

USBIPS Framework: Protecting Hosts from Malicious USB Peripherals¹

Chun-Yi Wang^{a, *} and Fu-Hau Hsu^b

^aFaceHeart Corp., 17 F.-12, No. 6, Sec. 4, Xinyi Rd., Da'an Dist., Taipei City 106471, Taiwan (R.O.C.) E-mail: 101582016@cc.ncu.edu.tw

^bDepartment of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Central University, No. 300, Zhongda Rd., Zhongli District, Taoyuan City 320317, Taiwan (R.O.C.) E-mail: hsufh@csie.ncu.edu.tw

*Corresponding author: Chun-Yi Wang

Email address: 101582016@cc.ncu.edu.tw

Telephone: +886-919115472

¹ Abbreviations

EDR	Endpoint detection and response
HCI	Host controller interface
HID	Human interface device
IoC	Indicators of compromise
OLE	Object linking and embedding
SADFE	Systematic Approaches to Digital Forensic Engineering
SP	Security and Privacy

Abstract

USB-based attacks have increased in complexity in recent years. Modern attacks incorporate a wide range of attack vectors, from social engineering to signal injection. The security community is addressing these challenges using a growing set of fragmented defenses. Regardless of the vector of a USB-based attack, the most important risks concerning most people and enterprises are service crashes and data loss. The host OS manages USB peripherals, and malicious USB peripherals, such as those infected with BadUSB, can crash a service or steal data from the OS. Although USB firewalls have been proposed to thwart malicious USB peripherals, such as USBFilter and USBGuard, they cannot prevent real-world intrusions. This paper focuses on building a security framework called USBIPS within OSs to defend against malicious USB peripherals. This includes major efforts to explore the nature of malicious behavior and build persistent protection from USB-based intrusions. We first present a behavior-based detection mechanism focusing on attacks integrated into USB peripherals. We then introduce the novel idea of an allowlisting-based method for USB access control. We finally develop endpoint detection and response system to build the first generic security framework that thwarts USB-based intrusion. Within a centralized threat analysis framework, it provides persistent protection and may detect unknown malicious behavior. By addressing key security and performance challenges, these efforts help modern OSs against attacks from untrusted USB peripherals.

Keywords: USB peripheral, USB firewall, human interface device, protocol masquerading, behavior-based detection.

1. Introduction

Computer peripherals provide critical features enabling system use. The wide use of computers is due not only to the cost and size decreases from mainframes to microcomputers but also to the interactivity facilitated by devices such as mice and keyboards. Printers, displays, and scanners have become essential components of the modern office environment. Aside from acting as peripherals to host computers, smartphones and tablets can themselves support peripherals attached to them.

Peripherals have a nearly limitless functionality scope, but their connection methods to host computers are limited to a few standards, such as USB [1] for wired connections and Bluetooth [2] for wireless.

Thus, most modern OSs support these standards (and peripherals that use them) by default. Their software stacks are implemented inside the kernel, and different device drivers are operated to support various peripheral classes.

However, this virtually unconstrained functionality presents the risk of malicious devices compromising computer systems. In a BadUSB attack [3], an attacker adds malicious functionality to a device firmware in the form of functionality accepted by the USB protocol. For example, aside from performing its expected function of data storage when plugged into a computer, a BadUSB flash drive may register keyboard functionality to inject malicious keystrokes and gain administrative privilege. Chargers that inject malware into iOS devices [4] or use AT commands to control Android devices [5] are further examples of malicious USB devices.

Some researchers argue that software-based attacks from malicious peripherals (e.g., USB and Bluetooth devices) that abuse protocol designs or exploit software stack vulnerabilities can be

thwarted by building packet-layer firewalls, such as USBFilter [6] and USBGuard [7], for I/O subsystems within OSs. However, although they can defend against attacks such as BadUSB, they can only work on Linux and need well-trained computer engineers to input allowlisting and blocklisting policies using complex rule languages. Moreover, they do not have a central management mechanism that discourages their use in network-based environments.

Furthermore, Hsu designed the Hermes attack, which bypasses USB firewalls, such as USBGuard and USBFilter, by fully simulating a USB device [8]. Hermes operates on a Raspberry Pi Zero W; it simply connects to a USB peripheral and copies all attributes that are already in the allowlist of the USB firewall product. This attack method limits the effectiveness of firewall-based mechanisms.

In light of the above, the central statement of this paper is that fragmented defenses cannot effectively stop attacks on any vulnerability vector.

This work aims to understand how to secure host machines with untrusted or even malicious modern peripherals plugged in. Specifically, this work explores how to build security solutions within OSs to thwart attacks from peripherals. We take a step-by-step approach to verify and go beyond the paper statement by setting the following goals:

- 1) Understand attack vectors and methodologies.
- 2) Find threats that pose significant risks.
- 3) Study methods of thwarting such threats.

Our results include the following:

- 1) A behavior-based IPS named USBIPS is developed. It mainly protects against malicious USB peripherals.

- 2) By detecting and responding to clients persistently, USBIPS can discover new threats and create relevant indicators of compromise (IoCs).
- 3) USBIPS can work practically on the wire while supporting various popular OSs.
- 4) USBIPS clients can work online and offline, and the USBIPS server can be deployed on the same host or a remote computer.

By dealing with key security and performance challenges, these developments lay the groundwork for strengthening modern OSs against attacks from untrusted or malicious peripherals and elucidate ways of building secure, trusted peripherals.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides the background of USB peripheral security and endpoint detection and response (EDR). Section 3 presents our security model and goals alongside the design of USBIPS. Section 4 details the implementation of our solution in kernel and user spaces on modern OSs; it also presents evaluation methods through case studies and benchmarks. Section 5 shows comparisons between our framework and other modern defense mechanisms, the limitations of our work, possible solutions and work-arounds, a summary of the study, future work directions, and our conclusion.

2. Background and Related Work

In this chapter, we explore the current attack surface of peripherals. Given the large body of literature on this subject, we initially categorize existing attacks according to their targeted functionality. We thus classify these functionalities into conceptual communication layers [9].

These layers denote the different entities across the host and peripherals (Figure 1).

The human layer, which is in the highest level, covers communications and other actions between human stakeholders. User-level programs on the host and the device capabilities are in

the application layer. Device firmware and the host OS, which have peripheral stacks (e.g., USB or Bluetooth stacks), are present in the transport layer. Finally, the physical layer denotes communication over the peripheral bus.

By classifying functionalities into layers, we can easily find similarities between approaches and derive primitives (subgroupings). These primitives cover both attack mechanisms (how attacks are accomplished) and attack outcomes (e.g., denial of service forgery, or eavesdropping). An attack is deemed successful if it violates a design assumption or executes an error in a layer. As for defenses, this layered approach helps elucidate the scope of security solutions. This work focuses on building defensive solutions to attacks targeting the transport layer.

2.1. USB Security

2.1.1. USB Protocol

USB flexibility stems from the use of composite devices that can have many stand-alone interfaces and configurations [9]. For example, one configuration of a USB headset may contain four interfaces, including a microphone, a keyboard (for volume control), and two speakers.

Figure 2 illustrates a two-configuration USB device. One of the configurations has one interface, and the other contains two. Two unidirectional (in/out) communication channels with the host machine are supported by each interface. A channel may have more than one endpoint, which is the communication sink. Composite devices are accomplished using two mechanisms: one for defining various types of peripherals and one for connecting to them.

Alongside USB 1.0, the concept of common class specifications [10,11] was introduced to organize various types of peripherals. A USB class is a group of one or more interfaces that merge to facilitate high-complexity functionality. Single-interface classes include the human interface device (HID) class, which enables the USB host controller to interact with mice and

keyboards, and the USB mass storage class [12,13], which defines data transfer between the host and storage devices. A composite device is a useful product composed of components of various classes, such as a USB headset, which involves the HID and audio classes. The notion of designing USB peripherals by combining multiple functionalities affects the state of USB security.

