Security and Key Establishment In

Wireless Sensor Networks



Gabriele Oligeri ISTI – CNR, Pisa





gabriele.oligeri@gmail.com





OUTLINE

- Sensors and WSNs
- Security on WSNs
- Key establishment
 - o Authentication
 - Secret generation
 - o Entropy
- Well known solutions
- Intrusion resilience
 - Adversary models
 - Forward secrecy
 - Backward secrecy
- Alternative solution

SENSORS... (1/2)

Iris sensor motes:

- 2.4 GHz IEEE 802.15.4, Tiny Wireless Measurement System
- Designed Specifically for Deeply Embedded Sensor Networks
- > 250 kbps, High Data Rate Radio
- Wireless Communications with Every Node as Router Capability
- Outdoor line-of-sight tests have yeilded ranges as far as 500 meters between nodes without amplification
- CPU ATmega1281, 128KB program flash memory, 512KB measurement flash memory, 8KB RAM.







Sensor board:

Expansion Connector for
Light
Temperature
RH
Barometric
Pressure, Acceleration/Seismic,
Acoustic, Magnetic and other

Applications:

 Indoor Building Monitoring and Security
 Acoustic, Video, Vibration and Other High Speed Sensor Data





WSN – APPLICATIONS (1/2)

Smart bridges:

- Vibration recordings of trucks crossing
- Structural health monitoring

Agriculture:

- Grape networks, Inc, CA, US
- Save energy and expenses
- Monitor the effectiveness of water and chemicals



Jindo Bridge – South Korea



Museum technology:

- ✓ Microclimate framing
- Protection for precious paintings
- remperature and humidity control



WSN – APPLICATIONS – MILITARY (2/2)

Applications for unmanned vehicles on the ground:

- Area surveillance and monitoring
- Obstacle breaching
- Target acquisition and designation
- Route clearance
- Mine and detection and disposal



ATTENDED OR UNATTENDED... THIS IS THE PROBLEM ! (1/2)

Attended WSNs :

On-line trusted third party (sink)
 Real-time data gathering
 Sensor management

ATTENDED OR UNATTENDED... THIS IS THE PROBLEM ! (2/2)

UnAttended WSNs :



OUTLINE

- Sensors and WSNs
- Security on WSNs
- Key establishment
 - o Authentication
 - Secret generation
 - o Entropy
- Well known solutions
- Intrusion resilience
 - Adversary models
 - Forward secrecy
 - Backward secrecy
- > Alternative solution

SECURITY ON WSN - WHY ?

- Sensors are cheap and easy to attack
 - No tamper proof hardware
 - No computational power
 - o Reduced memory size

NO strong security guarantees

- Eavesdrop and sell strategy attack Sensed data are precious
- Injecting fake values
 Actuators may inhibit damages







MAKING SENSED DATA SECURE (2/2)

Symmetric key is nice with sensors ... but there is not enough randomness around !!!



OUTLINE

- Sensors and WSNsSecurity on WSNs
- Key establishment
 - o Authentication
 - Secret generation
 - o Entropy
- Well known solutions
- Intrusion resilience
 - Adversary models
 - Forward secrecy
 - Backward secrecy
- > Alternative solution



Establishing a shared secret undergoes to two main problems:

>Authentication: Bob is really Bob ?

Secret generation: How to establish a new safe secret in a notsafe channel ?





Establishing a shared secret undergoes to two main problems:

> Authentication: Bob is really Bob ?

Secret generation: How to establish a new safe secret in a nonsafe channel ?





- Sensors and WSNs
- Security on WSNs
- Key establishment
 - o Authentication
 - Secret generation
 - o Entropy
- Well known solutions
- Intrusion resilience
 - Adversary models
 - Forward secrecy
 - Backward secrecy
- > Alternative solution

SECRET GENERATION - PIN (1/2)

A pre-shared secret can be burned in the sensors before the WSN deployment.





SECRET GENERATION - DH (2/2)

Diffie-Hellman is a key establishing algorithm



AUTHENTICATION - PKI

PKI: public key infrastructure involves the use of the "sink" Public key Each sensor encrypts the sensed data with the sink Pub. Key Only the Private key owner can access the sensed data



OUTLINE

- Sensors and WSNs
- Security on WSNs
- Key establishment
 - o Authentication
 - Secret generation
 - o Entropy
- Well known solutions
- Intrusion resilience
 - Adversary models
 - Forward secrecy
 - Backward secrecy
- > Alternative solution

THE BAD GUY... (1/2)



Perfect eavesdropper, no active behavior.



