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A talk about ISP mail handling

BUT, this audience not all that different!

• Outgoing log processing
  – spot problems on your smarthost
• Incoming log processing
  – spot email being sent “direct”
• Aardvarks & Zebras
  – different people’s spam experiences
What problems do ISPs have?

- Insecure customers
  - very few real spammers sending directly!
- Botnets
  - compromised end-user machines
- SOCKS proxies &c
  - mis-configuration
- SMTP AUTH
  - Exchange “admin” accounts + many others
ISP email
server
(smarthost)

ISP abuse@team

Complaints

Yahoo.com
Hotmail.com
Example.com
Example.co.uk
Beispiel.de
Etc.etc.etc

ISP

Email

Server

(smarthost)

Customer

Customer

Customer

Customer

Spammer

Spammer
ISP’s Real Problem

• Blacklisting of IP ranges & smarthosts
• Blocking by large email systems

HENCE:

• 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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Spotting outgoing spam

- Expensive to examine outgoing content
- Legal/contractual issues with blocking
  - “false positives” could cost you customers
- Volume is not a good indicator of spam
  - many customers with occasional mailshots
  - daily limits only suitable for consumers
- “Incorrect” sender doesn’t indicate spam
  - many customers with multiple domains
Key insight (2003, still true)

- 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 many delivery failures whereas legitimate email mainly works
Log processing heuristics

Report “too many” failures to deliver
  – more than 20 works pretty well
• Ignore “bounces”!
  – have null “< >” return path, these often fail
  – detect rejection daemons without < > paths
• Ignore “mailing lists”
  – most destinations work, only some fail (10%)
  – 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)
• But remote sites may reject malware
  ALSO (and very useful)!
• Virus authors don’t know how to say HELO
  – or say HELO differently every time
• So virus infections are also detected
  – albeit, viruses less common these days
Bonus! can also detect loops

• Many people talk to themselves
  – e.g. unknown destinations sent to smarthost
• Many people’s robots don’t have null sender
  – vacation messages often have sender details
  – advert auto-responders want to be replied to
  – eventually these robots correspond with other
dumbly configured systems and a mail loop is the
result – sometimes of very high volume
• Valuable to spot loops before 10K/day level!
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Heuristics for incoming email

• Simple heuristics on failures work really well
  – just as for smarthost
• Multiple HELO lines very common
  – often match MAIL FROM (to mislead)
  – may match RCPT TO (? authenticator ?)
• Pay attention to spam filter results
  – but need to discount forwarding
• Outgoing email will fail on this machine
Spam being sent through the smarthost:

------------------- aafcu@office.com ->
2009-03-18 16:44:03 -> !aarond@unl.edu  Size=1002
    also -> !aarond@unlserve.unl.edu
    -> aaronctidwell@yahoo.com
2009-03-18 16:44:06 -> aca@americancanoe.org  Size=1000
    also -> aca@collegeofangiology.org
2009-03-18 16:44:11 -> acwriters@aol.com  Size=1000
    also -> acwwa@hfx.andara.com
    -> aczesak@blainesd.org
2009-03-18 16:44:13 -> adrianne.shefik@dcsdk12.org  Size=1000
    also -> adrianyearsley@yahoo.com
    -> adrielcg@respirnetpro.com
2009-03-18 16:44:24 -> afhe@primenet.com  Size=1000
    also -> afhra.ahp@maxwell.af.mil
2009-03-18 16:44:25 -> !alamo_ccc@alamoccc.zzn.com  Size=1000
    also -> !alamosa@fws.gov
    -> alameatoni@aol.com
2009-03-18 16:44:27 -> ags-registry@fao.org  Size=1000
    also -> agstat@tds.net
    -> agthomson@msn.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Username</th>
<th>To Address</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-10</td>
<td>18:38:39</td>
<td>muvt@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>20:05:41</td>
<td>tay@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>20:37:57</td>
<td>jip@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>20:38:54</td>
<td>tgp@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>21:10:14</td>
<td>dapum@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>22:14:46</td>
<td>dwd@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>22:47:01</td>
<td>xflj@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>22:47:58</td>
<td>llf@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>23:19:24</td>
<td>tnsk@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-11</td>
<td>23:52:33</td>
<td>bemb@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-12</td>
<td>00:23:59</td>
<td>bixfh@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-12</td>
<td>00:24:56</td>
<td>rqjan@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-12</td>
<td>00:56:18</td>
<td>nxf@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-12</td>
<td>00:57:15</td>
<td>stmx@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-03-12</td>
<td>01:28:35</td>
<td>hxs@</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTASSOC1@mail.ru">MATTASSOC1@mail.ru</a></td>
<td>unrouteable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Varying HELO strings:

HELO = YJLBWOIVBH

2009-02-23 17:10:37 repliedlsoq@shoppingsingapore.com
  -> haywood@let-it-be-thus.com Size=1691
  -> haywoodd@let-it-be-thus.com
  -> hbxmyd@let-it-be-thus.com
  -> healyn@let-it-be-thus.com
  -> heardh@let-it-be-thus.com
  -> heha@let-it-be-thus.com

HELO = FZNPWYWPF

2009-02-23 17:10:38 bridger@acetaxes.com
  -> haven@let-it-be-thus.com Size=1578
  -> haynes@let-it-be-thus.com
  -> haynesdd@let-it-be-thus.com

HELO = geos-ddce7df6b3

2009-02-23 19:45:46 emf_oohne@evenmorefun.com
  -> d.levoi@evenoak.co.uk Size=3520
Summary

• Processing outgoing server logs works well
  – keeps smarthosts out of blacklists

• Processing incoming server logs effective
  – little “looped back” traffic, but high signal to noise

• Production systems deployed at Demon Internet since September 2003, and continue in 2009 to be a major contributor to abuse reports
  – that’s a Good Thing!
http://www.lightbluetouchpaper.org

CEAS papers: http://www.ceas.cc
2004: Stopping spam by extrusion detection
2005: Examining incoming server logs
2006: Early results from spamHINTS
2007: Email traffic: A qualitative snapshot
2008: Do Zebras get more spam than Aardvarks?
Demon email (Feb/Mar 2008)

- Ignored “bounces” (null sender)
  - mainly customer names taken in vain
- Treated \( n \)-addressed email as \( n \) emails
- 550 596 270 emails (8 million a day)
  - 56% were deemed to be spam by Cloudmark
- examined the first letter of the local parts
  - viz: was it addressed to an aardvark or a zebra
A: 47 million emails, 50.2% spam
Z: 4.1 million emails, 74.3% spam
“Real” Aardvarks/Zebras

• Not all email local parts are “real”
  – Demon doesn’t know a “ground truth”
  – non-real arise from “Rumpelstiltskin” or “dictionary” attacks… likely to be the underlying mechanism: your local part is guessed more often if there are a greater number of identical local parts

• So examine dataset to see which local parts receive $n$ non-spam emails during the eight week period and deem these to be “real”
addresses beginning with ‘a’

addresses beginning with ‘z’

Flattens out around 28 emails: viz: “one real email every second day”
Results

• Zebras get way more spam than aardvarks
  – zebras 75%, aardvarks 50%

• But suppose we ignore imaginary animals
  – “real” zebras get 20% spam
  – whereas “real” aardvarks get 35% spam

• Filter designers might like to think about this

• Animals might like to consider a species change

• People might consider a new email address
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