A USB host controller detects the presence and speed of a device plugged into the host machine by checking for changes in voltage on data pins. The GetDeviceDescriptors command initiates enumeration (Figure 3), where the host requests for the identifying information of the device, including its serial number, manufacturer, vendor ID (VID), and product ID [9]. The host controller resets the device and assigns an address to it for future communication. All device configurations are obtained using the GetConfigDescriptors request. A USB device has one configuration active at a time, although it can have more than one configuration. Each configuration can have one or more interfaces. These are acquired using the GetInterfaceDescriptors request and denote the vital functional entities served by various drivers in the OS. Then, GetInterfaceDescriptors finishes, drivers are loaded on behalf of the device, and class-specific subsets of the USB protocol (e.g., HID and storage) start operating.

2.1.2. USB Attacks and Defenses

According to this analysis of attacks, we find offensive primitives used in USB-based attacks. These exclude DMA attacks from USB devices, which are I/O attacks against peer devices and host machines [14-16]. In Table I, we map well-known attacks to their layers and primitives.

Table I. Notable USB-based attacks grouped into communication layers [9]

Layer	Offensive Primitive	Attack

Human	Outsider threats	<p>Social engineering (USB way) [17]</p> <p>Planted USB drives (US government) [18]</p> <p>USB flash drive as social engineering attack vector [19]</p> <p>Planted USB drives (Tischer et al., 2016) [20]</p>
	Insider threats	<p>Data breach via USB sticks [21]</p> <p>Theft of encrypted USB stick [22]</p> <p>Manning leak of classified records (WikiLeaks) [23]</p> <p>Document smuggling (Snowden) [24]</p>
Application	Code injection	<p>BRAIN virus [25]</p> <p>Stuxnet [26,27]</p> <p>Conficker [28]</p> <p>Flame [29]</p> <p>Duqu virus (user-mode rootkit) [30]</p>
	Data extraction	<p>Webcam extraction [31-33]</p> <p>Audio extraction [34]</p> <p>USBee [35]</p> <p>TURNIPSCHOOL [36]</p>
Transport	Protocol masquerading	<p>USB rubber ducky [37,38]</p> <p>USBdriveby [39]</p> <p>TURNIPSCHOOL [36]</p> <p>USB bypassing tool [40]</p> <p>BadUSB [3]</p> <p>Hermes [8]</p>

	Protocol corruption	FaceDancer [41] UMAP2 [42] Syzkaller [43]
Physical	Signal eavesdropping	Smartphone USB exploits [44] Side-channel attack [45,46] BadUSB hub [14] USB fingerprinting [15,16,47] USBSnoop [48] CottonMouth [49,50] USB GPS locator [51,52]
	Signal injection	USBKill [53] Bad-quality USB cables [54] USBee [35] TURNIPSCHOOL [36]

Human-layer abuse involves human error and social engineering performed by outsiders or privileged insiders. Manning [23] and Snowden [24] are typical cases of stealing sensitive information using USB flash drives. Application-layer attacks are user-space processes on the host and their interactions with device functionalities. Such attacks are generally classified into two categories: code injection (e.g., Stuxnet [26,27]), where malicious code is injected by an attacker into the host, and data exfiltration (e.g., TURNIPSCHOOL [36]), where data on the host are accessed by a device without authorization. Transport-layer attacks are grouped into two main categories: those that send malicious messages/packets to compromise the host OS and those that masquerade via additional interfaces. In a BadUSB attack [3], an attacker can

reprogram the USB device firmware to add certain functionalities, such as keyboard functionality. This compromised USB flash drive then injects malicious keystrokes to compromise the host OS. FaceDancer [41] is a programmable USB microcontroller sending malicious USB packets. Physical-layer attacks compromise communication confidentiality and integrity across a USB bus. In this context, signals are activities occurring over the USB bus. For example, USB Snoop [48] signals leaking from adjacent USB ports to eavesdrop on the traffic across a USB bus. USBKill [53] is a USB flash drive with multiple capacitors. It draws power from the USB bus it is plugged into. After it is fully charged, it discharges to burn the host machine.

Regardless of communication layer, attacks exploit the default assumption of trust in the USB ecosystem. Defenses are designed based on the layer used to attack a target, not the layer that is modified to implement the defense. In Table II, we map well-known defenses to their layers and primitives. Some solutions use multiple defensive primitives.

Table II. Proposed defenses grouped into communication layers [9]

Layer	Defensive Primitive	Defense
Human	Security education	Government notices [55] Education materials [56]
	On-device data encryption	IronKey [57] Kanguru [58]
	On-device host authentication	Kells [59] ProvUSB [60]
	Host- or	System provenance [61]

	device-based auditing	Transient provenance [62] ProvUSB [60]
Application	System hardening	AutoRun shutdown [63] Metascan [64] Olea [65] Windows CE [66] TMSUI [67] Smart Blocker [68] USBFilter [6]
	Device-emulating honeypots	Ghost [69]
	Driver-based access controls	GoodUSB [70]
Transport	Firmware verification	IronKey [71] FirmUSB [72] ProXray [73] Viper [74]
	USB stack fuzzing	USB fuzzing [75,76] hardware-based fuzzing [77] vUSBf [78] Syzkaller [43] POTUS [79] USBFuzz [80]

	USB packet firewall	USBFilter [6] USBGuard [7] USBFirewall [81] Linux (e)BPF Modules (LBM) [82]
	Host-emulating honeypots	GoodUSB [70] SandUSB [84] Cinch [84]
Physical	Antifingerprinting	USB host fingerprinting [16]
	Secure channel	Cinch [84] UScramBle [85]

Security training and antivirus software can mitigate human- and application-layer attacks, and the quality of USB hardware can be improved to reduce physical-layer attacks; however, transport-layer defenses are limited. USBFirewall [86] protects the USB stack on the host by identifying malformed USB packets, such as those created using FaceDancer, using a formal protocol-syntax model. Through virtualization, Cinch [84] reduces the attack surface of the host; the host OS is isolated from the USB host controller by hoisting it into a VM. Then, USB traffic is entirely tunneled through a disposable gateway VM using an IOMMU. However, USBFirewall cannot thwart attacks such as BadUSB, and the overhead of Cinch limits its use in practice. Tian et al. proposed USBFilter/usbttables [6], a stack similar to netfilter/iptables that filters USB traffic. First, iptables implements rules via pattern matching over port numbers and IP addresses, and usbttables can pattern match USB ports and buses; these processes are linked to specific physical areas on the host machine that cannot be imitated by harmful peripherals [6,9]. USBGuard, a software framework was proposed to protect a host against malicious USB devices by using

device descriptor information to implement basic blocklisting and allowlisting [7]. Unlike other allowlisting-based mechanisms, USBGuard can compute hash for every device and ensure that each device has a unique identity. Tian et al. proposed an extensible framework named LBM [82], which needs only one hook to place incoming and outgoing peripheral data in peripheral subsystems, enabling the development of modules for filtering specific types of peripheral packets (e.g., Bluetooth socket buffers or USB request blocks). Unlike previous solutions, LBM is a general framework that suits any peripheral protocol. Although USBFilter, USBGuard, and LBM can thwart attacks such as BadUSB, they only work on Linux and need well-trained computer engineers to input allowlisting and blocklisting policies using complex rule languages. Moreover, they do not have a central management mechanism and thus are hard to use in network-based environments. Hsu designed the Hermes attack, which bypasses USB firewalls, such as USBGuard and USBFilter, by fully simulating a USB device [8]. Hermes runs on a Raspberry Pi Zero W, simply connects to a USB peripheral, and copies all attributes that are in the allowlist of the USB firewall product. This attack method limits the effectiveness of firewall-based mechanisms.

2.2. Windows Application Programming Interface (API)

The Windows API, also known as WinAPI, is Microsoft's core set of APIs and is in Microsoft Windows OSs. The Windows API collectively pertains to various platform implementations that often have different names (e.g., Win32) [87].