Active adversary ... but still honest:

Secrets disclosureNo code injection



THE BAD GUY... (2/2)

- Adversarial model
- ✓ Honest but curious
- She can tamper the sensor but she cannot perform code injection, or more generally, change the sensor behavior.



- Why ?
- She is interested on the perfect working of the WSN
- Overall secrets and data disclosure



FORWARD SECRECY (1/2)

> Forward secrecy:

- Data collected before the compromised event (in the past) must be safe
- Easy to achieve
- > Periodic one-way secret evolution $K^{r+1}=H(K^r)$
- Encrypted data in the past is protected by pre-image resistance hash property



FORWARD SECRECY (2/2)

Let the secret key change at each round !

$$K_0 \xrightarrow{H} K_1 \xrightarrow{H} K_2 \xrightarrow{H} K_3 \xrightarrow{H} K_4 \xrightarrow{H}$$

H is a cryptographic hash function:

- > It is easy to compute the hash value for any given message.
- \succ It is infeasible to find a message that has a given hash.
- > It is infeasible to modify a message without hash being changed.
- It is infeasible to find two different messages with the same hash.

BACKWARD SECRECY

> Backword secrecy:

- Data collected after the compromise event (in the future) must be safe
- A contribution of secure randomness suffices for intrusion-resilience



WELL KNOWN SOLUTIONS... AND WELL KNOWN ISSUES

PIN : The worst solution... and the most adopted. Key refreshment does not exist Forward and backward secrecy are not guaranteed

- PKI : Strong key encryption No entropy if used as stand-alone solution (low forward secrecy) Backward secrecy is guaranteed
- DH: Key refreshment guarantees forward secrecy Backward secrecy is missing

ISSUES:

- Forward secrecy needs a simple key refreshment algorithm.
- Backward secrecy needs a true random number generator or a "good approximation" of it.

The generated secret **must** be shared

LET'S GO BACK TO THE PROPOSED ADVERSARIES



How to guarantee forward and backward security with the previously proposed adversaries ?



Perfect eavesdropper, no active behavior.

Active adversary ... but still honest:

Secrets disclosureNo code injection



LOOKING FOR RANDOMNESS..

... a simple solution for a pure eavesdropper adversary

Let the secret key change at each round !



OK !

But what if the adversary gets **more powerful** and takes a screw driver ?

- \succ The adversary will access all the data in the sensor
- All the secrets will be disclosed





COPING WITH THE SCREW DRIVER... (1/3)

- Adversary
 - Randomly picks a sensor
 - Global eavesdropper
- Sensor
 - □ Complete secrets disclosure



Need for a new protocol that allows to re-gain secrecy even between **compromised peers** with a **global eavesdropper adversary**.







The question is:

Is there a way to generate a shared secret between two compromised pairs that is unknown to a global eavesdropper adversary ?

The received signal power may be a possible solution...



RECEIVED SIGNAL POWER - RSS

Each device features RSS estimation capability CSMA cannot work without it

Bob

Received signal power is affected by:

- Distance
- Line of sight
- Multipath

Alice

COPING WITH THE SCREW DRIVER... (3/3)

After the secret disclosure, the sensor should be able to regain its secret status in some way.

How to do this ?

Received Signal Strength (RSS) can help us...

- The communication channel is "almost" symmetric
- > The communication channel is temporal coherent
- The RSS is strongly spatial dependent



OUTLINE

- Sensors and WSNs
- Security on WSNs
- Key establishment
 - o Authentication
 - Secret generation
 - o Entropy
- Well known solutions
- Intrusion resilience
 - Adversary models
 - Forward secrecy
 - Backward secrecy
- Alternative solution

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT A REAL SCENARIO

Alice wants to agree on a shared secret with Bob

Eve is aware of all the information in the network Alice/Bob memory content Alice/Bob algorithms Eve wants to guess the on-going shared secret

How to deal with this scenario?



REAL SCENARIO – SIMPLE CUT

Simple cut of the line-of-sight between Alice and Bob

Alice and Bob experiment almost the same fluctuations during the cut

- There is a constant offset between the two RSS values
- There are fast fluctuations that prevent the two signals to be exactly the same

Eve cannot experience the same channel fluctuations due to her position





REAL SCENARIO – CROSS WALK

A person cross-walks the line-of-sight between Alice and Bob

Alice and Bob experiment almost the same fluctuations during the cut

- There is a constant offset between the two RSS values
- There are fast fluctuations that prevent the two signals to be exactly the same

Eve cannot experience the same channel fluctuations due to her position





REAL SCENARIO – ZIG ZAG

A person performs a zig-zag walk between Alice and Bob

Alice and Bob experiment almost the same fluctuations during the cut

- There is a constant offset between the two RSS values
- There are fast fluctuations that prevent the two signals to be exactly the same

Eve cannot experience the same channel fluctuations due to her position





RECEIVED POWER AS A SECRET GENERATOR

The estimates power (RSS) can be used to generate shared secrets between pairs Fast fluctuations may prevent the agreement...

