

# Hold The Door! Fingerprinting Your Car Key to Prevent Keyless Entry Car Theft

Kyungho Joo\* Wonsuk Choi\* Dong Hoon Lee

Korea University



\* Co-first Authors

# **Outline**

- Introduction
- Attack Model
- Our Method
- Evaluation
- Discussion
- Conclusion



- Traditional system
	- Physically insert a key into the keyhole
	- Inconvenient
	- Vulnerable to key copying





- Keyless Entry System
	- Remote Keyless Entry (RKE) System
	- Passive Keyless Entry and Start (PKES) System
- Attacks on Keyless Entry System
	- Cryptanalysis
	- Relay Attack
	- etc. (e.g., Roll-jam)









- Countermeasures
	- Distance bounding protocol
		- Sensitive to timing error (Propagates at the speed of light)
	- UWB-IR Ranging System
		- Efforts are underway (IEEE 802.15.4z Task Group) [1-3]
		- Requires an entirely new keyless entry system
- Motivation
	- Device Fingerprint: Exploits hardware imperfection
	- PHY-layer signal analysis

[1] UWB with Pulse Reordering: Securing Ranging against Relay and Physical Layer Attacks (M. Singh et al.) [2] UWB-ED: Distance Enlargement Attack Detection in Ultra-Wideband (M. Singh et al.) 5[3] Message Time of Arrival Codes: A Fundamental Primitive for Secure Distance Measurement (P. Leu et al.)





- Contributions
	- New attack model
		- Combines all known attack methods; our attack model covers both PKES and RKE systems
		- Single/Dual-band relay attack, Cryptographic attack
	- No alterations to the current system
		- Easily employed by adding a new device that captures and analyzes the ultra-high frequency (UHF) band RF signals emitted from a key fob
	- Evaluations under varying environmental factors
		- Temperature variations, NLoS conditions (e.g., a key fob placed in a pocket) and battery aging



- Passive Keyless Entry and Start (PKES) System
	- LF band (125~135 kHz, Vehicle)
		- $\cdot$   $\sqrt{2}$  meter communication range
	- UHF band (433, 858 MHz, Key fob)
		- ~100 meter communication range)
	- Shared cryptographic key between the key and the vehicle





• System Model





# **Outline**

- Introduction / Background
- Attack Model
- Our Method
- Evaluation
- Discussion
- Conclusion



- Single-band Relay Attack [\*]
	- Manipulate LF band signal only
	- Wired / Wireless Attack







- Dual-band Relay Attack (I. Amplification Attack)
	- Manipulate both LF and UHF band signals
	- Amplifies UHF band signal and injects to the vehicle





- Dual-band Relay Attack (II. Digital Relay Attack) [\*]
	- Performs the whole process of digital communication
	- Demodulate LF/UHF band signal







- Cryptographic Attack [\*]
	- Single attacker
	- Injects LF band signals to the key fob
	- Records valid responses and extract secret key
	- Exploits weaknesses of cryptographic algorithm







# **Outline**

- Introduction / Background
- Attack Model
- Our Method
- Evaluation
- Discussion
- Conclusion



• Overview (HODOR)





• Feature Extraction





• Feature Extraction (Continue)



 $\int$ 

Noise

Signal

 $A \neq$ 

- Training
	- Semi-supervised learning • Only requires legitimate data **Normalization** • Covers unknown attacks Parameter • OC-SVM, k-NN 90% Classifier  $\rightarrow$  Output  $\left|\rightarrow\right|$   $\frac{\mu}{\tau}$ **Training**  $\sigma$ Legitimate data 10% **Testing** X10 EA

**SITY** 



# **Outline**

- Introduction / Background
- Attack Model
- Our Method
- Evaluation
- Discussion
- Conclusion



- Experimental Setup
	- Cars: KIA Soul, Volkswagen Tiguan
	- SDRs: HackRF One, USRP X310
	- SW: GNURadio
	- Loop Antenna, SMA Cable (Relay LF band signal)







- Selected Classification Algorithms
	- One-Class SVM (OC-SVM) with Radial Basis Function (RBF) kernel
	- k-NN with Standardized Euclidean Distance
	- MatLab implementation
- Performance Metric
	- Assume False Negative Rate (FNR) as 0%
	- Calculate False Positive Rate (FPR)





• Single-Band Relay Attack Detection



Experimental Setup

(LF band signal relay)



(0% FPR in both algorithms)





SITY

- Dual-Band Relay Attack Detection
	- Amplification Attack



- Dual-Band Relay Attack Detection
	- Digital Relay/ Cryptographic Attack



Experimental Setup (Cryptographic Attack)



(Average FPR k-NN: 0.65%, SVM:0.27% )



- Environmental Factors
	- Non-Line of Sight (NLoS) conditions, Dynamic Channel Conditions



**Location of key fob**

**Location of key fob**

Backpack: FPR k-NN: 1.32%, SVM:1.35%

Pocket: FPR k-NN: 1.71%, SVM:1.67%

#### Underground: FPR k-NN: 5%, SVM:4%

26 Roadside: FPR k-NN: 2%, SVM:3%



# Appendix

- Environmental Factors
	- Signals from RKE system







Average FPR k-NN: 6.36%, SVM:0.65% Average FPR k-NN: 0%, SVM:0%



#### • Execution time

- Implementation on Raspberry Pi
	- 1.4Ghz Core, 1G RAM
- Python Code





Total Execution Time K-NN: 163.8ms and SVM: 159.038ms



- Feature Importance
	- Utilizing Relief algorithm





# **Outline**

- Introduction / Background
- Attack Model
- Our Method
- Evaluation
- Discussion
- Conclusion



# **Discussions**

- HODOR and Security
	- Threshold is a trade-off parameter in HODOR
	- Small threshold leads to the false alarm; a large threshold leads to the false-negative (attack success)
- Feature Impersonation
	- Attacker must impersonate the whole feature at the same time
	- Impersonating a specific feature leads to a distortion in other features
- Practicality
	- Shortened execution time



# Conclusion

- Proposed a sub-authentication system
	- Supports current systems to prevent keyless entry system car theft
- Effectively detect simulated attacks that are defined in our attack model
	- Reducing the number of erroneous detection occurrences (i.e., false alarms)
- Found a set of suitable features in a number of environmental conditions
	- Temperature variation, battery aging, and NLoS conditions





# HODOR! Q&A (Thank you!)





This work was supported by Samsung Electronics



# Appendix



• Playback Attack Detection



