Fuzzing and protocol analysis case-study of DNP3

Adam Crain, Automatak







Developed by Harris Corp, handed over to a vendor-neutral User Group in **1993.**

Many features have been "bolted on", including security.

IEEE STANDARDS ASSOCIATION IEEE Standard for Electric Power Systems Communications— Distributed Network Protocol (DNP3)

IEEE Power and Energy Society

Sponsored by the Transmission and Distribution Committee and Substations Committee



IEEE

Layered Architecture

User code

Application Layer

IED/RTU or your SCADA master

Application Service Data Unit (ASDU) Typical max size of 2KB semantics == functions + objects

Transport Layer

Link Layer

Tx segmentation Rx re-assembly of APDUs

Adds CRCs and addressing. Error checking and (de) multiplexing.



Application layer messages

function	Header + data (1)	•••	Header + data (N)



Application-layer semantics

OBJECTS

Measurements, time sync, file transfer, controls, etc, etc

FUNCTION CODES

READ

WRITE

.

OPERATE

CONFIRM

RESPONSE

UNSOLICITED

• ∞ combinations

- multiple types per message
- Some function codes are "function only"

Project *Robus*

- Started in April 2013
- 30+ CVEs found via fuzzing
- Deep study of failure modes in one protocol
- automatak.com/robus



Focus on serial / masters





DNP3 Fuzzing









Common Faults



uint32_t count = stop - start + 1; $// \leftarrow$ integer overflow



Less Common Faults

Unexpected function code / object combinations



- unexpected objects
- accepts broadcast



DNP3 Security



- Tightly coupled to the DNP3 application layer
- Auth-only
- New functions
- New objects
- 2 modes of authentication



Porous Trust Boundary



- Data is dangerous, intended function matters not.
- Every time you extend DNP3, you make it less secure.
- Optional challenges make security state machine overly complex

2 modes of authentication



Challenge-response – 2 pass authentication

"Aggressive mode" – 1 pass authentication



Aggressive mode message

normal U function	Jser ID & CSQ	Payload objects 	HMAC
----------------------	------------------	------------------------	------



Issue #1: Aggressive-mode ambiguity



Header / Function	????	///// Payload Headers ////

You can only tell if this is an aggressive mode request by speculatively parsing the 1st object header. Ambiguity is dangerous.





Issue #2: Lack of an envelope for HMAC



DNP3 headers cannot be "skipped". They must be parsed sequentially (at least lightly), so that you known where the next one starts.





"Session key status object"

- Total size framed by TLV in wrapping header
- Composed of fixed-size and variable-length subfields
- Final v-length field is the remainder of the encapsulation.





"Update key change reply"

- Total size framed by TLV in wrapping header
- Composed of fixed-size and variable-length subfields
- Final v-length field is the remainder of the encapsulation
 AND a length prefix.



What does the spec have to say?

A.45.12.2.3 Notes

This object shall always be used with a Qualifier of 0x5B, indicating that the object is of variable length up to 65 535 octets, specified in the Object Prefix. The length of the Challenge Data may therefore be either calculated from the qualifier or read from the corresponding field of the object.



SA Conclusions

- Prefer a layered approach to SCADA security to that decouples legacy protocol encodings/semantics from security.
- Design security to address both function and implementation attack surface.



How can langsec help?

- Critical infrastructure vendors need better tools besides hand-rolled parsers.
- Standards bodies need the theory/guidance to produce better designs.
- Protocols need reference implementations to guide their evolution.



Questions?

