learn a state machine model, we achieve similar results that were achieved by [7]. We expect that by using a larger number of clusters for our encoding algorithm we can also achieve similar results that were achieved by [7].

When we compare our approach to an existing work [29] that also used an unsupervised approach to detect anomalies, we see that our approach is not as accurate but we do achieve a much higher $F_1$ score. This work also used three features from the dataset to learn their model; the duration of the flow, the number of bytes sent by the source host within a flow and the type of service of the destination host. Only one of the features is in common between this work and our work.

Additionally, we have compared our work to the work that was done in [8]. The performance results are presented in Table 4. As this work tries to label source hosts instead of labelling flow, we needed to change our evaluation method for the comparison. In our evaluation for this comparison, we compute for each source host how many connections it has made that are flagged as anomalies and how many connections it has made are flagged as benign. If a source host has produced less than 1000 flows, then we mark this source host as benign as we do not have enough information to conclude whether this host is malicious or not. If a source host has produced at least one thousand flows and if at least 25% of the connections that were made by a source host are flagged anomalous, then we mark this source host as malicious. When we compare our results to the results of BotFP, we see that our approach is as accurate as BotFP but we have a lower $F_1$ and precision score. The low performance on these two metrics can be explained by the same issue that we encountered when we compared our performance results to other existing works that used the CTU-13 dataset; many benign source hosts did not produce many flows. We have added the criteria to
mark source hosts as benign if they have not produced at least one thousand flows, but with this criteria, our approach still produced more false positives. This causes us to achieve a lower precision score. For the work that is done in [8], the authors do use the source port information for their model but the authors have argued that the statistical difference in the operating systems between the host machines is an interesting feature to detect botnets.

**UGR-16 Dataset** When looking at the performance results that we have achieved with our approach on the UGR-16 dataset, we see that our encoding algorithm provides us with the best results compared to the percentile and the frequency encoding.

When we compare the results of our approach to existing works that use the same dataset, we see that we do not achieve an accuracy as high as the other works. However, our approach does provide achieve higher performance results than the work that was done in [30] and [15] when we compare based on the $F_1$ score and the recall score. For the precision score, we achieved similar results as [30] and [15]. For this dataset, it was a bit difficult to compare our work to other existing works as they do not always report the same set of performance metrics. Furthermore, it should be noted again that in our approach we train our model in an unsupervised manner using only benign data and three features whereas the existing works mostly train their models in a supervised manner and used more than three features to train their models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Learning Category</th>
<th>Encoding Accuracy</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
<th>Prec. Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>Contextual Frequency</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.825 0.908 0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.843 0.895 0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.885 0.882 0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed et al [6]</td>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.996 - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bansal Mahapatra [7]</td>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.894 0.890 0.925 0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haghighat Li [12]</td>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.999 0.999 0.999 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugraha et al [21]</td>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.986 0.977 0.995 0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoppi et al [29]</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.990 0.22 - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that in our approach we drop traces that do not have the same length as the length of the sliding that was used. As we sort the flows
Table 4: Performance results of our approach compared to BotFP on CTU-13 dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Learning Category</th>
<th>Encoding Accuracy</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
<th>Prec. Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaise et al.</td>
<td>Supervised and</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Performance results of our approach on UGR-16 dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Learning Category</th>
<th>Encoding Accuracy</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
<th>Prec. Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach</td>
<td>Unsupervised</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larriva-Novo et al. [13]</td>
<td>Supervised Learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magan-Carrion et al. [15]</td>
<td>Supervised Learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajagopal et al. [24]</td>
<td>Ensemble of Supervised and Unsupervised</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoppi et al. [30]</td>
<td>Meta-Learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the connections, there could be many connections that do not have enough flows to create traces that have the same length as the sliding window. This means that we miss benign data that could be used to train our model and we might mislabel malicious flows from shorter connections. This could affect the performance of our models negatively.

