

### IIoT and Security – An External View

Matthias Luft, mluft@ernw.de Stefan Kiese, skiese@ernw.de





### ERNW

- Vendor-independent
- o Established 2001
- o 65 employees, 42 FTE consultants
- Continuous growth in revenue/profits
  - No venture/equity capital, no external financial obligations of any kind
- Customers predominantly large/very large enterprises
  - Industry, telecommunications, finance



### **ERNW** Mission

- o Integrity
- o Independence
- o Technical Competence
- $\circ~$  Open Access to Knowledge





### # whoami

- o Matthias Luft
- CEO of ERNW GmbH
- $\circ$  IT Security since 2006
  - Hypervisor/virtualization/network security
  - Production security since 2010
    - "Shopfloor Micro Segmentation with Industrial Firewalls"
    - Author of ENISA's "Hardware Threat Landscape and Good Practice Guide"
- From pentester to researcher to consultant to team lead





### # whoami

- o Stefan Kiese
- $\circ~$  Security Researcher @ERNW GmbH
- o IT Security since 2010
  - Embedded & RF Security
- $\circ$  E.g.
  - "Dropping the MIC; picking up the keystore" Extracting CISCO Manufacturer Installed Certificates
  - Author of ENISA's "Hardware Threat Landscape and Good Practice Guide"







### ERNW and IIoT

- Penetration Tests/Vulnerability Assessments
- o Risk Assessments
- Design Review/Architecture
  - o Particular focus on network architecture
- o Security Concepts





### Agenda

- Industrial Internet of Things Current State
- o IIoT Security Challenges
- Case Studies & Potential Security Approaches



Current State

## Adventures in Attacking Wind Farm Control Networks

# Cyber attack hits German train stations as hackers target Deutsche Bahn



## A Dam, Small and Unsung, Is Caught Up in an Iranian Hacking Case

By JOSEPH BERGER MARCH 25, 2016









Systems

## Making maintenance smarter

Predictive maintenance and the digital supply network

## **PLM + MES + ERP = Closed-Loop Product Lifecycle**

**Current State** 



Current State - Summary

- o Security Level:
  - $\circ$   $\;$  Not at a new record high
- $\circ~$  At the same time:
  - Plans/requirements to increase exposure.





### Industrial Internet of Things

- o Interconnectivity between
  - o different shop-floors
  - o ERP
  - o Office
  - o external Partners
  - o ...
- o Drivers:
  - o Predictable Maintenance
  - Just in Sequence production
  - Optimization of Production Processes





### **Relevant Distinctions**

- Sensor/PLC vs.
   Panel PC vs.
   Full-Blown Industrial PC
- Soft- and hardware settings are very different!





### Challenges

- IIoT Protocol Characteristics
- o Network Exposure
- o Maintenance Access
- Update and Vulnerability Management
- o Physical Security
- Establishment of Trust
- o Security Testing





Protocols & Network Exposure

- Industrial systems were designed to work in a "closed" environment
- Safety and availability were top priority
- Communication was designed in a "point-to-point way", like
  - Serial, RS485, CAN, Fieldbus
- Security therefore based on/achieved by physical connections



### Categorization Regarding Use Case

- Process automation protocols
- Industrial control system protocols
- Building automation protocols
- Power system automation protocols
- Automatic meter reading protocols
- o Automobile / Vehicle protocol buses



### Categorization Regarding Origin/Characteristicss

- Fieldbus
- $\circ$  Ethernet/LAN
- o Wireless
  - $\circ$  LAN-like
  - o Bus-like
- + real-time or safety-oriented variations



### Categorization Regarding their Origin

- o Fieldbus
  - o CAN
  - o Serial
  - ModBus
  - Profibus
- $\circ$  Ethernet/LAN
  - $_{\odot}$  See above in TCP/IP version ;-)
  - o OPC-UA
  - o SMB
  - o MQ-TT
  - o DDS

- o Wireless
  - LAN See LAN
  - o Bus-like
    - Zigbee
    - o Bluetooth



### "Bus" vs "LAN"

- Systems with only bus-like connectivity need a gateway
  - Common example: Temperature sensors in production system used to predict maintenance
    - $\circ~$  Queried via ZigBee
    - Data pushed into analytics cloud by gateway
- Security issues come into play when sensors are to be made widely exposed.





