

# TLS for PVA?

Michael Davidsaver  
George McIntyre

# ... what is best in life?

- Maximize control system uptime
- Minimize time to repair
- Get a good night's sleep

# Why talk about “Security”?

<https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2018/01/the-internet-of-omg-vulnerable-factory-and-power-grid-controls-on-internet/>

*... Part of the issue is that many of these systems are outside of the usual domain of IT departments and run by separate organizations with a much different sort of security ethos. ...*



This is us!

# Why talk about “Security”?

<https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2018/01/the-internet-of-omg-vulnerable-factory-and-power-grid-controls-on-internet/>

*... Part of the issue is that many of these systems are outside of the usual domain of IT departments and run by separate organizations with a much different sort of security ethos. ...*

- Implications...
  - Outside of this room our concern for operational efficiency can be an **issue!**
  - IT will take blame if we get hacked regardless of prior involvement
  - IT folks are not (always) incentivized to maximize uptime, etc.

# Why am I talking to you?

- Opportunity
  - ... to be proactive and add strong security EPICS toolbox.
- Fear
  - Reaction to a ~high profile hack of a science facility will force control systems to ~entirely disconnect from the internet.

# Why talk about “Security”?

- Zero-ish trust
  - Trust is the hardest part of securing anything
  - ... because you have to trust someone(s)
- Air-ish gap
  - imo. an “aspirational” more than a practical reality
  - Still has the potential to be massively inconvenient

# Why not air gap?

- Notifications
- Remote troubleshooting / repair
- Continuous improvement
  - SNS added 2x PVs *since end of commissioning*
- User facilities have users
  - ... who are remote
  - ... who can go elsewhere!

# HTTP vs. PVA/CA

- Multiplicity
  - HTTP has few “big” Servers, and many “small” Clients
  - PVA/CA has few “big” Clients, and many “small” Servers
- Time scales
  - HTTP connections mostly short lived
  - PVA/CA connections live longer
- Administration
  - HTTP installations span the planet
  - PVA/CA mostly within an organizational unit
- Names
  - HTTP can leverage the distributed DNS name database
  - PVA/CA use (mostly) broadcast name lookup

NSLS2 circa 2015 had ~800 servers on ~100 hosts.

PVA/CA w/ broadcast/multicast search has special vulnerability to MitM by “adjacent” attacker



# What has been done?

- CA style "voluntary" authentication (host+user names)
  - "threat model" is stray mouse click
  - PVA does the same
- Access "Security" (aka. EPICS ACL)
- Server weakly authenticates client
- client does **not** authenticate server
- `var asCheckClientIP 1`
  - CA/PVA client host name can't spoof host name
  - Base 7.0.3.1

Partial mitigation

# What needs protection?

*Yes*

- Unauthorized PUT
- Tampering with GET/MONITOR

*Trick authorized user into  
Making incorrect PUT*

*No*

- Secrecy

*May come incidentally,  
just not required*

# Threat model

- Actors

- Passive attacker on adjacent host

*Same subnet*

- Active attacker on adjacent host

- Attacker on client host

*Same host*

- Attacker on server host

- Compromised client

*Same process*

- Compromised server

# Threat Vectors (1)

|                                        | Reasonable ©<br>Mitigation? |                           |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| • Passive traffic inspection (TCP/UDP) | Yes/No                      | <i>Doesn't<br/>matter</i> |
| • Denial of service by search spam     | Partial                     |                           |
| • Search hijacking                     | Yes                         |                           |
| • Server impersonation                 | Yes                         |                           |
| • Server credential theft              | Partial                     |                           |

# Threat Vectors (2)

- Passive traffic inspection (TCP/UDP)
- Denial of service by search spam
- Search hijacking
- Server impersonation
- Server credential theft

Reasonable ©  
Mitigation?

TLS/??? *Doesn't matter*

NameServer

NS

TLS

NS + cert. pinning

# TLS for PVA

# System Considerations

- Distributing CA certs.
  - Straight forward copying of (mostly) static files
- Issuing Server (and Client) certs.
  - Tedious ~manual process
  - What Common Name?
- Cert. validity
  - Expiration date?
  - Certificate Revocation List?
  - **Periodic online check** (Open Certificate Status Protocol)?

# Certificate Validity

- Time based
  - Valid between X and Y
  - Encoded in certificate
- CRL
  - Periodically published list of revoked (bad) certs.
- Open Certificate Status Protocol
  - Access to database of signatures on valid certificates (w/ time)
  - Like an expiration date
  - Can be updated **w/o reissuing** cert.
  - Requires client connection to OCSP server(s)

*Trust in NTP becomes critical*

*“stapling” helps*



# “secure” EPICS?

- Distributed name server
  - Bridge to site user auth. systems
  - Cert. management
- IOCs
  - TLS Cert.
  - Key is unique ID

# What to do now?

- Stronger authentication

*Zoo of user auth. mechanisms  
(kerberos, ldap, ...)*

- in both directions

*Client authenticates server!*

- *Distributed* Name server

- prevent trivial MitM

- “pinning” prevents (some) impersonation

- Secure transport (TLS)

# What to do now?

*Can sites collect operations stats on how remote access affects MTtR?  
How many trouble calls involving remote triage?  
How many trouble calls involving remote repair?*

I can help to aggregate