### 5.8 Evading Detection of our Models

For our approach, we learn state machine models from NetFlow data and use them to detect anomalies within a network. By looking at the (log-likelihood) probability plots that we have generated using our state machine models, we can already see the large deviation in the network behaviour for the malicious data. Figure 4, 5 and 6 present the plots of the probabilities of the traces from the AssureMOSS, CTU-13 and the UGR-16 dataset respectively. We have coloured the benign traces in blue and the malicious traces in red to make it easier for the reader to see which traces in the test set are the malicious traces. Furthermore,
it should be noted that a higher peak in the plot means a lower probability for a given trace to occur.

We now want to reflect on how an adversary can evade detection by our models. Our models can already detect the large deviation in the network behaviour using only three features from the NetFlow datasets to train our models. We argue that it is hard for an adversary to avoid our anomaly detection method if it is deployed on different networks. As we are using three features (duration, protocol and number of bytes sent) to train our models, an adversary can try to avoid detection by mimicking the values that were produced by benign hosts within a network for these three features. This could be a very hard task as not only would an adversary need to know the normal network behaviour (and this is different for each network), but the adversary would also need to produce network traffic in such a way that the feature values occur within the contexts of the feature values produced by normal network behaviour. Failing to do so, our encoding algorithm will give a different encoding to the traffic produced by the adversary and our models will detect this deviation.

Though it is difficult, an adversary can still evade detection by our approach. In our approach, we drop traces that do not have the same size as the size of the sliding window that we have used to create the traces. As we are sorting the NetFlow data based on the connections before the traces are created, an adversary can bypass our approach by creating many small connections to different destination hosts. However, we argue that it is also possible for us to sort the data differently and we would detect the traffic that is produced by the adversary.

Another way how the adversary can evade our detection by our approach is by producing traffic in such a way that our encoding algorithm would put it in the large cluster of infrequent unique feature values. An example of this large cluster was seen in our investigation of our performance results on the CTU-13 dataset. Being able to create traffic that will be put within this large cluster by our encoding algorithm, the state machine model would assign very high probabilities to the corresponding traces and therefore evade detection. We aim to further investigate how to correctly handle such infrequently occurring values in future work.

6 Conclusion & Future Work

6.1 Conclusion

In this work, we presented an encoding algorithm that can be used to pre-process a NetFlow dataset for machine learning. The encoding algorithm directly uses the frequency of the feature values to compute a context in which the feature values occur. The context is then used to group feature values to create an encoding for the given feature. The intuition is that feature values that occur within a similar context will get the same encoding. We show an application of our encoding algorithm by using it to pre-process three different NetFlow datasets and then use the encoded data to learn state machine models for anomaly detection. For
Fig. 4: Probabilities of the train and test traces for the AssureMOSS dataset. The higher the peak, the lower the probability for a given trace to occur. Benign traces are coloured in blue and the malicious traces are coloured in red.

Fig. 5: Probabilities of the train and test traces for the CTU-13 dataset. The higher the peak, the lower the probability for a given trace to occur. Benign traces are coloured in blue and the malicious traces are coloured in red.

6.2 Future Work

While investigating our performance on the CTU-13 dataset, we have noticed that our encoding algorithm produces a very large cluster in which all infrequent feature values are put. This is a behaviour that we want to capture with our encoding but it does not work for feature values that occur infrequently in the each dataset, we have computed our performance results and compared them to existing works that used the same dataset. From the comparison, we notice that our approach is not as accurate as existing works that use the CTU-13 and the UGR-16 dataset. However, these typically use supervised learning setups with many more features. Our approach does outperform some of the existing works based on the $F_1$, precision and recall scores.
train set and frequently in the test set. As it occurs frequently in the test set, the symbol that is used to represent this large cluster will appear more often in the test traces and the state machine model would give this symbol a very high probability for it to occur. This would then raise many false negatives. As one of our future works, we want to investigate how we can deal with this issue in our encoding and for the learning of the state machine models.

For this work, we have only used NetFlow. For future work for our encoding algorithm, we would like to evaluate it on other types of data e.g. software log data. We believe that our encoding could also be beneficial for encoding software log data and it would also be interesting to compare our encoding algorithm to existing works that are used to process software log data.
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