

Adaptive Security Framework for Ad-Hoc Mobile Wireless Network

RAJANI MURALEEDHARAN & LISA ANN OSADCIW PhD,
L.C. SMITH COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, SYRACUSE, NY.

Goal

- ★ To analyze and propose a defense mechanism against cross layer Denial of Service (DoS) attacks in Ad-Hoc Wireless Networks (AWN).
- ★ To predict the validity of the DoS attacks using receiver operating characteristics (ROC).
- ★ To achieve maximum reliability on DoS claims improving the Quality of Service (QoS) using evolutionary algorithms (Ant System).

Swarm Intelligence (Ant System)

- ★ Multiple ants (agents) working together to find the global optimum.
- ★ Communicate interactively either directly or indirectly.
- ★ Move towards optimal solution by sharing knowledge.
- ★ Depositing pheromones for communication.
- ★ Tabu-list serves as a memory tool.

| |
|--------------------|
| Application Layer |
| Presentation Layer |
| Session Layer |
| Transport Layer |
| Network Layer |
| Data Link Layer |
| Physical Layer |

"Traditionally, communication using AWN is assumed to be SECURE"

Protocol (Flooding, De-synchronization)

Routing (Misdirection, Homing, Black Hole)

Coding (Collision, Exhaustion, Unfairness)

Modulation (JAMMING)

Mathematical Approach

- ★ Initializing of AWN:
 $D_{xy} = \sqrt{(X_1 - X_2)^2 + (Y_1 - Y_2)^2}$
 $\psi_{ij} = 10$
Global Performance, $\eta_{ij} = \frac{w_1 * (H_p - H_a)}{H_p} + \frac{w_2 * (D_p - D_a)}{D_p} + \frac{w_3 * (E_p - E_a)}{E_p}$
DoS parameters
 $+ \frac{w_4 * (PD_p - PD_a)}{PD_p} + \frac{w_5 * (PL_p - PL_a)}{PL_p} + \frac{w_6 * (B_p - B_a)}{B_p} + \frac{w_7 * (SNR_p - SNR_a)}{SNR_p}$
- ★ Transition Probability P_{ij} , $P_{ij} = \frac{[(\psi_{ij})^\alpha \cdot (\eta_{ij})^\beta]}{\sum_k [(\psi_{ik})^\alpha \cdot (\eta_{ik})^\beta]}$
- ★ For Number of Iterations
 1. $E_{ij} = 1 / (D_{ij})^2$
 2. Pheromone deposition $\psi_{ij}(t) = \rho \psi_{ij}(t-1) + Q / \eta_{ij}$
 3. transition probability,
 4. Update Tabu List

Results & Analysis

| Jammer Type | # of Malicious nodes | Average Distance | Average Energy | Average Packet Loss | Average Packet Delivery | Detection (%) |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| STJ | 3 | 9.756 | 15.2038 | 0.038 | 97.349 | 0.9721 |
| | 12 | 92.373 | 50.0292 | 0.3792 | 68.7423 | 0.8619 |
| ELINT | 3 | 10.2921 | 20.948 | 0.173 | 82.1823 | 0.8023 |
| | 12 | 70.0383 | 90.893 | 0.9236 | 0.0034 | 0.5466 |
| Sybil Attack | 3 | 11.0972 | 12.2241 | 0.0212 | 85.0068 | 0.8197 |
| | 12 | 67.4066 | 80.4509 | 0.5731 | 25.7913 | 0.6063 |
| Worm-hole Attack | 3 | 6.0793 | 29.2943 | 0.0167 | 92.1670 | 0.8594 |
| | 12 | 50.4687 | 75.9057 | 0.1905 | 37.4319 | 0.7089 |

Conclusion

- ★ Under Single Tone Jammer (STJ) attack, 97% packet delivery is achieved.
- ★ Under ELINT attack, 82% packet delivery with only 20% energy dissipation is obtained.
- ★ Under Sybil attack, 97% of the time illegitimate nodes were detected prior to attack.
- ★ Collision in Ant System was avoided by 93%, under 50% of network failure.
- ★ Trade-off between performance parameters such as energy, Pd, PI and DoS characteristics is dependent on the Weights.
- ★ Addition of parameters in the future will not affect the approach.