



Addressing Security and Privacy Challenges in Internet of Things

Arsalan Mosenia Postdoctoral Researcher



Internet of Things

Enabling numerous services over the Internet Interconnection of heterogenous entities Over 50B Internet-connected devices by 2020

Challenges & Research Directions



New architectures
Fog/Edge Computing
Unused devices

Huge amount of data
Heterogeneity
Missing records

Real-time processing
Small battery
Small storage

Security attacks
Information leakage
Security-friendly design

Security Challenges

Security and privacy

- □ Existence of insecure in-market products
- □ Lack of standardization
- □ Resource constraints
- □ Unknown threats



Potential Attackers

Attackers:

- Occasional hackers
- ✤ Cybercriminals
- Government

Attackers' Motivations:

- Controlling devices
- Stealing *sensitive* information

IoT-based systems:

- ✤ Huge amount of information
- Monitoring/automation





Research Themes



Research Themes

IoT & CPS Security						
Unco	vering	Development of				
Security/P	rivacy Flaws	Security-friendly Systems				
Information	Security	Wearables &	Smart	Underlying		
Leakage	Vulnerabilities	Implants	Vehicles	Networks		
[IEEE TETC, 2016] [IEEE TETC, 2017] [IEEE TMSCS, 2017] [ATC USENIX, 2018] [Survey, IEEE TMSCS, 2017]		[IEEE TMSCS, 2015] [IEEE TC, 2017] [IEEE TMSCS, 2017] [IEEE TMSCS, 2017] [Survey, ACM EDA,	[UbiComp, 2018] [UbiComp, 2018] 2017]	[USENIX Sec, 2018 [FWC, 2018]		

OpenFog Consortium



61 members strong, headquartered in 17 countries as of January 2018

Outline



ProCMotive: Bringing Programmability and Connectivity to Vehicles

IoT & CPS Security					
Uncovering		Development of			
Security/Privacy Flaws		Security-friendly Systems			
Information	Security	Wearables &	Smart	Underlying	
Leakage	Vulnerabilities	Implants	Vehicles	Networks	



Location Privacy

Attacks against location privacy lead to:
advertisement, spams, or scams
disclosure of personal activities
...



Location privacy: determining *when, how, and to what extent* location data are shared

Prior Attacks on Location Privacy

Fundamental limitations of previous attacks:

- Substantial prior knowledge of the path
- *An attack-specific training dataset
- ♦ Very limited accuracy, e.g., less than 45%





The extent of location-related information that can be inferred from *presumably non-critical* data was <u>not</u> well-understood!

Fundamental Challenges

A realistic privacy attack:

- Minimal prior knowledge
- * No attack-specific training dataset
- ✤ High accuracy
- Different activities
- Robustness



PinMe may offer a promising navigation system for autonomous vehicles

Sources of Information



Step 1: Dynamic Partitioning & Activity Classification











What if the user shakes the phone? **Merging**

Activity classification (4 SVMs):

- □ Air pressure
- □ Acceleration
- □ Heading (compass)

Step 2: Tracking the Vehicle



Real-world Evaluation

- 1. Three smartphone: Galaxy S4 i9500, iPhone 6S, and iPhone 6
- 2. Two datasets:
 - Set #1: 405 data chunks collected during different activities (271 chunks for driving)
 Set #2: 3 data streams collected by 3 users (Mazda 3, Mazda CX7, Toyota Camry)



Results: Tracking the Vehicle



Results: End-to-end Evaluation



Trajectories of three different users. Starting from the left and moving to right: (a) Princeton [Galaxy S4 i9500], (b) Princeton [iPhone 6], and (c) Baltimore [iPhone 6S]



Tracking mechanism	#Activity	Prior	Training	OS	Sampling	Device/Vehicle	Success
		info.			freq.	dependence	Rate
ACComplice	1	Y	Y	Android	30 Hz	Y	10%*
Han et. Al, 2012				iOS			
PowerSpy	1	Y	Y	Android	N/A	Y	45%
Michalevsky et al., 2015							
Narian et al., 2016	1	Ν	N	Android	20-100	Y	10%*
PinMe	4	Ν	N	Android	5 Hz	N	100 %
				iOS			

