

GPS Vulnerabilities and Implications for Telecom

Moderator

Dr. James Armstrong *Chief Technology Officer, Symmetricom*

Panelists

Todd Humphreys

Assistant Professor, University of Texas at Austin

Martin Nuss, Ph.D.

Vice President, Technology and Strategy and CTO, Vitesse Semiconductor

About the Speakers

Moderator:



Dr. James Armstrong *Chief Technology Officer Symmetricom*

Panelists:



Todd Humphreys Assistant Professor Aerospace Engineering and Engineering Mechanics University of Texas at Austin



Martin Nuss, Ph.D.

Vice President, Technology and Strategy and Chief Technology Officer Vitesse Semiconductor



GNSS





GNSS Challenges: GPS Tested by DOD

Geographical Area Impacted			9 Month Duration 141 NOTAMs		
Maximum Miles ²	Minimum Miles ²	Average Miles ²		Shortest	1.0 hour
455,805	66,018	139,795	-	Average	6.63 hours
k 1	1000	14 I. I.		Longest	72 hours
		T CAR		Cumulative	782 Hours 90 days
	could of Colligants				Sec.
			Gulf of Mexico	+Havina -	250
	99.6%	6 Availab	ility		Google



Everyday Localized GNSS Outages



GPS jammers and spoofing

Mechanical / antenna failures



Environmental / lightning storms



Frequency and Phase Specifications

Application	Frequency: Physical / Air Interface	Phase	
UMTS/LTE FDD Residential Small Cell	NA / 250 ppb	NA	
UMTS Metro Small Cell	NA / 100 ppb	NA	
GSM / UMTS / W-CDMA		ΝΑ	
CDMA2000		± 3 to 10 μs	
TD-SCDMA		± 1.5 μs	
LTE -FDD	16 ppb / 50 ppb	NA	
LTE-TDD	10 000 / 30 000	± 1.5 μs	
LTE-A MBSFN		± 1 μs	
LTE-A CoMP (Network MIMO) *		± 0.5 to ± 1.5 μs	
HetNet Coordination (eICIC)		± 5 μs	

*Multiple proposals under consideration



LTE Synchronization

Application	Frequency / Air Interfaces	Time /Phase	Why You Need to Comply	Impact of Non-compliance
LTE (FDD)	16 / 50 ppb	N/A	Call Initiation	Call Interference Dropped calls
LTE (TDD)	16 / 50 ppb	+/- 1.5 μs	Time slot alignment	Packet loss/collisions Spectral efficiency
LTE MBSFN	16 / 50 ppb	+/- 32 μs	Proper time alignment of video signal decoding from multiple BTSs	Video broadcast interruption
LTE-A MIMO/COMP	16 / 50 ppb	+/- 500 ns	Coordination of signals to/from multiple base stations	Poor signal quality at edge of cells, LBS accuracy



Timing Technology Options



Resilient Networks Needs 2 Out of 3





Secure Time

Todd Humphreys Assistant Professor

University of Texas at Austin

Outline

- Inside a GPS spoofing attack
- Example effects of time manipulation on communications, finance, and energy sectors
- Misconceptions about timing security
- Options for secure ns-accurate timing



Example Attack

















Spoofer's Effect on PPS Phase





Example Effects: CDMA Cellular Systems

- CDMA 2000 standard requires towers to be synchronized to within 10 us of GPS time
- Synchronization has many benefits: soft handoff, more efficient acquisition, better power efficiency in handset
- Towers all use same spreading code; they distinguish themselves by the phase of this code in 52-us increments
- A spoofer could induce a 10-us error in a tower in less than 30 mins; thereafter, handoff to nearby towers would become unreliable
- Worse yet, a coordinated spoofing attack could bring multiple towers into spreading code phase alignment: Handsets near cell edges may not be able to connect calls



Example Effects: Smart Energy Distribution

- Phasor Measurement Units (PMUs) are a key enabling technology for the next-generation power grid
- PMUs require synchronization to better than 26 us
- All PMUs rely on GPS for synchronization
- Latest PMUs have been built with control in mind: can be configured to take immediate control action (e.g., trip a generator) if PMU data indicate a fault condition
- A spoofing attack against a PMU can simulate a fault condition

D.P. Shepard, T.E. Humphreys, A.A. Fansler, "<u>Evaluation of the Vulnerability of Phasor Measurement Units</u> to GPS Spoofing Attacks Evaluation of the Vulnerability of Phasor Measurement Units to GPS Spoofing <u>Attacks</u>," International Journal of Critical Infrastructure Protection, Vol. 5, December, 2012.