> A correction algorithm is needed

Static/empty environments cannot be considered with this algorithm RSS is almost flat in static environments Eve can easily guess the key

The "perfect" scenario is constituted by: One or more disturbance events that affect the RSS values at Alice and Bob A "privacy region" that protects Bob and prevents Eve to guess the on-going secret



RANDOMNESS HARVESTING

... re-gaining a secret status





Let's consider a real deployment with:

6 anchors A mobile user with **Alice on her neck** and **Eve on her wrist**

Anchors:

Belong to a secure infrastructure .

Are trusted and can communicate securely among them.

E.g.: Eve is interested on compromising Alice and not the anchors.

Alice wants to pair with one or more anchors







Baseline scenario

6-anchors scenario

Rounds Anchors	$0\ldots Lw-1$	$Lw \dots 2Lw - 1$	$2Lw\ldots 3Lw-1$	$3Lw \dots 4Lw - 1$	\rightarrow
$egin{array}{c} \mathcal{B}^0 & & \ \mathcal{B}^1 & & \ \mathcal{B}^2 & & \ \mathcal{B}^3 & & \ \mathcal{B}^4 & & \ \mathcal{B}^5 & & \ \mathcal{B}^5 & & \ \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} \mathcal{K}^0_0 \ \mathcal{K}^1_0 \ \mathcal{K}^2_0 \ \mathcal{K}^3_0 \ \mathcal{K}^4_0 \ \mathcal{K}^5_0 \ \mathcal{K}^5_0 \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} \mathcal{K}_1^0 \ \mathcal{K}_1^1 \ \mathcal{K}_1^2 \ \mathcal{K}_1^3 \ \mathcal{K}_1^3 \ \mathcal{K}_1^4 \ \mathcal{K}_1^5 \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} \mathcal{K}_2^0 \ \mathcal{K}_2^1 \ \mathcal{K}_2^2 \ \mathcal{K}_2^2 \ \mathcal{K}_2^3 \ \mathcal{K}_2^4 \ \mathcal{K}_2^5 \ \mathcal{K}_2^5 \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} {\cal K}^0_3 \ {\cal K}^1_3 \ {\cal K}^2_3 \ {\cal K}^3_3 \ {\cal K}^3_3 \ {\cal K}^4_3 \ {\cal K}^5_3 \end{array}$	· · · · · · · · · ·
Hashing	$\begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \downarrow \\ H(\circ) \\ \downarrow \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \downarrow \\ H(\circ) \\ \downarrow \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \downarrow \\ H(\circ) \\ \downarrow \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \downarrow \\ H(\circ) \\ \downarrow \end{array}$	· · · · · · · · · ·
Session Keys	\mathbf{K}_1	\mathbf{K}_2	\mathbf{K}_3	\mathbf{K}_4	





MEASUREMENTS AND PERFORMANCE (1/2)

Indoor scenario with 6-anchors

✓ Office environment during working hours

Adversary position

 \checkmark Sensor on the neck and adversary on the wrist

Agreement frequency

 \checkmark Peers experience the same key and commit on it

Guessing frequency

 \checkmark The adversary is able to guess the key

Mean computed over the last 5 samples

➢ Key length 32 bits







MEASUREMENTS AND PERFORMANCE (2/2)



- ➢ 6-anchor scenario
- Bin width fixed to 27
- Key length increases security
- Longer keys are more difficult to achieve
- Longer keys are more difficult to guess

HOW SECRET ARE THE SECRET KEYS ?



- RSS values among the peers are well correlated but not between the peer and the adversary.
- Symbols values can be modeled as a Gaussian random variable.
- The entropy of the normal distributions obtained varying b_w is close to a "perfect" uniform distribution.



Generated symbols

b_w	2	4	8	16
Normal Distribution	3.39	2.92	1.57	0.98
Uniform Distribution	4	3.16	2.32	1.58

FUTURE WORKS IN SENSORS PAIRING

- Entropy analysis
- Privacy region analysis
- Looking for different algorithms to perform the agreement
- Pairing between smart phones





Any questions ?