Detection is not enough: Low-Cost Attack Recovery for Robotic Vehicle Systems

Pritam Dash, Zitao Chen, Guanpeng Li, Mehdi Karimibiuki,


Karthik Pattabiraman




THE UNIVERSITY
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Robotic Vehicles (RV): Motivation

Robotic Vehicles (RV) are becoming popular in many industrial sectors.

Perception in Robotic Vehicles (RV)



Sensor Attacks Against Robotic Vehicles (RV)

GPS Spoofing.
Transmit malicious GPS Signals

Actual Position

Spoofed Position

Tippenhauer et. al. On the requirements for successful GPS spoofing attacks. CCS'11

Sensor Attacks Against Robotic Vehicles (RV)

Signal Injection.
Optical, Magnetic or Acoustic noise

Son et. al. Rocking Drones with Intentional Sound Noise on Gyroscopic Sensors. Usenix Security'2015

Sensor Attacks in the Real World



Iran–U.S. RQ-170 incident

UK Warship falsely pleased near Russian Naval Base by a GPS Cyber-attack


GENESIS
GENESIS

Prior work

Invariant Based Detection

Model based Detection

“Very Effective in Detecting Attacks”

Choi et. al., Detecting Attacks against Robotic Vehicles: a Control Invariant Approach, CCS’18
Quinonez et. al., SAVIOR: Securing Autonomous Vehicles with Robust Physical Invariants, Usenix Security’20

Detection is not Enough ...



Choi et. al., Detecting Attacks against Robotic Vehicles: a Control Invariant Approach, CCS'18
Quinonez et. al., SAVIOR: Securing Autonomous Vehicles with Robust Physical Invariants, Usenix Security'20

Failsafe is not enough either…



Our Goal

Recover from attacks and complete the mission without crashing the RV

Two Techniques for Attack Recovery:

1. **PID-Piper [DSN’21 - Best paper award]**

2. **DeLorean [Under submission]**

Sensor PID Control Actuator Signal



PID Control (Proportional Integral Derivative)

Sensor PID Control Actuator Signal





Sensor □ PID Control □ Actuator Signal



Sensor PID Control Actuator Signal



RV under Attack



PID Over-Compensates under Attacks





PID Over-Compensates under Attacks



PID Over-Compensates under Attacks





PID Over-Compensates under Attacks





PID Over-Compensates under Attacks





PID Over-Compensates under Attacks



PID compensation | handling faults ✔
under attacks ✘

Approach to design Recovery Techniques

Persistent error → Erroneous Physical States → Erroneous Actuator Signals

Recovery Requirements

- R1: Handle persistent errors erroneous physical states
- R2: Prevent erroneous actuator Signals

Feedforward Controller (FFC) Design

Feedforward Control





FFC design using LSTM Model

Feedforward Control (FFC) design

u(t) ⟵ *f(x(t), w(t))*

w ⟶ waypoints

x ⟶{ gyro, mag, baro, gps, accelerometer, coefficients, ….., } 44 parameters

Feature Engineering ⟶ Reduced Feature set: 24 parameters

LSTM design

Correlate past and present sensors ⟶ Reject sensor perturbations

PID-Piper: Recovery Framework

Feedforward Control

Feedback Control



PID-Piper: Recovery Framework

Feedforward Control

Feedback Control



PID-Piper: Recovery Framework

Feedforward Control

Feedback Control



Experimental Setup

PID-Piper Implementation

- FFC built using LSTM model (Python)
- Trained (Python)
- Plugged into Autopilot Firmware (C++)

Training

- 30 RV mission profile data
- Circular, Polygonal, Straight line.