Background: Post-2007 "REG NMS" regulations have fragmented US markets, forcing large investors to "vacuum up" liquidity from multiple trading venues

Problem: Liquidity vanishes as high-frequency traders (HFTs) sense the presence of a large institutional trader (IT) (a "whale") in one venue and then alter orders in other venues before the IT can complete its orders there.

Whales Strike Back: In response to the HFT's (entirely legal) game of bait-and-switch, ITs have developed a powerful weapon: smart order routing (SOR).

SOR's Timing Component: SORs continuously monitor round-trip times to various exchanges (and possibly monitor time stamps). They then break up large orders and launch them so that they arrive at multiple exchanges *simultaneously*.





Suppose, due to geometrical distance and networking delays, the route to NYSE is 2 ms shorter than route to BATS



SOR delays NYSE order by 2 ms so that both orders arrive simultaneously



SOR delays NYSE order by 2 ms so that both orders arrive simultaneously



SOR delays NYSE order by 2 ms so that both orders arrive simultaneously



Trade executed at best price: The HFT could not alter orders at either exchange because the orders from the IT arrived simultaneously

An Absolute Time Component to Smart Order Routing

If SORs only use round-trip time (RTT) to measure delays to each exchange, then they have no dependence on absolute time. But there can be many 100s of microseconds of error in the estimated forward-path delay when only RTT measurements are used: HFTs can exploit this error! Consequently, there is increasing pressure on the exchanges to timestamp order arrivals with (absolute) microsecond accuracy. Such timestamps would likely allow the forward-path delay to each exchange to be estimated accurately enough (e.g., < 100 us) that HFTs could not exploit the remaining errors.

But market reliance on absolute time stamps opens up a vulnerability to time manipulation ...





Action: Spoofer advances time at NYSE by 2 ms. Result: An SOP reliant on absolute time stamps now sees equivalent-time routes to NYSE and BATS



SOR issues both market orders simultaneously



Trade executed at best price at NYSE. HFT detects "whale" at NYSE and quickly changes ask price at BATS; HFT's alteration arrives *before* the IT's order.







Trade executed at HFT price at BATS.

HFT makes profit at \$1/share.

Misconceptions About Timing Security (1/2)

- "Holdover" capability of GPS-disciplined oscillator (GPSDO) protects against spoofing
 - Holdover will not be triggered by a sophisticated spoofing attack
- The reference oscillator's drift rate is the upper limit of speed at which a GPSDO can be spoofed (e.g., 1 us per day)
 - Drift rate only matters if GPSDO is configured to alarm on a mismatch between GPS rate and internal clock rate
 - Even then, spoofer can push GPS timing at ~5x the calibrated clock drift rate because of need to keep false alarm rate low



Misconceptions About Timing Security (2/2)

- Timing errors only become a problem at the level of seconds, or maybe milliseconds.
 - Microseconds matter for comms, finance, and energy sectors
- Cross-checking against an atomic clock affords foolproof timing security
 - Rubidium clock with stability of 10⁽⁻¹²⁾ can be pushed off by ~100 ns per day
- PTP/NTP are the solution to GPS spoofing problem
 - These are getting better, but, due to network asymmetry, they still not accurate enough for most demanding applications non-dedicated networks



Options for Secure ns-Accurate Timing (1/2)

- Obtain required permissions to purchase SAASM-equipped GPSDO
 - Lots of paperwork, special handling
 - Expensive
 - Fairly secure against spoofing
 - Not secure against replay attack
- Wait for GPS Directorate to insert digital signatures into modernized GPS signals
 - They're making progress! (The University of Texas is helping.)
 - Not so strong as SAASM for timing security, but quite effective
 - Eventually inexpensive, but will require new GPSRO



Options for Secure ns-Accurate Timing (1/2)

- Cross-check GPS timing against redundant high-quality (e.g., atomic) clocks
 - Self-contained
 - Expensive
 - Absolutely secure to within about 5x the drift rate of ensemble
- "All Signals" Approach: Develop a GPSDO that pulls in signals from GPS + Glonass + Galileo and rigorously cross-checks these
 - None on market yet (so far as I'm aware)
 - Potentially inexpensive: uBlox LEA-7 runs ~\$50
 - Spoofer's job gets much harder with each new signal
- PTP/NTP over a dedicated network





Reliable Network-Based Timing

Martin Nuss, Ph.D. Vice President, Technology and Strategy and CTO Vitesse Semiconductor

Overview

- We need a backup for GPS to provide timing
- Packet-based network timing using IEEE1588 Precision Time Protocol is the solution
- Even stringent TD-LTE and LTE-A timing requirements can be met