### **Network Isolation**

- Most industrial systems not designed for operation in an untrusted environment are now connected to several other network systems
  - $\circ$  Violating the PERA model
- Operation systems used on shop floor are often EOL and cannot be replaced by current secure operating systems because of compatibility
- ICS often do not have the capability for (strong) authentication and authorization
- ICS systems are designed for safety and availability Appling IT Security measures may break them
- => Network-level controls often only viable approach



### Approaches

- Integrate shop floor networks into overall zoning model
  - Including classification
- Same firewall management processes/tools
- Enforce intermediate/gateway systems
- o Monitoring



### Particular Focus: SMB

- Various industrial malware families use SMB for lateral movement/infections.
- SMB must be in focus of overall network filtering design.



"But our shop floor network is isolated"

- $\circ~$  Rarely fully the case:
  - Maintenance access
    - $_{\circ}$   $\,$  Unpatched service laptops  $\,$
    - Remote access/network connections
  - Multi-million EUR/USD manufacturing systems as phone chargers
  - Updates via USB drives



### Case Study

- $\circ$  12 factory sites
- Maintenance via service laptops
- Different production system families
- Single-point-of-failure production systems
- Distribution of files/updates via USB drives or SMB





### Case Study

- Introduction of MES triggered network changes
- Changes to be used to analyze security posture
- Most relevant threats:
  - o Malware





### Case Study

- Evaluation of security benefit of network segmentation of
  - $\circ$  Factories
  - Production system families
  - SPOF production systems
  - Arbitrary combinations of those
- o Operational feasibility:
  - Number of network segments ranging from 1 to 276
- Micro segmentation was evaluated as well





### Security Benefit?

- Segmentation of Factories:
  - o Containment to one site
- Production system families:
  - No real security benefit, ensuring that malware can reach all vulnerable systems
- SPOF production systems:
  - Isolation between regular and SPOF systems, ensuring minimal viable operation





### Solution

- Zoning factories and SPOF systems
- o Central file exchange hubs
  - $\circ$   $\,$  Reducing need for USB  $\,$
  - Clear filtering model, incoming network traffic for hubs, nowhere else
    - $\circ$  Containment!
- Establishment of contractual controls for service providers/maintenance
- $\circ$  Introduction of AV terminals





### Applicability?

- Target environment heavily SMB-based
- Similar communication structures exist for OPC-UA/MQ-TT as well and can be used to develop network zoning models





Update and Vulnerability Management

#### Advisory (ICSA-18-107-03) Rockwell Automation Stratix Services Router

#### CVSS v3 9.8

- ATTENTION: Exploitable remotely/low skill level to exploit.
- Vendor: Rockwell Automation
- Equipment: Allen-Bradley Stratix 5900 Services Router
- Vulnerabilities: Improper Input Validation, Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer,
  Use of Externally-Controlled Format String.

#### Advisory (ICSA-18-088-02) cv

Siemens TIM 1531 IRC

CVSS v3 9.8

**ATTENTION:** Exploitable remotely/low skill level to exploit. **Vulnerability:** Missing Authentication for Critical Function

#### Advisory (ICSA-13-084-01)

Siemens CP 1604 and CP 1616 Improper Access Control

#### Advisory (ICSA-12-102-04)

Siemens Scalance X Buffer Overflow Vulnerability

Original release date: April 11, 2012 | Last revised: May 08, 2013

🍤 Tweet 🛛 🛃 Send



**Challenges of Patching** 

- Reliability requirements resulting in extensive testing
- No over-the-air update capabilities guaranteed
  - Read: Internet connectivity ;-)
- Important Effort: <u>FDA striving</u> to make modern update capabilities mandatory!