Summary and Future Work

PinMe:

- sheds light on information leakage from seemingly-benign data
- $\boldsymbol{\diamondsuit}$ offers a promising alternative to GPS

We:

- ✤ are performing a large-scale study
- started conversations with companies

U.S. Patent Pending

The most popular paper of IEEE Trans. Multi-scale Computing Systems, Jan. 2018 Extensive media coverage (e.g., Schneier on Security & Android Authority)

IoT & CPS Security						
Uncovering Security/Privacy Flaws		Development of Security-friendly Systems				
Information Leakage	Security Vulnerabilities	Wearables Implants	Smart Vehicles	Underlying networks		

State-of-the-art Vehicles

Stats:

- ♦ Over 1B vehicles, 78M vehicles sold in 2017
- ✤ Average age of vehicles > 12 years
- * Most of them *do not* support connectivity/programmability



Transmitters

Shortcomings:

- 1. Unavailability of service when wireless is lost
- 2. Lack of programmability
- 3. Significant cellular data usage
- 4. Intolerable response time



New Vehicular Apps



Enabling data-dominant, latency-sensitive, mission-critical, and privacy-sensitive applications

Architectural Overview



Design Goals





Connectivity

Vehicle-to-Cloud Vehicle-to-phone Vehicle-to-Vehicle Security

Privacy

Programmability

Cost

Access control Virtualization (containers)

Data manipulation Minimal transmission

Customized Apps Minimal transmission Low response time

Vehicular Add-on Middleware



Data Collection



Enabling data collection from Built-in sensors

20-40 sensors, e.g., speed, RPM *Add-on modules:

□ GPS receiver

Camera

□ BLE-based Sensor Tag

R= [{"appID": "<ID>", "appToken": <Token>, "requestType": "dataCollection"}, {"source": "vehicle", "type": "vehicle_speed"]

Response= requests.post(webserver_url, R, headers={'Content-type':'application/json'}

Data Collection (Cont.)



Access Control

Policy types:

- Strict
- Context-aware (over 10 contexts)
 - 1. Location-based
 - 2. Operational (e.g., idle/moving)
 - Example: Only send controlling commands when the vehicles is not moving!
 - 3. Situational (e.g., accident)





Access Control (Cont.)



Port Management

Public functions:

- ✤ Dongle isolation
- Congestion control (rate adjustment)
- Probing



Case Study I: Insurance Monitor

Usage-based insurance plans offer very low rates!

However, their acceptance is limited:

- ✤ Security
 - □ Injecting commands [Savage et al.,2015]
 - Denial-of-service attacks
- ✤ Privacy
 - □ Reading the vehicle's private data
 - □ Tracking the vehicle [Gao et al., 2014]



Case Study I: Insurance Monitor

Security:

- ✤ Access control
 - Dongle can only <u>**read**</u> speed
- Port management
 - Behavioral analysis
 - Statistical analysis
 - Learning the profile

- Privacy:
 - Port management
 - Data manipulation

Example: Noise addition





Results: Prevention of Command Injection

Legitimate requests:

□ 100 requests (querying speed data) with the frequency of 1 → forwards all requests to the vehicle ✓

✤ Illegitimate requests:

 \Box 100 attempts to query other data \rightarrow requests are dropped \checkmark

 \Box 100 queries with a high frequency \rightarrow puts requests in a queue \checkmark

Case Study II: Experimental Results (Cont.)

Enhancing privacy: (i) shuffling, (iii) shuffling & rounding, (iii) noise addition

Noise addition: $V_i = V_i + Z_i$, where Z_i drawn from a uniform distribution with the range of R



Utility= No. of Speed Violations (Speed >30mph)

Case Study II: Amber Response

Stats:

43 children have been recovered every year 800,000 children are abducted in the U.S. every year



Case Study II: Amber Response (Cont.)

Three implementations:

- Cloud-based: On-cloud plate recognition
- SmartCore-based: Local plate recognition
- Hybrid: Plate area detection and color detection on SmartCore



ProCMotive can revolutionize vehicular industry

UbiComp 2018 U.S. Provisional Patent Innovation Award (2017), IP Accelerator Award (2018)



Thank you!

