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Current (Jul 04) problems for ISPs

- Insecure customers
  - very few real spammers in the UK!
- Open proxies
  - mainly “trojans on non-standard ports”
- SMTP AUTH
  - Exchange “admin” accounts + many others
- Systems still insecure “out of the box”
  - brand new XP is compromised before secured
ISP’s Real Problem

• Blacklisting of IP ranges & smarthosts
  - listme@listme.dsbl.org

• Rapid action necessary to ensure continued service to all other customers

• But reports may go to the blacklist and not to the ISP (or will lack essential details)
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Why Spotting Spam is Hard

• Expensive to examine outgoing content
• Legal/contractual issues with blocking
  – and “false positives” could cost you customers
• Volume is not a good indicator of spam
  – many customers with occasional mailshots
• “Incorrect” sender doesn’t indicate spam
  – many customers with multiple domains
Key Insight

- Lots of spam is to ancient email addresses
- Lots of spam is to invented addresses
- Lots of spam is blocked by remote filters

- Can process server logs to pick out this information. Spam has delivery failures whereas legitimate email mainly works
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My Log Processing Heuristics

- Report “too many” failures to deliver
  - more than 40 works pretty well
- Ignore “bounces”!
  - have null “<>” return path, these often fail
  - detect rejection daemons without <> paths
- Ignore “mailing lists”
  - most destinations work, only a few fail
  - more than one mailing list is a spam indicator!
Bonus! Also Detects Viruses

• Common for mass mailing “worms” to use address book (mainly valid addresses)
• Recent trend towards scanning the browser cache and (Swen) accessing Usenet servers
  – so many addresses now invalid or badly formed
  – plus remote sites may reject incoming malware
• So virus infections are also detected
Evaluation at Large UK ISP

- 28 day period (1-28 March 2004)
- No public holidays (ie 20 working days)
- 85K active customers (of 200K total)
- 33.4 million emails (51.8 million destinations)
- System had been in production 6 months
  – hence there are no edge effects (initially was spotting dozens of problems per day)
- No major virus events occurred
Evaluation Methodology

• Manually check all reports from system
  – spamming patterns are very obvious
• False positive occurs when report is wrong!
• False negatives assessed by comparison of results with manual inspection of results from a far more sensitively tuned version.
  – also examined all other reports of viruses etc
## Results (total over 28 days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abuse Type</th>
<th>total detected</th>
<th>false positive</th>
<th>false negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Spammers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Servers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virus Infection</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email loops</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking More Closely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abuse type</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>False+ve</th>
<th>False -ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Servers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALSE POSITIVES:
- 36 customers running multiple genuine mailing lists
- 22 customers with >40 delivery failures during one day
- 11 assorted other reasons (see paper)

FALSE NEGATIVES:
- 7 (of the 10) were one “cutecandy” spammer (using a fixed sender string & remote sites accepted a dictionary attack)
Future Work

• Spammers will evolve!
  – Spam resembling bounces will be hard to spot
  – Valid MAIL FROM will be harder to detect
  – Reducing the volume will be harder to spot

• Viruses will evolve!
  – Changing HELO isn’t doing them much good
  – May begin to avoid nonsense destinations
Conclusions

• Spammers & viruses that hide a pattern at the destination make a pattern at the source
• Some simple heuristics currently spot these patterns: with delivery failures being key
• False positives mainly caused by software & users that are being especially clueless 😞
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THE END : Any questions ??
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