New Base Stations Require New Timing Models



 For 2G/3G, E1/T1 backhaul also provided (frequency) synchronization

 New base stations use Gigabit Ethernet for backhaul

TD-LTE and LTE-A need phase in addition to frequency synch



GPS Not Viable in Many New LTE Deployments

Outdoor Small Cells

- Small Cells to deliver LTE capacity
- Often no line of sight to GPS satellites
- More vulnerable to attacks at street level





Indoor Picocells

- Picocells or Enterprise Femtocells for LTE indoor coverage & capacity
- Can't get timing to Femtocells using GPS



The Solution: Timing Over IP/Ethernet

Two new methods for carrying timing and synchronization over Ethernet networks have emerged





Frequency Delivery Over PTP-Unaware Networks

- ITU-T G.8261.1 completed work on 1588 FREQUENCY delivery
- Packet delay variations (PDV) need to be within bounds
- Software algorithms ("servos") are key to filter out effect of PDV
- Key servo performance usually long-term wander



ITU-T G.8261.1 test cases compared against G.823 Traf & SEC MTIE masks



LTE Can Require Very High Phase/Time Accuracy

- Many wireless standards require PHASE synchronization in addition to frequency
- LTE-Advanced in particular requires very tight phase synch
- Standards are in the process of defining time and phase delivery via IEEE1588 to these specs





Factors That Impair PTP Time & Phase Accuracy

- Upstream/downstream packet delay asymmetries translate directly into time & phase errors
- Packet switching inherently has unpredictable queuing and forwarding delays
- Additional mechanisms become important when getting into the 100ns accuracy range



Queuing and forwarding delay asymmetries alone can be >100µs, blowing LTE phase accuracy requirements by 2 orders of magnitude



Boundary and Transparent Clocks to the Rescue



Boundary Clock (BC)

- Recovers clock from the master, and regenerates clock towards next node
- Can be combined with Time Stamping at the PHY level to eliminate I/O serialization PDV

Transparent Clock (TC)

- Simply corrects the Sync packet time stamp for residence time in the node
- Can be implemented solely at the PHY level if desired



Network Timing Cost Comparison



- and Egress
- No PLL, no OCXO, no 1588 protocol processing

- Boundary Clocks more expensive than Transparent Clocks
- Switches and Routers typically implement both
- TC can lower cost of clock
 recovery at slave
- Could be important for cost sensitive Small Cells



Performance of a BC/TC Network

Configuration	Frequency Support	1PPS MTIE (5000 s)	1 PPS Max TE
Master -	PTP	24 ns	25 ns
Slave	SyncE	17 ns	11 ns
Master -	PTP	75 ns	51 ns
Slave	SyncE	30 ns	17 ns

Select ITU-T G.8261.1 test cases; for details see WD17, June 2012 ITU-T SG15 Meeting

- Nanosecond-level MTIE and Max
 Time Errors for both BC and TC
- No dependence on traffic load
- PHY-based time stamping removes queuing as well as I/O serialization PDV

For Fiber or 1000Base-T connected nodes, sub-10ns maximum time errors can easily be achieved



Not all Backhaul Networks are Alike



. Thursday, February 7, 2013

Time Error Budgets for Various Link Types

Equipment Type	Time Error Budget
Switch/Router (1000BT or Fiber)	10-20ns
Microwave Link	100ns
GPON	100ns
DSL	?





BC/TC can control Time Errors to <10ns; Distributed TC can keep MW & PON to <100ns





Calculating Maximum Network Time Errors

- Operators need an easy way to calculate maximum time error
- This is possible if standards specify maximum time errors per equipment class

Equipment	Max Time Error	Hop Count
Small Cell	20 ns	3
MW/MMW Link	100 ns	2
Cell-site Gateway	20 ns	1
Pre-Aggregation Router/Switch	20 ns	1
Aggregation Router	20 ns	10
Total Network Time Error 500		

1588 network timing will be possible even with multiple Microwave links in the last mile



Summary and Conclusions

- GPS cannot be the only source of timing we need a backup!
- IEEE1588 PTP with Boundary and Transparent Clock support can provide networks based timing even for TD-LTE & LTE-Advanced
- Standards should allocate time error budgets per equipment class so operators can easily calculate maximum network time errors for heterogeneous backhaul networks



Thank you for attending GPS Vulnerabilities and Implications for Telecom

All registered attendees will receive a follow up email containing links to a recording and the slides from this presentation.

For information on upcoming ATIS events, visit www.atis.org/events