Experimental Setup

PID-Piper: Metric for Mission Success

- GPS Offset ~5 m



PID-Piper: False Positives

Analysis Type	SRR [RAID'20]	PID-Piper [This work]
Recovery Activated	20%	10%
Missions Failed	50%	0%
FPR	**10%**	**0%**

$$FPR = \frac{Number\ of\ missions\ failed}{Total\ number\ of\ missions}$$

PID-Piper: Recovery under Attacks

Analysis Type	SRR [RAID'20]	PID-Piper [This work]
Mission Success	13%	83%
Mission Failed (no Crash)	50%	17%
Crash/Stall	**37%**	**0%**

$$Mission\ Success = \frac{No.of\ missions\ with\ deviation < 10\ meters}{Total\ number\ of\ missions}$$

PID-Piper: Recovery under Attacks

Analysis Type	SRR [RAID'20]	PID-Piper [This work]
Mission Success	13%	83%
Mission Failed (no Crash)	50%	17%
Crash/Stall	**37%**	**0%**

Recovery was successful in 83% of the cases with 0 crashes.

PID-Piper under Stealthy Attacks





PID-Piper: Overheads

Analysis Type	PID-Piper [This work]
CPU Overhead	~7%
Energy Overhead	~0.9%
Mission delays	Negligible

PID-Piper: Summary

- **PID-Piper: A framework to recover Robotic Vehicles from attacks**
- Feed-forward Control to address overcompensation.
- 3 real and 3 simulated RV systems.
- 83% mission success from attacks, 0% false positives, limit stealthy attacks

Videos

Code: https://github.com/DependableSystemsLab/pid-piper

Pritam Dash, Guanpeng Li, Zitao Chen, Mehdi Karimibiuki, Karthik Pattabiraman,
PID-Piper: Recovering Robotic Vehicles from Physical Attacks, DSN, 2021.
Best Paper Award.

DeLorean: Multiple Sensors under Attack

Manipulate camera and LiDAR

GPS and Gyroscope

Cao et. al., Invisible to both Camera and Lidar, IEEE S&P 2021

DeLorean: Threat Model



Cao et. al., Invisible to both Camera and Lidar, IEEE S&P 2021

DeLorean: Goal



Recovery Requirements

R1: Prevent erroneous physical states

R2: Prevent erroneous actuator signals



DeLorean: Identify the Sensor(s) under attack



Recovery Requirements

R1: Prevent erroneous physical states

R2: Prevent erroneous actuator signals

DeLorean: Isolate Sensor(s) from Control Process



Recovery Requirements

R1: Prevent erroneous physical states

R2: Prevent erroneous actuator signals

DeLorean: Substitute Input Sequence



Recovery Requirements

R1: Prevent erroneous physical states

R2: Prevent erroneous actuator signals

DeLorean: Substitute Input Sequence

Record Historical States

Position,
Velocity,
Angular rates…

Throttle



DeLorean: Substitute Input Sequence



DeLorean: Recovery with Replay



Replay Historical States

DeLorean: Recovery with Replay



Replay Historical States

Experimental Setup

ARDUPILOT

DeLorean: Mission Success Under Attacks (Percentage)

Nos. of attacked Sensors	SRR [RAID'20]	PID-Piper	DeLorean
1	64	100	100
2	20	20	100
3	0	0	100
4	0	0	88
5	0	0	82

DeLorean recovers the RVs in 94% of the cases overall (0 crashes).
82% mission success even under attacks targeting all the sensors.

DeLorean: Summary

DeLorean: A framework to recover RVs from multi-sensor attack.

- Replays historic states to recover from attacks: single & multi-sensor
- Evaluated in 4 real RVs, and 2 simulated RVs
- **94% mission success, 82% when all the sensors are under attack**
  - No other technique is able to recover from multi-sensor attacks beyond 2
- **Performance overhead: 7.5%, Energy overhead: 19%**

Under submission

Conclusion

Robotic Vehicles (RV) security is an important problem

- Used in many mission-critical and safety-critical settings
- Sensors can be modified/spoofed by attackers
- Need to ensure **mission success** despite attacks on RV

Two Techniques for recovering RVs from sensor attacks

- PID-Piper [DSN'21] : Single-sensor, but persistent attacks
- DeLoRean[submitted]: Multiple-sensor, but localized attacks
- Future work: Recovering RV platoons/drone swarms from attacks