The Windows API is designed mainly for OS–application interactions. For communication between various Windows applications, Microsoft developed different technologies alongside its main API. The first was dynamic data exchange, followed by object linking and embedding

(OLE), automation objects, the Component Object Model, the .NET framework, and ActiveX controls. These technologies are not completely distinct, as some of their functions overlap. The Windows API provides access to the basic resources available to Windows systems, among other functions. These resources include devices, file systems, threads, processes, and error handling. In 16-bit Windows, these functions are in `krnl286.exe`, `kernel.exe`, or `krnl386.exe` files; in 32- and 64-bit Windows, they are in `KernelBase.dll` and `kernel32.dll` files. These files are in the `\Windows\System32` folder across all Windows versions [88].

3. System Design

Modern USB-based attacks incorporate a broad variety of attack vectors, from signal injection to social engineering. Regardless of the vector used by a USB-based attack, people and enterprises are mostly concerned about service crashes and data loss. However, the recently proposed fragmented defenses cannot effectively thwart attacks on any vulnerability vector.

In this section, we propose USBIPS, a comprehensive framework that defends systems against USB-based attacks through behavior-based methods. We also introduce our designed system structure, components, and processes and explain the concept behind each implemented method and how they work together.

3.1. Objectives

The services and data on the host are key assets, so we pursue the following objectives:

- 1) Establish a behavior-based detection mechanism that focuses on abnormal intentions of the key assets.
- 2) Detect all USB devices plugged into a host, and at least recognize these devices as HIDs, storage devices, or network adapters.

- 3) Find IoCs and discover abnormal devices correctly by monitoring the behavior of the three types of devices individually.
- 4) Combine allowlisting- and behavior-based methods on different vectors for comprehensive protection.
- 5) Develop a centralized management framework that can maintain the integrity of logs and support further threat analysis and persistent protection.

3.2. Design Principle

Based on the abovementioned objectives, our research is based on the following design principles:

- 1) Detect and classify attached devices as HID, storage devices, or network adapters.
- 2) Use an allowlist to filter these devices by checking descriptor information.
- 3) Perform behavior-based detection.
 - a) HID: ensure that the Captcha input from the detected device is correct.
 - b) Storage: find illegal file access events relevant to specific paths.
 - c) Network: monitor configuration changes, and find abnormal DNS query results.

3.3. Methodologies

In this section, we explain the structure and components of the proposed framework (Figure 4) and illustrate how it can thwart USB-based attacks through behavior-based methods.

When a device is plugged into a computer's USB interface, an interrupt is triggered such that the processor responds to an event that needs attention from the software. The USB specification in the kernel space of an OS involves three layers of software abstraction [84].

The host controller interface (HCI), the lowest level, configures and interacts with the host controller hardware through a local bus (e.g., PCIe). An HCI driver is specific to the hardware

interface of the host controller but exposes hardware-independent abstraction to the following software layer (core). The core handles power management and device addressing and exposes an interface used by high-level drivers to communicate with devices. The core also enumerates a device that is plugged in, which requires identifying it and activating its driver.

Class drivers, the uppermost layer, are high-level drivers that communicate with device functions.

An interface is provided between USB devices and the rest of the OS by these drivers. For instance, the class driver of a keyboard communicates with the input subsystem of the kernel. A mass storage class driver, which communicates with the storage subsystem of the kernel, is another example. The USB specification defines generic classes for various devices, such as mice, keyboards, network interfaces, cameras, storage, and audio devices. OSs generally support large subsets of generic classes, enabling devices to use preexisting drivers.

The main component of the proposed framework is the USBIPS client, which works in the user space. The USBIPS client collects and encodes the descriptor information of devices by interacting with kernel modules using the Win32 API on Windows. Therefore, behavior-based mechanisms can be used to thwart USB-based attacks. We explain the system components in the following subsections: a device classifier, an allowlisting-based access controller, a behavior-based detector (HID behavior observer, illegal storage access behavior detector, and illegal network usage detector), and DAEMON and service observer. For practical purposes, we mainly develop the client using Windows, which is more suitable for a wide range of users, and most functions are coded in C/C++ using the Windows API.

Another critical component, the USBIPS server, is an EDR-based analysis center. It is a collection of multiple functions divided into four components: the client status monitor, log analyzer, allowlist manager, and behavior rule manager. The server monitors the status and

controls the versions of USB clients, collection logs, and analysis logs. It updates and distributes allowlists and behavior rules that provide all UPBIPS clients a central management mechanism.

3.3.1. USBIPS Device Classifier

The features and functions of USB devices differ, and so do the corresponding behavior of users. Thus, we need to classify these devices into various types. The process of the USBIPS device classifier is shown in Figure 5.

First, to acquire the types and relevant identifiers of various USB devices, we need to make the OS send notification messages that represent the events when a device is plugged into a USB interface. Before registering for device notification, we specify the device class of interest using its GUID [89]. Here, we focus on USB devices functioning as HID, storage devices, and network adapters, which are defined as follows:

```
1 //HID collections, also valid for storage volumes
2 #define GUID_DEVINTERFACE_HID
    {0x4d1e55b2, 0xf16f, 0 x11cf, 0x88, 0xcb,
    0x00, 0x11, 0x11, 0x00, 0x00, 0x30}
3 //Network devices
4 #define GUID_DEVINTERFACE_NET
    {0xcac88484, 0x7515, 0 x4c03, 0x82, 0xe6,
    0x71, 0xa8, 0x7a, 0xba, 0xc3,0x61}
```

Hence, we can register for device notification upon application startup, when a window is created. The following is an example of a storage volume notification:

```
1 // Registering for HID and storage device
notification
```

```

2 DEV_BROADCAST_DEVICEINTERFACE
    NotificationFilter;

3 NotificationFilter.dbcc_size =
    sizeof(DEV_BROADCAST_DEVICEINTERFACE);

4 NotificationFilter.dbcc_devicetype =
    DBT_DEVTYP_DEVICEINTERFACE;

5 NotificationFilter.dbcc_classguid =
    GUID_DEVINTERFACE_HID;

```

Second, the aforementioned window receives a notification of a change in the hardware configuration of a USB device that matches the three specified device classes when the device is plugged into a computer [90]. Therefore, we can identify these device classes by retrieving their descriptor information from the device management structure in the notification message [91].

The following is an example of a device class notification:

```

1 // Notification of a device change
2 case WM_DEVICECHANGE:
3     .....
4     // A storage volume is attached
5     case DBT_DEVICEARRIVAL:
6         // To handle a storage device
7         if (lpdb->dbch_devicetype ==
            DBT_DEVTYP_VOLUME)
8         {
9             // Volume data

```

```

10     AttachAnalyze((PDEV_BROADCAST_VOLUME)
        IParam);
11     .....
12 }
13 // To handle an HID or a network adapter
14 if (lpdb-> dbch_devicetype ==
        DBT_DEVTYP_DEVICEINTERFACE)
15 {
16     // Interface data
17     PDEV_BROADCAST_DEVICEINTERFACE
        pDev =
        (PDEV_BROADCAST_DEVICEINTERFACE)
        IParam;
18     .....
19 }

```

After classifying USB devices into HIDs, storage devices, and network adapters, we detect abnormal behavior, control access rights, and gather and analyze logs.

3.3.2. Allowlisting-Based USBIPS Access Controller

To prevent devices from triggering behavior detection processes and overloading the host computer, we implement an allowlisting-based access control mechanism to filter these devices by checking their descriptor information. The process of the allowlisting-based USBIPS access controller is shown in Figure 6.

