

1.Context

Internet of Things (IoT) systems are very widespread but often not properly protected. If compromised, they can create serious issues and even cyber-physical attacks.

2.Goal

4. Introducing MUD in Smart **Home Gateways**



Manufacturer Usage Description (MUD) standard (RFC-8520) defines an architecture and a data model to restrict communications to and from IoT devices. To make IoT devices compatible with MUD, manufactures have to write devices' network policies in a dedicated file (the MUD file) stored on their server(s).

To simplify the development of secure and reliable IoT solutions. Primarily, the focus is on developers with limited homes and smart experience in *cybersecurity* of *IoT* systems.

3. A threat model for extensible **Smart Home Gateways**



home devices Smart affected often by are vulnerabilities. IoT lf objects are managed by a Home Gateway Smart



(SHG), there is a potential single point of failure.

Moreover, the risk of a bugged gateway raises if it can be extended by third-parties plug-ins. Hence, we proposed a threat model [2] to help developers during creation (or security analysis) of plug-ins.

 Table 1 Proposed threat model.

Category	ID	Description
Confidentiality	T1	a plug-in could access and use private data of other attack targets (i.e., data
		outside its scope)
	T2	a plug-in could access and spread private data of other attack targets (i.e.,
		data outside its scope)
Integrity	T3	a plug-in could alter the state of smart home devices outside its scope
	T4	a plug-in could alter private data of other attack targets outside its scope
Availability	T5	a plug-in could <i>delay</i> the regular functionality of an attack target
	T6	a plug-in could <i>alter</i> one of the regular functionalities of an attack target
	$\mathbf{T7}$	a plug-in could <i>alter</i> the regular functionality of an attack target preventing



Our proposal [3] allows plug-ins developers to leverage MUD for their plug-ins. Specifying plugins' network requirements in a MUD-compliant way, developers can indirectly protect non-MUDenabled IoT devices and every software plug-in.

At run-time these requirements are collected and merged by a dedicated SHG's components in a gateway-level MUD file. This file is retrieved and processed, like in a traditional MUD architecture, in a transparent way for the MUD manager and the devices connected to the SHG. Reiterate the flow



- a plug-in could aller the regular functionality of an attack target, prevention the smart home users from using it
- a plug-in could physically *damage* an attack target T8
- T9 a plug-in could interact with an attack target, pretending to be a different Authentication entity

T10 a plug-in could access an authorization level higher than expected Authorization Non-Repudiation T11 a plug-in could anonymously communicate with an attack target

To demonstrate the feasibility of the threats, we developed a set of proofs of concept [2] for a widespread open-source SHG.

Currently, we are working on demonstrating how programmers can inadvertently introduce these threats into their plug-ins. The study involves two different SHG: Home Assistant and WebThings.

5. References

- 1. Corno, F.; De Russis, L.; Mannella, L. "Helping Novice Developers Harness Security Issues in Cloud-IoT Systems", 2022. Journal of Reliable Intelligent Environments (Springer); 3/2022; 261-283; 8 Issue pp. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40860-022-00175-4
- Corno, F.; Mannella, L. "A Threat Model for Extensible Smart Home 2. Gateways", 2022. SpliTech 2022: 7th International Conference on Smart and Sustainable Technologies (IEEE); Split / Bol, Croatia; July 5-8, 2022; https://doi.org/10.23919/SpliTech55088.2022.9854235
- Corno, F.; Mannella, L. "A Gateway-based MUD Architecture to Enhance 3. Smart Home Security", 2023. SpliTech 2023: 8th International Conference on Smart and Sustainable Technologies (IEEE); Split / Bol, Croatia; June 20-23, 2023; https://doi.org/10.23919/SpliTech58164.2023.10193747