Lecture #6: IoT Edge Security Systems

<u>Cristian Hesselman</u>, Elmer Lastdrager, <u>Ramin</u> <u>Yazdani</u>, and Etienne Khan

University of Twente | May 27, 2020



Lab assignment

- MUD descriptions: you'll need to generate them yourselves, tools are available
- IoT devices: you'll need to work with the actual hardware, no emulations (unless as an extra)
- Use IoT devices without a browser-like interface, such as light bulbs, audio speakers, doorbells
- Do not use multi-purpose devices like tablets, phones, laptops
- At least 2 IoT devices per group of 3 and at least 3 devices per group of 4



• Etienne Khan available for assistance



Paper summaries

- You must have handed in your two summaries BEFORE this lecture
- You can use the summaries during the oral exam ("open book")
- You <u>cannot</u> complete SSI without submitting 12 paper summaries!



Interactive Lecture

- Goal: enable you to learn from each other and further increase your understanding of the papers (contributes to preparing yourself for the oral exam)
- Format:
 - 1. We'll ask someone to provide their **opinion** of the paper
 - 2. Summary by teachers (put any questions in the chat)
 - 3. Questions: discussion starters and fact questions
 - 4. Discussion (use your mic)
 - 5. We may ask someone specific to start the discussion
- Experimental format resulting from Corona pandemic, please provide feedback!



"CommunityGuard: A Crowdsourced Home Cyber-Security System", SDN-NFV Security, 2017*

Chase E. Stewart, Anne Maria Vasu and Eric Keller



* Figures are from this paper, unless stated otherwise

Concept

- Significant part of the IoT targets home networks (little or no IT security knowledge)
- Possibility to launch powerful DDoS attacks using these devices [MIRAI]
- A device residing between a home router and the cable modem connected to cloud
- Efficiency proportional to the amount of subnets that deploy it





C-Guard Architecture

BeagleBone Black used as guardian node

- on-board 10/100 Mbps Ethernet port
- another interface was added using an USB to 10/100 Mbps Ethernet adapter
- runs Snort IPS/IDS



Source: https://images-na.ssl-imagesamazon.com/images/I/71PDU796juL._AC_SL1500_.jpg

Community Outpost running on a cloud server

• needs to be scalable and secure (obvious attack target)





Question

Who should be responsible for running the CommunityGuard Outpost Server?

A: Specific IoT device vendors

B: ISPs

C: Cloud providers

D: ...



C-Guard Prototype

Three cron jobs running on Guardian Node:

- Updating Snort rules from rule repositories
- Exchanging information about malicious traffic with the Outpost Server
- Generating new anti-DDoS rules using DDoS server beacons



Quiz

Which of the following is <u>**not**</u> considered as a potential malicious activity from users in the paper?

A: getting access to user data

B: infecting other networks with Malware

C: removing malicious IP addresses from blacklist

D: trying to blacklist legitimate IP addresses



Server Blacklist





Outgoing DDoS Prevention

Developers add DDoSed server IPs to table





Evaluation

- Test setup including 2 Guardian Nodes
- A few manually written Snort rules to treat safe traffic as malicious
- Manually added DDoSed (TCP SYN) IP addresses to the database
- Legitimate traffic between the attacking node and the target was still allowed while attack traffic was dropped



Performance

Limiting factors:

- USB to Ethernet adapter
- Slow SD card writes

Sometimes the test case performs better than baseline which might be due to network fluctuations.





Lessons Learned

- Residential IoT networks need a default and simple security mechanism due to the lack of expertise compared to enterprises.
- DDoS attacks are easier to mitigate using a cooperative framework, however building trust in such a system is not straightforward.
- Adding an edge security system (using mechanisms proposed in this paper) introduces a negligible performance downgrade (if proper hardware is used)



Discussion

- How would you attack the CommunityGuard system?
- What are the advantages/disadvantages of deploying an edge security system in this way?
- Would you implement such a system at your home?



"DeadBolt: Securing IoT Deployments", Applied Networking Research Workshop, Montreal, QC, Canada, July 16, 2018 (ANRW '18)



Quiz: key IoT issue

What's the key IoT issue that Deadbolt's security services aim to tackle?

- A. Autonomy of IoT devices
- B. Heterogeneity of IoT devices
- C. Invisibility of IoT devices
- D. Interoperability of IoT devices



DeadBolt key concepts

- Security functions
 - Verification that device software is up to date
 - Protection against remote exploits (control flow attacks)
 - TLS to exchange data
 - Deny-by-default firewall
- Components
 - Trusted gateway (AP)
 - Light weight IoT devices => third party virtual device derivers (proxies)
 - Heavy weight IoT devices => VMs



DeadBolt architecture



Quiz: operation

At what level in the protocol stack does DeadBolt operate?

- A. Network level
- B. Application level
- C. Both
- D. Neither



Quiz: fast patching

What steps does Deadbolt go through to patch devices?

- A. AP blocks device, sends the firmware to the device, deblocks it after update
- B. Device launches a new VM, updates it, then swaps new and primary VMs
- C. Devices fetches the new firmware and then reboot to install
- D. Devices launch a virtual driver, which fetches the firmware, and push it to the device



Remote attestation

- Relying party (verifier) assesses trustworthiness of remote (IoT) systems (provers) [Abera]
 - Software-based, hardware-based, hybrid
 - Attestation of device swarms, control flow attestation (hash over the execution path)
- Relying party requesting evidence about attributes, such as [RATS]:
 - Composition and make of system components
 - Assertion/claim origination or provenances
 - System component integrity and configuration
 - Operational state and measurements of steps which led to the operational state
 - Environmental characteristics of the device such as its GPS location

[Abera] T. Abera, N. Asokan, L. Davi, F. Koushanfar, A. Paverd, A. Sadeghi and G. Tsudik, "Things, Trouble, Trust: On Building Trust in IoT Systems", Design Automation Conference (DAC), 2016 [RATS] IETF Remote ATtestation ProcedureS WG, https://datatracker.ietf.org/group/rats/about/ Gene Tsudik, "A Minimalist Approach to Remote Attestation", https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cL9I9OoXlVE&t=2967s



Quiz: attestation in DeadBolt

What's the core component of the remote attestation functions that DeadBolt supports?

- A. The trusted platform module
- B. The device drivers
- C. The firewall rules
- D. The hypervisor



Discussion: pros/cons of DeadBolt design choices

- Quarantining
- Threat model
- Heaviness of heavy-weight devices
- Attestation for heavy-weight devices
- Trust model

•

• Description of code properties

• Authors' conclusion: "We believe that DeadBolt is a practical approach for securing IoT deployments."





Key takeaways

- DeadBolt is an edge security system, device-to-gateway comms model
- Remote attestation is an interesting feature, separate field of research
- Strong claim about practical applicability (in your teachers' opinion :-)



Volg ons

NI SIDN.nl
@SIDN
In SIDN

Discussion & feedback

Next lecture: **Wed Jun 3**, **10:45-12:30** Topic: IoT device behavior



Before we go: status of your lab assignments?

- We usually get quite a few questions in class, but that's different now
- Thumbs up or down in the chat + group number
- Groups 1 through 11 (minus 3)

