An experimental security analysis of an Industrial Robot Controller

Davide Quarta, Marcello Pogliani, Mario Polino, Federico Maggi, Andrea Maria Zanchettin, Stefano Zanero

> San José (CA), May 22nd, 2017 38th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy



DIPARTIMENTO DI ELETTRONICA INFORMAZIONE E BIOINGEGNERIA







Motivation: Industry 4.0 Trends



Motivation: Lack of Awareness

Survey: Robot users vs. system security

50 domain experts—users interviewed: 20 answers

- > 28%* access control policies not enforced
- > 30% robots accessible over Internet
- > **76%** *never* performed a pentest
- > **50%** not a *realistic* threat

How do we define a robot-specific attack?

> I/O Accuracy

- Read precise values
- Issue correct/accurate commands
- ≻ Safety
 - Never harm humans
 - Correctly inform operator
 - Integrity
 - No damage to the robot

> I/O Accuracy

- Read precise values
- Issue correct/accurate commands

> Safety

- Never harm humans
- Correctly inform operator
- Integrity
 - No damage to the robot

I/O Accuracy

- Read precise values
- Issue correct/accurate commands

> Safety

- Never harm humans
- Correctly inform operator

Integrity

■ No **damage** to the robot

> I/O Accuracy

Read precise values



Robot-specific Attack: Digital-borne violation of any of these requirements



No damage to the robot

5 Robot-specific Attacks

Attack 1: Control Loop Alteration

Original and unmodified code is executed by the robot



Attack 2: Tampering with Calibration Parameters

Original and unmodified code is executed by the robot



Attack 3: Tampering with the Production Logic

2 Attacker alters original code or commands

-



8 No code integrity checks

Attack 4 & 5: (Perceived) Robot State Alteration



Custom Physical Protections, if any (despite regulations)

Fwd:

to

Researchers hijack a 220-pound industrial robotic arm

has long had a robotics program and laboratories with larger robot arms than the one shown. These were the kind of robot arms where the lab floor had a red line to show the swing distance - inside that line and you could be struck by the arm, potentially fatally. Some of the early models were controlled by PCs connected to the corporate network. When powered down, the arms and their controllers were supposed to be safed. However, the COTS computers had a wake-on-LAN function. The internal security folks ran nmap with ping and happened to include the robotics labs' LAN. The PC woke up, automatically ran the robotics control program, and the arm extended to full length and swung around its full arc. This was witnessed by workers in the lab who, fortunately, were behind the red line.

From Attacks to Threat Scenarios

- 1) Production Plant Halting
- 2) Production Outcome Alteration
- 3) Physical Damage
- 4) Unauthorized Access
- 5) Ransom requests to disclose micro defects

Case Study

















Industrial Routers

Brand	Exposed Devices	No Authentication	Known Vulnerabilities	New Vulnerabilities
Belden	956		4	1
Eurotech	160			
eWON	6,219	1,160	10	
Digi	1,200		2	1
InHand	883			
Моха	12,222	2,300	30	1
NetModule	886	135		1
Robustel	4,491		1	
Sierra Wireless	50,341	220	4	
Virtual Access	209		1	
Welotec	25			
Westermo	6,081	1,200	7	2
TOTAL	83,673	5,105	59	6



Vulnerabilities

- a. **BOF leading to RCE (**ABBVU-DMRO-124641)
- b. **BOF in FlexPendant (**ABBVU-DMRO-124645)
- c. BOF in /command endpoint (ABBVU-DMRO-128238)
- d. Command Injection (ABBVU-DMRO-124642)
- e. Authentication bypass (ABBVU-DMRO-124644)

Full Controller Exploitation



Attack POCs

- 1) Accuracy Violation: PID parameters detuning (Attack 1) DEMO
- 2) Safety Violation: User-Perceived Robot State Alteration (Attack 4)
- 3) **Integrity** Violation: Control-loop alteration (Attack 1)



Attack POCs

- 1) **Accuracy** Violation: PID parameters detuning (Attack 1)
- 2) **Safety** Violation: User-Perceived Robot State Alteration (Attack 4)
- 3) **Integrity** Violation: Control-loop alteration (Attack 1)

POC 2: Safety Violation

Malicious DLL



POC 2: Safety Violation

Malicious DLL



Attack POCs

- 1) Accuracy Violation: PID parameters detuning (Attack 1)
- 2) **Safety** Violation: User-Perceived Robot State Alteration (Attack 4)
- 3) **Integrity** Violation: Control-loop alteration (Attack 1)

POC 3: Integrity Violation

- > Robot's arm **collapse** on itself
- Motors substantially damaged

Quite a risky POC! Verified with a robotics' expert

Conclusions: Future Challenges

- > New standards, beyond safety issues
- > Attack detection and hardening
- > Secure collaborative robots
- > (Detailed countermeasures in the paper)



Questions?

Davide Quarta, Marcello Pogliani, Mario Polino, Federico Maggi, Andrea Maria Zanchettin, Stefano Zanero

> San José (CA), May 22nd, 2017 38th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy



DIPARTIMENTO DI ELETTRONICA INFORMAZIONE E BIOINGEGNERIA