The USBIPS access controller maintains device allowlists that contain detailed descriptor information, such as the VID, serial number, and partition volume number (prebuilt by users). The controller then compares the descriptor information of the plugged device and the allowlist of the corresponding device type. We use Microsoft SQL Server Compact [92] to store the allowlists and device usage records. We compare descriptor information using Microsoft OLE DB interfaces [93] to exfiltrate data from the allowlists. The following is a sample comparison of descriptor information:

```
1 // Set the query text for the command.
2 _sprintf_s(tlCmdText, _T("SELECT DeviceID
    FROM (SELECT DeviceID, Product, Serial,
    Volume , CASE WHEN CHARINDEX('*',
    Serial) = 1 THEN 1 ELSE 0 END FStar ,
    SUBSTRING(Serial, 2, LEN(Serial) - 1)
    FSSerial , CASE WHEN CHARINDEX('*',
    Serial) = LEN(Serial) THEN 1 ELSE 0 END
    BStar , SUBSTRING(Serial, 1, LEN(Serial) -
    1) BSSerial FROM RegDevice)T WHERE
    (Product = '%s') AND (((Serial <> '') AND
    ((Serial = '%s') OR (FStar = 1 AND
    CHARINDEX(FSSerial, '%s') = (LEN('%s') -
    LEN(FSSerial) + 1)) OR (BStar = 1 AND
    CHARINDEX(BSSerial, '%s') = 1))) OR
    ((Serial = '') AND (Volume = '%s'))"),
```

```
Product, SerialNumber, SerialNumber,  
SerialNumber, SerialNumber, VolumeSN);  
3 hr = pICmdText-  
>SetCommandText(DBGUID_DBSQL,  
tICmdText);
```

After descriptor information is compared, the USBIPS access controller performs the following processes:

- 1) If the descriptor information of the plugged device matches one of the records in the allowlists, the host will be allowed to mount the device.
- 2) If the descriptor information of the plugged device does not match any record in the allowlists, the user will be asked to decide whether the host is allowed to use the device or not.
 - a) If the user decides to use the plugged device, the descriptor information of the device will be appended to the allowlists and the host will be allowed to mount the device.
 - b) If the user refuses to use the plugged device, the USBIPS access controller will send a message to the kernel modules to block the device.

3.3.3. USBIPS Behavior-Based Detector

We propose a behavior-based mechanism that detects abnormal intentions of services and data on the host. We design its detection methods separately according to the different types of USB devices.

After a plugged device passes USB device classification (Section 3.3.1), the USBIPS behavior-based detector starts monitoring the device continuously and will not block it unless/until

abnormal behavior is detected. We mainly focus on detecting abnormal behavior surrounding HIDs, storage devices, and network adapters to validate the effectiveness of our detection methods.

3.3.3.1. USBIPS HID Behavior Observer

In recent years, USB protocol masquerading has emerged as a USB attack, including USB rubber ducky, BadUSB, and Hermes, as mentioned in Section 2.1.2.

The most useful, effective attack is a spoofed keyboard, which resembles a USB flash drive but opens a terminal and emulates a keyboard input. An antivirus program cannot protect a system from this attack.

In this paper, we propose an active defense mechanism that requires interaction between a user, a device, and a host and observe reasonability during this interaction. Although many devices are HIDs, such as keyboards, mice, gamepads, and webcams, we mainly select a keyboard as our primary target. Other HIDs have much fewer features, and may inflict less harm to a host than keyboards. The process of the USBIPS HID behavior observer is shown in Figure 7.

When a BadUSB device is connected to the USB interface of a computer, it requests the OS to load keyboard and storage drivers and enable the corresponding devices. USBIPS intercepts and blocks keystrokes from all keyboards when this keyboard is activated. A window named `HookingRawInput` [94] pops up and asks the user to enter a Captcha using the newly detected keyboard. Keystrokes of non-Captcha characters are intercepted and blocked. If Captcha verification succeeds, then USBIPS will allow keystrokes from all keyboards, continue to monitor the keystrokes of the newly detected keyboard, and detect abnormal behavior. If verification fails, then USBIPS will keep blocking the keystrokes of all keyboards and issue an alarm. All keystrokes are blocked until the abnormal keyboard is removed.

Here, we implement a Captcha mechanism using the BCryptGenRandom function [95] to generate random numbers and retrieve eight random bytes as a Captcha. The following is an example of this process:

```
1 // Fill the buffer with random bytes
2 NTSTATUS Status = BCryptGenRandom(
    NULL, // Alg Handle pointer; NULL is passed as
    BCRYPT_USE_SYSTEM_PREFERRED_RNG
    flag is used
    (PUCHAR) pbRNG, // Address of the buffer that
    recieves the random number(s)
    cbRNG, // Size of the buffer in bytes
3 BCRYPT_USE_SYSTEM_PREFERRED_RNG);
    // Flags
4 .....
5 if(CryptBinaryToStringW(pbRNG, cbRNG,
    dwFlags, sz, &cch))
6 {
7     wprintf(_T("%S\n"), sz);
8     _tesncat_s(szCaptcha, 128, sz,
    CAPTCHA_LEN);
    }
```

3.3.3.2. USBIPS Illegal Storage Access Behavior Detector

Several solutions can be used to thwart illegal storage behavior, such as AutoRun shutdown [63], allowlisting-based access control, GoodUSB [70], and USBFilter [6]. An attacker cannot easily breach a host using a USB storage device alone. As stated in Section 3.3.3.1, a BadUSB device may combine keyboard and storage functions. Therefore, the device can attack by inputting malicious commands and stealing sensitive data from an HDD or copying malware from the flash drive. Although we also propose methods of detecting abnormal behavior caused by composite USB devices with keyboard and network functions, we still need to monitor storage accesses to avoid unknown attacks. The process of the USBIPS illegal storage access behavior detector is shown in Figure 8 and can be broken down into the following steps:

- 1) Disabling execute access to all USB drives to provide basic protection for a host from executing malware on USB devices
- 2) Assigning target paths on HDDs and USB drives that contain sensitive data or other data of interest
- 3) Implementing an application named FileActivityWatch [96] to monitor file access events and check whether each event is relevant to the target paths
 - a) If the path information in a file access event matches a target path, then USBIPS will block this file access and issue an alarm.
 - b) If the path information in a file access event does not match any target path, then USBIPS will pass this file access and keep monitoring all file accesses.

3.3.3.3. USBIPS Illegal Network Usage Detector

Verifying whether a USB network device is malicious or harmless according to descriptor or even packet information is difficult. The source or destination process of a USB packet is hard to track due to the means by which modern OSs hide device access details from applications.

Additionally, this problem appears when inspecting USB network device packets, including wired dongles (e.g., Ethernet) and wireless adapters (e.g., Wi-Fi). These USB device drivers typically have their own RX/TX queues, which are used to enhance system performance through asynchronous I/O. Here, the USB device is an intermediate layer encapsulating IP packets into USB packets to be processed by the USB networking hardware [6].

We propose a way to detect illegal network usage by inspecting network configuration changes and accompanying abnormal behavior. The process of the USBIPS illegal network usage detector is shown in Figure 9 and can be broken down into the following steps:

- 1) Obtaining a snapshot of all adapter configurations for further comparison
- 2) Using an application named DNSQuerySniffer [97] to monitor configuration changes, mainly focusing on DHCP or DNS server changes
- 3) Inspecting and checking DNS query results by comparing them with HiNet or Google DNS server results
 - a) If the DNS query results are the same, then USBIPS will pass the configuration changes and keep monitoring
 - b) If the DNS query results are different, then USBIPS will fix the DHCP or DNS server settings to the right addresses and issue an alarm.

3.3.4. USBIPS DAEMON and Service Observer

The USBIPS DAEMON and the USBIPS service observer bilaterally monitor and protect each other. This concept is explained as follows:

3.3.4.1. USBIPS DAEMON

The USBIPS DAEMON is the main component of the proposed systems, and it activates the abovementioned components. The USBIPS service observer is introduced into a system process

(e.g., services.exe) via code injection to protect it from being disabled, suspended, or removed.