### Agile Fairy Dust & Industrial

- Merging DevOps & Embedded/Industrial
  - Proposing ShopDevOps? ;-)
- o Current trend:
  - Software delivery via containers also in industrial/embedded environments





### **Container Benefits**

- Room for another one day workshop and discussion.
- o Benefits:
  - Development environment == production environment
  - Ecosystem focused on software delivery
    - $_{\circ}~$  Thus update delivery
  - $_{\odot}$   $\,$  Added process isolation and control  $\,$ 
    - Avoiding side-effects/cohesion





### Container & Embedded

- Performance: Should be feasible for >= panel PC
- Sample Memory footprint, x86\_64:
  - Docker 1.13: 390MB
  - o Overhead per container: 5MB
- Dedicated projects with embedded scope available:
  - o <u>resin OS</u>
  - o <u>SkiffOS</u>
  - <u>HypriotOS</u>





### Shop Floor System Evolution

- $\circ$  Case Study
- Six to seven digit EUR/USD production system
- Multiple systems involved
- o Central industrial PC for operation





- $\circ$  Windows XP embedded
- Default accounts, usernames == passwords
- No Windows patching
- $\circ~$  Apache versions with RCE vulnerabilities
- Remote maintenance:
  - o IPsec connection to target network required





- o Windows XP embedded
- o Standard remote attack surface minimized
  - Removal of features, deactivation of services
  - Use of local firewall
  - $\circ$  Patch process
- Complex (yet fixed) passwords
- o Additional hardware firewall on demand
- $\circ$  But now:
  - .net Remoting
  - IPC\$ jumped back into availability
- o Remote maintenance:
  - o IPsec connection to target network required





- Windows XP embedded
- Remote attack surface minimal
- Local attack surface wide open
  - $\circ$  Hardcoded credentials
  - Binary planting in home-grown update services + various other proprietary services





- New remote maintenance solution
- Support case:
  - Triggered by help desk
  - Deployment of clean baseline maintenance VM
  - Connection of VM to incoming (i.e. triggered by end customer) IPsec tunnel
- Only vulnerability:
  - SSH MitM





- $\circ~$  Upgrade of Industrial PC to Windows 7  $\,$
- Continuous test bed with regard to new malware samples
- Kiosk breakout required USB HID descriptor fuzzing
- Upcoming deployment of a custom Windows Shell





- Custom Windows Shell in place
- Current working step:
  - Update management and increased isolation leveraging Windows containers





### **Physical Security**

- $\circ$  Authentication
  - For maintenance access?
    - $_{\odot}~$  See case study
  - $\circ$   $\,$  For daily operation?
- o USB
  - Again, production systems used as phone chargers
  - o Use of "dirty" USB media





### Establishing Trust

- Bold opening statement:
  - Machine certificates and trust stores incl. lifecycle infrastructure should be one of the first discussions of every product development/shop floor projects
- Strong requirements for:
  - $\circ$  Signature verification
  - Establishment of trusted communication channels





### Case Study Data Hub

- Data Hub development project
- Industrial server to aggregate data for various systems/sensors
- Linux-based
- Custom, light-weight web services for communication
- To be deployed in fully unknown network infrastructure
- Lifecycle via APT repository
- o Only requirement: Internet-uplink



### Challenges

- o Maintenance access
- AAA backend infrastructure
- Establishing communication with client devices
  - $\circ$  Discovery out of scope



### Establishing Communication Channels

- o No DNS entries
- o No known IP ranges
- Off-channel verification not operationally feasible.
- Deployment of machine certificates from newly established CA.
- Implementation of custom "pinning" upon first connection.



### Maintenance Access

- Backend service is pulled on a regular basis
- Job to enable maintenance access stored in backend
  - Including a one-time password
  - Which can then be checked out by service technician
  - o Optional approval in hub web interface
  - For offline systems: Check out RFC4226
- Remote maintenance comparable, using reverse SSH tunnels to SSH non-interactive jump host



### Vendor Trust

- Make security requirements mandatory in RFP phases
- Request extensive proof of security quality assurance from vendors
  - One-page "We do security best practices" is not enough
  - Pentest results can be shared, if everything is performed properly
  - They don't need to be confidential.
    - And even if so, you're running strictly confidential or highly critical operations on the products, right?





### Summary

- Network zoning/filtering model essential
- Leverage modern AAA approaches
- Push for strong software lifecycles
- Challenges vendors for security transparency





### Thank You For Your Attention!

Discussion!







<u>lduchi\_mata</u> ldnet0Ski





www.insinuator.net