This is illustrated by the following example:

```
1 // Retrieve services.exe process ID
2 HANDLE hProcess, hThread, hSnapshot;
3 PROCESSENTRY32 Pe32;
4 hSnapshot =
    CreateToolhelp32Snapshot(TH32CS_SNAPPROCESS, NULL);
5 Pe32.dwSize = sizeof(PROCESSENTRY32);
6 if(Process32First(hSnapshot, &Pe32))
7 {
8     do{
9         if(!_tcscmp(Pe32.szExeFile, _T("SERVICES.EXE")))
10             break;
11     }while(Process32Next(hSnapshot, &Pe32));
12 }
13 // Open services.exe process
14 hProcess = OpenProcess(
    PROCESS_CREATE_THREAD |
    PROCESS_QUERY_INFORMATION |
    PROCESS_VM_OPERATION | PROCESS_VM_WRITE |
    PROCESS_VM_READ, FALSE, Pe32.th32ProcessID);
15 // 1. Allocate memory in the remote process for szLibPath
16 // 2. Write szLibPath to the allocated memory
```

```

17 pLibRemote = ::VirtualAllocEx(hProcess, NULL,
    sizeof(szLibPath), MEM_COMMIT, PAGE_READWRITE);
18 ::WriteProcessMemory(hProcess, pLibRemote, (void*)szLibPath,
    sizeof(szLibPath), NULL);
19 // Load the protected module into the remote process via
    CreateRemoteThread & LoadLibrary
20 hThread = ::CreateRemoteThread(hProcess, NULL, 0,
    (LPTHREAD_START_ROUTINE) ::GetProcAddress( hKernel32,
    "LoadLibraryA"), pLibRemote, 0, NULL);

```

3.3.4.2. USBIPS Service Observer

While the USBIPS service observer is protected by being injected into services.exe, it can also be reversely used to monitor and protect the USBIPS DAEMON from being disabled or removed. By protecting each other, these system components ensure each other's availability.

3.3.5. USBIPS Server

The USBIPS server provides a centralized management mechanism containing four components: the client status monitor, log analyzer, allowlist manager, and behavior rule manager. The USBIPS server communicates with USBIPS clients using an API (representational state transfer) and the JSON data format. Following these programming standards, we can easily implement the components of the centralized management mechanism, and their functions are introduced as follows:

- 1) Client status monitor: to monitor clients' states, such as software and hardware configurations, device usage, and file access records

- 2) Log analyzer: to collect logs from clients and show events and alarms to system managers for instant response and further analysis
- 3) Allowlist and behavior rule manager: to modify device allowlists and adjust behavior detection rules and then distribute updated allowlists and rules to all clients

4. Evaluation

In this chapter, we describe the implementation of the proposed framework and each of its components. The evaluation methods are introduced as well. Table III provides the specifications of the USBIPS clients and the USBIPS server used in our experiments and evaluation.

Table III. Specifications of USBIPS clients and USBIPS server used in experiment environments

Component	Hardware	OS	CPU	Memory
USBIPS Client A	Acer Aspire V5-573G laptop	Windows 10 21H1	Intel Core i5- 4200U 1.6 GHz	8 GB
USBIPS Client B	ASUS U32VJ laptop	Windows 10 21H1	Intel Core i5- 3210M 2.5 GHz	6 GB
USBIPS Server (VM)	ASUS U32VJ laptop	Windows Server 2012 R2 9600	Intel Core i5- 3210M 2.5 GHz	4 GB

One of the USBIPS clients operated on an Acer Aspire V5-573G laptop that had an Intel Core i5-4200U 1.6 GHz CPU with 8 GB memory and ran version 21H1 of Windows 10. Moreover,

the machine was equipped with a USB 3.0 controller and two USB 2.0 controllers from the Intel 8/C220 series chipset.

The other USBIPS client operated on an ASUS U32VJ laptop that had an Intel Core i5-3210M 2.5 GHz CPU with 6 GB memory and ran version 21H1 of Windows 10. It was equipped with a USB 3.0 controller and two USB 2.0 controllers from the Intel 8/C220 series chipset.

On the contrary, the USBIPS server was a VM that had an Intel Core i5-3210M 2.5 GHz CPU with 4 GB memory and ran Windows Server 2012 R2 build 9600; it operated on the same machine as the second client (ASUS U32VJ laptop).

We show the capability of USBIPS by examining various USB devices and discussing practical use cases that are nontrivial for traditional mechanisms of access control. Table IV lists the types of USB devices used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed framework: a USB rubber ducky (spoofed keyboard), a Hermes set (spoofed flash drive), a Transcend JetFlash 16 GB flash drive, and an ASUS USB-N10 150 Mbps 11n Wi-Fi adapter.

Table IV. USB devices used to assess effectiveness of USBIPS

USB Device	Type
USB rubber ducky	HID (spoofed keyboard)
Hermes	Storage (spoofed flash drive)
Transcend JetFlash 16 GB	Storage (flash drive)
ASUS USB-N10 150 Mbps 11n	Network (Wi-Fi adapter)

We conducted an experiment by deploying two USBIPS clients and a USBIPS server. We performed normal usage of a USB storage device and various types of USB-based attacks. Then, we evaluated the effectiveness of the allowlisting-based access control and behavior-based detection of USBIPS. The experiment structure is shown in Figure 10.

We studied various USB devices and present practical use cases that are nontrivial for traditional mechanisms of access control. We recreated real-world workloads to create common USB use cases and elucidate the performance effect of USBIPS.

4.1. Effectiveness of Device Classification and Allowlisting-Based Access Control

To assess the effectiveness of the device classification and allowlisting-based access control of USBIPS, we utilized the USB devices shown in Table IV as a treatment group. We input their identifiers into the allowlists before using them in the host. The allowlists we input into USBIPS are shown in Figure 11. We also prepared several USB devices that were not in the allowlists (an SD card reader, a portable HDD, another USB keyboard, and a Wi-Fi adapter) and utilized them as the control group.

The aforementioned USB devices were plugged in sequentially, and we observed the results of device classification and access control from the usage records parsed by each USBIPS client from the logs. The findings show that the USBIPS clients could correctly classify the USB devices, perform allowlisting access control in real time, and generate the corresponding logs and alarms. A set of usage records of the USB storage devices is shown in Figure 12. A white background means normal usage, whereas a red background represents alarms indicating that the corresponding devices were blocked by the USBIPS client. We used Hermes to simulate a Transcend JetFlash 16 GB flash drive, and its usage records were the same as those of a real one. The USB rubber ducky, simulating a USB keyboard, was not blocked by the USBIPS clients because it duplicated all identifiers of real USB keyboards ever used by the host.

4.2. Effectiveness of Behavior-Based Detection of HIDs

To measure the effectiveness of the behavior-based detection of HIDs, we executed a BadUSB attack using a rubber ducky [38]. As mentioned in Section 3.3.3.1, although many devices are

classified as HID, we used a spoofed keyboard because it is a stronger, more effective attack. We mainly used a rubber ducky to simulate a keyboard with a set of payloads that combined keystrokes of commands to form a complete malicious behavior. Here, the sample command was executed when we plugged the rubber ducky into the host. A notepad application popped up and showed “Hello World! I’m in your PC!” in the absence of any detection or protection measure. The effectiveness of USBIPS behavior-based detection in protecting a host against rubber ducky attacks is shown in Figure 13. When the rubber ducky was plugged into the host, the USBIPS client detected and verified it as an HID immediately. Then, the HookingRawInput window popped up and asked the user to enter a Captcha. The keystrokes of all keyboards were rendered ineffective except the keystrokes matching the Captcha from the newly detected keyboard. However, nothing was input because the rubber ducky sent keystrokes to a “run” window (WINDOWS r) and then to a “notepad” window, and all keystrokes were blocked by the USBIPS client.

Because a Captcha is used to verify whether a USB HID is a true keyboard, an attacker may try to guess the characters of a Captcha and repeatedly send guesses to the host where the spoofed HID is plugged in. In this paper, we implement a Captcha mechanism by using the BCryptGenRandom function [95] to generate random numbers that comply with the NIST SP800-90 standard, specifically its CTR_DRBG portion. AES-256 CTR_DRBG is implemented using the BCryptGenRandom function, which has a block length of 128 bits and a key length of 256 bits [98]. We then retrieve eight random bytes generated by the BCryptGenRandom function as a Captcha. Executing an enumeration task for a side-channel attack on CTR_DRBG is feasible, requiring as little as 2^{21} operations to recover a random-number-generator output [99]. A hypothetical attack may require approximately 2^{64} operations

for AES-192 and 2^{128} operations for AES-256 [100]. In our implementation, to conduct the aforementioned attacks on either CTR_DRBG or AES-256 is difficult and impracticable because the USBIPS client restricts keyboard functions and the only way to guess a Captcha is to type or send keystrokes from USB devices; however, this process is time consuming.

4.3. Effectiveness of Behavior-Based Detection of Storage Devices

To measure the effectiveness of the behavior-based detection of storage devices, we performed a data theft attack by using Hermes to simulate a spoofed USB device. The simulated Transcend JetFlash 16 GB flash drive could easily pass the allowlisting-based access control mechanism and be mounted as an F partition on the host. To examine the detection mechanism, we copied several files from the “confidential” folder in the C partition to the root folder in the F partition while both folders were in the target paths for USBIPS monitoring.

The FileActivityWatch window popped up and listed all abnormal file activity records as alarms immediately when the files in the “confidential” folder were being copied. The experiment results of detecting the data theft attack using USBIPS are in Figure 14. The record contents included filenames with full paths, processes performing file activities, and last read and write times, which informed the user in real time of the data theft attack.

4.4. Effectiveness of Behavior-Based Detection of Network Adapters

To assess the effectiveness of USBIPS behavior-based detection of network devices, we simulated a DNS spoofing attack by building a spoofed DNS server in the same network as the target host. When the ASUS USB-N10 150 Mbps 11n Wi-Fi adapter was plugged into the host, the test program was triggered, and an attempt to modify the configuration of the DNS server was made. We then performed the DNS spoofing attack and observed the results of behavior detection by USBIPS.

As expected, the DNSQuerySniffer window popped up and listed all abnormal DNS query records as alarms immediately when the Wi-Fi adapter was plugged in and the configuration change of the DNS server occurred. The experiment results of detecting the DNS spoofing attack using USBIPS are shown in Figure 15. USBIPS successfully detected the redirection of traffic from a legitimate website (e.g., www.google.com) to a malicious website (e.g., www.google.attacker.com).

5. Conclusion

In this chapter, we compare our framework with other modern defense mechanisms, find and examine our study limitations, present possible solutions and work-arounds, summarize the study, discuss future work, and conclude this paper.

5.1. Comparison

In this section, we compare system properties of USBIPS, USBFilter, LBM, FirmUSB, and Cinch. These properties are the defense surface over various vulnerability vectors, defense ability against BadUSB attacks, behavior-based detection methods, OS support capabilities, and centralized management mechanisms. Table V shows the comparison results.

Table V. Comparison results between USBIPS and other frameworks

	USBIPS	USBFilter/LBM	FirmUSB	Cinch
Defense Surface	Application/transport	Transport	Transport	Transport
Defense against BadUSB Attacks	All USB ports	Specified USB port	Impractical, requiring extra facilities	Not real time and requires extra facilities

Behavior Detection	Yes	No	No	Yes
Support OS	Windows	Linux	Platform independent	Linux
Central Management	Yes	No	No	No

The comparison results show that only USBIPS works on the defense surface of the application layer; the others work in the transport layer. USBIPS protects a host against BadUSB attacks, whereas the others have several limitations in terms of this function. To the best of our knowledge, very few existing solutions that work in the application layer can effectively thwart BadUSB attacks, and most of them can only support Linux OSs. By contrast, USBIPS can work on Windows OSs, which have a wider range of users. Furthermore, USBIPS and Cinch have behavior-based detection methods, which may be extended to overcome new types of attacks in the future. Finally, only USBIPS has a centralized management mechanism that can provide persistent protection to a large number of hosts and may detect unknown malicious activity.

5.2. Limitations

Here, we find and examine the limitations of our work: a lack of defense surfaces, behavior rule update mechanisms, and protection ranges.

- 1) Software layer depth: As USBIPS was developed using the Windows API, a USBIPS client detects and controls a USB device after the driver is loaded. Thus, USBIPS may fail to block malicious behavior in an earlier stage. For example, by the time a USBIPS client detects illegal storage access behavior, the files will have almost finished read or

write activities. USBIPS blocks these activities by deleting the copied files after the corresponding write activities are finished.

- 2) Challenges in updating rules for new IoCs: We did not create a detection method for storage and network devices as standardized rules; this makes it difficult for USBIPS clients to update behavior rules. Besides, an HID detection method that needs interactions with users is hard to regard as a standard rule and difficult to update. When a new IoC is found, the easiest way to update the behavior-based detection mechanism presently is to update the entire software of the USBIPS client. Moreover, these required interactions may cause some users to feel confused and helpless. When the HookingRawInput window pops up, the keystrokes of all keyboards are blocked. Even keystrokes from a newly detected true keyboard that does not match the Captcha will not return any response to any application in a host. A user may interpret this as a system/application error and may restart the host. Although this is an effective way to thwart USB keyboard spoofing attacks, it also disturbs users who are using true keyboards.
- 3) Challenges in thwarting attacks via other devices: The detection methods of the proposed system were developed individually according to different devices. It is not easy to find methods for all kinds of devices. Moreover, the detection method for HIDs only focuses on keyboard behavior when many other breaches may be generated for other HIDs. For example, an attacker may use a spoofed mouse to move a cursor to a specific application and implement double-click instructions to perform malicious behavior, such as stealing a file from a host to a flash drive or shutting down a DHCP service on a server. Another possible case is that an attacker can record a user's voice

or obtain pictures without alerting the user by using a spoofed webcam that resembles a USB flash drive. Effective solutions have yet to be developed to overcome such problems.

5.3. Future Work

To overcome the limitations in Section 5.2, we present some solutions that may need to be pursued in the future.

- 1) Development of USBIPS client in driver layer: If developed using Windows Minifilter, USBIPS can control a device before its driver is loaded, thus improving the aforementioned file-blocking mechanism. Moreover, other features of abnormal behavior may be identified from unusual contents in USB packets.
- 2) Standardization of rules: A method of converting the detection methods for storage and network devices to standardized rules, such as YARA rules, should be devised. This will help the USBIPS server update the behavior-based detection methods easily by only distributing new rules to clients. In addition, additional rule-based detection methods for HID devices that will not disturb users should be developed. In general, a user should have similar HID usage habits, such as the frequency of using a specific HID, and actions before and after a specific HID is plugged into a host. Therefore, developing a behavior-based detection mechanism using machine learning techniques may be a feasible way to enhance USBIPS.
- 3) Grouping of devices and relevant detection methods: A short-term solution to breaches coming from different types of USB devices is to analyze similarities between various devices and identify general detection methods that suit these devices. In the long run, a machine learning-based mechanism may be developed.

5.4. Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrate USBIPS, a comprehensive system that protects a host from malicious activity executed through USB peripherals. Moreover, we show that a framework that works on the defense surface of the application layer can protect a host from BadUSB attacks effectively. Most existing solutions work in the transport layer, whereas USBIPS combines the defense surface of the transport and application layers while performing allowlisting-based access control before behavior-based detection. USBIPS supports Windows OSs, which is used by a wide range of users. A USBIPS client can work both online and offline, and a USBIPS server can be deployed on the same host or on a remote computer. Furthermore, the centralized management mechanism of USBIPS enables a system to manage clients easily and handle events instantly. Furthermore, it provides persistent protection to a large number of hosts and may detect unknown malicious activity.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Enago for their assistance in reviewing and proof reading the article and giving suggestions. Furthermore, authors extend special thanks to Alva for her constructive language and writing assistance and article modification.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author contributions: **Chun-Yi Wang:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Fu-Hau Hsu:** Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing

Data statement: Not applicable

References

- [1] Apple, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, Microsoft, Renesas, STMicroelectronics, Texas Instruments, Universal Serial Bus 3.2 Specification: Revision 1.0, Technical Report, 2017.
- [2] Bluetooth SIG, Inc., Bluetooth Core Specification v5.0, Technical Report, 2016.
- [3] K. Nohl, S. Krißler, J. Lell, BadUSB – On accessories that turn evil, BlackHat, Singapore, 2014.
- [4] B. Lau, Y. Jang, C. Song, T. Wang, P. Chung, P. Royal, Mactans: injecting malware into iOS devices via malicious chargers. in: Proceedings of the Black Hat U.S.A. Briefings, Las Vegas, NV, 2013.
- [5] D.J. Tian, G. Hernandez, J.I. Choi, V. Frost, C. Ruales, P. Traynor, H. Vijayakumar, L. Harrison, A. Rahmati, M. Grace, K.R.B. Butler, ATtention spanned: comprehensive vulnerability analysis of AT commands within the android ecosystem. in: 27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18), 2018.
- [6] D.J. Tian, N. Scaife, A. Bates, K.R.B. Butler, P. Traynor, Making USB great again with USBFILTER. in: 25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16), Washington, D.C., 2016.
- [7] USBGuard project. <https://usbguard.github.io/>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [8] Y.W. Hsu, Hermes: A light weight method to simulate a USB device or pass a USB firewall [Master thesis], National Central University, Taiwan, 2019.
- [9] D.J. Tian, N. Scaife, D. Kumar, M. Bailey, A. Bates, K.R.B. Butler, SoK: Plug & pray today - Understanding usb insecurity in versions 1 through C. in: Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P), 2018.

- [10] SystemSoft Corporation, Intel Corporation, Universal serial bus common class specification, Revision 1.0, Intel Corporation, 1997.
- [11] The USB Device Working Group, USB class codes. <https://www.usb.org/defined-class-codes>, 2015 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [12] USB Implementers Forum, Inc., USB mass storage class specification overview. https://www.usb.org/sites/default/files/Mass_Storage_Specification_Overview_v1.4_2-19-2010.pdf, 2010 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [13] USB Implementers Forum, Inc., U.S.B. mass storage class, CBI, transport. https://www.usb.org/sites/default/files/usb_msc_cbi_1.1.pdf (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [14] K. Nohl, BadUSB exposure: hubs. <https://opensource.srlabs.de/projects/badusb/wiki/Hubs>, 2014 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [15] L. Letaw, J. Pletcher, K. Butler (Host), Identification via USB fingerprinting. in: 6th International Workshop on Systematic Approaches to Digital Forensic Engineering (SADFE), IEEE, 2011.
- [16] A. Bates, R. Leonard, H. Pruse, D. Lowd, K.R.B. Butler, Leveraging USB to establish host identity using commodity devices. in: Proceedings of the 21st ISOC Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS 14), San Diego, CA, USA, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2014.23238>.
- [17] S. Stasiukonis, Social engineering, the USB way, Dark Reading, 2006.
- [18] P. Sewers, US Govt. plant USB sticks in security study, 60% of subjects take the bait. <https://thenextweb.com/news/us-govt-plant-usb-sticks-in-security-study-60-of-subjects-take-the-bait>, 2011 (accessed 8 April 2024).

- [19] J.R. Jacobs, Measuring the effectiveness of the USB flash drive as a vector for social engineering attacks on commercial and residential computer systems [Master's thesis], Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 2011.
- [20] M. Tischer, Z. Durumeric, S. Foster, S. Duan, A. Mori, E. Bursztein, M. Bailey, Users really do plug in USB drives they find. in: Proceedings of the 37th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P '16), San Jose, California, USA, 2016, pp. 306–319. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2016.26>.
- [21] M.J. Schwartz, 2011, How USB sticks cause data breach, malware woes. <https://www.darkreading.com/cyber-risk/how-usb-sticks-cause-data-breach-malware-woes>, 2011 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [22] D. Pauli, Secret defence documents lost to foreign intelligence. <https://www.itnews.com.au/news/secret-defence-documentslost-to-foreign-intelligence-278961>, 2011 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [23] K. Zetter, K. Poulsen, U.S. intelligence analyst arrested in Wikileaks video probe. <https://www.wired.com/2010/06/leak/>, 2010 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [24] K. Zetter, Snowden smuggled documents from NSA on a thumb drive. <https://www.wired.com/2013/06/snowden-thumb-drive/>, 2013 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [25] H.J. Highland, The BRAIN virus: fact and fantasy, Comput. Sec. 7 (1988) 367–370. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4048\(88\)90576-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4048(88)90576-7).
- [26] Common vulnerabilities and exposures, CVE-2010-2568. <https://cve.mitre.org/cgi-bin/cvename.cgi?name=CVE-2010-2568>, 2010 (accessed 8 April 2024).

- [27] N. Falliere, L. O'Murchu, E. Chien, Stuxnet dossier. https://www.wired.com/images_blogs/threatlevel/2011/02/Symantec-Stuxnet-Update-Feb-2011.pdf, 2011 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [28] S. Shin, G. Gu, Conficker and beyond: A large-scale empirical study. in: Proceedings of the 26th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, Ser. ACSAC '10, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1920261.1920285>.
- [29] K. Zetter, Meet 'flame,' the massive spy malware in Infiltrating Iranian computers, Wired. <https://www.wired.com/2012/05/flame/>, 2012 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [30] P. Szor, Duqu-threat research and analysis, McAfee Labs. https://scadahacker.com/library/Documents/Cyber_Events/McAfee%20-%20W32.Duqu%20Threat%20Analysis.pdf, 2011 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [31] P. Oliveira Jr., FBI can turn on your web cam, and you'd never know it. <https://nypost.com/2013/12/08/fbi-can-turn-on-your-web-cam/>, 2013 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [32] CBS/AP, BlackShades malware hijacked half a million computers, FBI says. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/blackshades-malware-hijacked-half-a-million-computers-fbi-says/>, 2014 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [33] M. Brocker, S. Checkoway, iSeeYou: disabling the MacBook webcam indicator LED. in: 23rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 14), 2014, pp. 337–352.
- [34] T. Ater, Chrome bugs allow sites to listen to your [private conversations]. <https://www.talater.com/chrome-is-listening/>, 2014 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [35] M. Guri, M. Monitz, Y. Elovici, USBee: air-gap covert-channel via electromagnetic emission from USB. in: Privacy Sec. Trust (PST), 14th Annual Conference on, IEEE, vol. 2016, 2016, pp. 264–268. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PST.2016.7906972>.

- [36] D. Spill, M. Ossmann, K. Busse, TURNIPSCHOOL – NSA playset. <http://www.nsaplayset.org/turnipschool>, 2015.
- [37] Hak5, USB rubber ducky. <https://shop.hak5.org/products/usb-rubber-ducky>, 2010 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [38] Hak5, USB rubber ducky payloads. <https://github.com/hak5/usbrubberducky-payloads>, 2013 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [39] S. Kamkar, USBdriveby. <http://samy.pl/usbdiveby/>, 2014 (accessed 1 April 2022).
- [40] J. Bang, B. Yoo, S. Lee, Secure USB bypassing tool, Digit. Investig. 7 (2010) S114–S120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diin.2010.05.014>.
- [41] Good, FET, Facedancer21. <http://goodfet.sourceforge.net/hardware/facedancer21/>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [42] NCCGROUP, Umap2, <https://github.com/nccgroup/umap2>, 2018 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [43] Google, Found Linux kernel USB bugs. https://github.com/google/syzkaller/blob/master/docs/linux/found_bugs_usb.md, 2017 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [44] Z. Wang, A. Stavrou, Exploiting smart-phone USB connectivity for fun and profit. in: Proceedings of the 26th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, Ser. ACSAC '10, ACM, New York, NY, 2010, pp. 357–366. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1920261.1920314>.
- [45] K. Sridhar, S. Prasad, L. Punitha, S. Karunakaran, EMI issues of universal serial bus and solutions. in: INCEMIC-2003: 8th International Conference on Electromagnetic Interference and Compatibility, 2003, pp. 97–100. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICEMIC.2003.237887>.

- [46] D. Oswald, B. Richter, C. Paar, Side-channel attacks on the Yubikey 2 one-time password generator. in: International Workshop on Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection, Springer, 2013, pp. 204–222.
- [47] A. Davis, Revealing embedded fingerprints: deriving intelligence from USB stack interactions. in: Blackhat USA, 2013.
- [48] Y. Su, D. Genkin, D. Ranasinghe, Y. Yarom, USB snooping made easy: crosstalk leakage attacks on USB hubs. in: 26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17), Vancouver, BC, 2017.
- [49] NSA/DNI, 2008, Cottonmouth-I. https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:NSA_COTTONMOUTH-I.jpg, 2008 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [50] NSA/DNI, 2008, Cottonmouth-II. https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:NSA_COTTONMOUTH-II.jpg, 2008 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [51] Mich, Inside a low budget consumer hardware espionage implant. https://ha.cking.ch/s8_data_line_locator/, 2017 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [52] Grandado.com, 3 in 1 GIM Answer Monitor USB Charging Data Transfer Cable GPS Locator. <https://gbr.grandado.com/products/3-in-1-gim-answer-monitor-usb-charging-data-transfer-cable-gps-locator-gps-position-line-tracking-cord-compatible-with-sim-card-4?variant=UHJvZHVjdFZhcmlhbnQ6MjAxODI4Mjc1>, (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [53] USB, Kill, USBKill. <https://www.usbkill.com/>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).

- [54] S. Mlot, New standard makes sure that USB-C cable won't fry your device. <https://www.pcmag.com/news/new-standard-makes-sure-that-usb-c-cable-wont-fry-your-device>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [55] P. Walters, The risks of using portable devices. <https://www.cisa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/RisksOfPortableDevices.pdf>, 2012 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [56] P. Walters, Social engineering a USB Drive. <https://www.cmu.edu/iso/aware/be-aware/usb.html>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [57] P. Walters, IronKey. <http://www.ironkey.com/enUS/resources/>, 2013 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [58] Kanguru Solutions, Secure encrypted U.S.B. flash drives. <https://www.kanguru.com>, (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [59] K.R.B. Butler, S.E. McLaughlin, P.D. McDaniel, Kells: A protection framework for portable data. in: Proceedings of the 26th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, 2010, pp. 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1920261.1920296>.
- [60] D.J. Tian, A. Bates, K.R.B. Butler, R. Rangaswami, ProvUSB: block-level provenance-based data protection for USB storage devices. in: Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS, vol. 16, 2016, pp. 242–253. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978398>.
- [61] A. Bates, D. Tian, K.R. Butler, T. Moyer, Trustworthy whole-system provenance for the Linux kernel. in: Proceedings of the 24th USENIX Security Symposium, 2015.
- [62] S.N. Jones, C.R. Strong, D.D.E. Long, E.L. Miller, Tracking emigrant data via transient provenance. in: 3rd Workshop on the Theory and Practice of Provenance, TAPP 11, 2011.

- [63] D. Pham, M. Halgamuge, A. Syed, P. Mendis, Optimizing windows security features to block malware and hack tools on USB storage devices. in: Prog. Electromagn. Res. Symp., 2010.
- [64] OPSWAT, Metascan. <https://www.opswat.com/blog/evaluation-of-anti-malware-engines-to-qualify-for-opswat-metascan>, 2013 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [65] OLEA Kiosks, Inc., Malware scrubbing cyber security kiosk. <http://www.olea.com/product/cyber-security-kiosk/>, 2015 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [66] Microsoft, Inc., USB Filter (Industry 8.1), Microsoft website. [https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/previous-versions/windows/embedded/dn449350\(v=winembedded.82\)?redirectedfrom=MSDN](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/previous-versions/windows/embedded/dn449350(v=winembedded.82)?redirectedfrom=MSDN), 2014 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [67] B. Yang, D. Feng, Y. Qin, Y. Zhang, W. Wang, TMSUI: A trust management scheme of usb storage devices for industrial control systems, Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2015/022, 2015.
- [68] S.A. Diwan, S. Perumal, A.J. Fatah, Complete security package for USB thumb drive, Comp. Eng. Intell. Syst. 5 (2014) 30-37.
- [69] S. Poeplau, J. Gassen, A honeypot for arbitrary malware on USB storage devices. in: Crisis, 7th International Conference on Risk and Security of Internet and Systems, vol. 12, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CRISIS.2012.6378948>.
- [70] D.J. Tian, A. Bates, K.R.B. Butler, Defending against malicious USB firmware with GoodUSB. in: Proceedings of the 31st Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC, vol. 15, 2015, pp. 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818000.2818040>.

- [71] Imation, IronKey secure USB devices protect against BadUSB malware. <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20140808005723/en/IronKey%E2%84%A2-Secure-USB-Devices-Protect-Against-BadUSB-Malware,2014> (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [72] G. Hernandez, F. Fowze, D.J. Tian, T. Yavuz, K. Butler, U.S.B. Firm, Vetting USB device firmware using domain informed symbolic execution. in: 24th A.C.M. Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 17), Dallas, USA, 2017.
- [73] F. Fowze, D.J. Tian, G. Hernandez, K. Butler, T. Yavuz, ProXray: protocol model learning and guided firmware analysis. in: IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng. 47 (2019) 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2019.2939526>.
- [74] Y. Li, J.M. McCune, A. Perrig, VIPER: verifying the integrity of PERipherals firmware. in: Proceedings of the 18th A.C.M. Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 2011, pp. 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2046707.2046711>.
- [75] M.W.R. Labs, USB fuzzing for the masses. <https://labs.withsecure.com/publications/usb-fuzzing-for-the-masses>, 2011 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [76] R.D. Vega, USB attacks: fun with Plug and Own. <https://lira.epac.to/DOCS-TECH/Hacking/USB/USB%20Attacks%20-%20Fun%20with%20Plug%20and%20wn.pdf>, 2009 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [77] M. Jodeit, M. Johns, USB Device Drivers: A Stepping Stone into Your Kernel, DEEPSEC, 2009.
- [78] S. Schumilo, R. Spenneberg, H. Schwartke, Don't trust your USB! How to find bugs in USB device drivers. in: Blackhat Eur., 2014.

- [79] J. Patrick-Evans, L. Cavallaro, J. Kinder, POTUS: probing off-the-shelf USB drivers with symbolic fault injection. in: 11th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT 17), Vancouver, BC, 2017.
- [80] H. Peng, USBFuzz: A framework for fuzzing USB drivers by device emulation. in: 29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security '20), 2020.
- [81] P. Johnson, S. Bratus, S. Smith, Protecting against malicious bits on the wire: automatically generating a USB protocol parser for a production kernel. in: Proceedings of the 33th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC, vol. 17, 2017.
- [82] D. Tian, G. Hernandez, J.I. Choi, V. Frost, P.C. Johnson, K.R.B. Butler, LBM: A Security Framework for Peripherals within the Linux Kernel. in: 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), San Francisco, CA, 2019.
- [83] E.L. Loe, H.C. Hsiao, T.H.J. Kim, S.C. Lee, S.M. Chen, SandUSB: an installation-free sandbox for USB peripherals. in: 2016 IEEE 3rd World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT), Reston, VA, USA, 2016.
- [84] S. Angel, R.S. Wahby, M. Howald, J.B. Leners, M. Spilo, Z. Sun, A.J. Blumberg, M. Walfish, Defending against malicious peripherals with cinch. in: Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Security Symposium, 2016.
- [85] M. Neugschwandtner, A. Beitler, A. Kurmus, A transparent defense against USB eavesdropping attacks. in: Proceedings of the 9th European Workshop on System Security, Euro. Sec., vol. 16, 2016.
- [86] P.C. Johnson, S. Bratus, S.W. Smith, Protecting against malicious bits on the wire: automatically generating a USB protocol parser for a production kernel. in: Proceedings of

the 33rd Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC), 2017, pp. 528–541.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3134600.3134630>.

- [87] M. Russinovich, Inside native applications, Microsoft website.
<https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/sysinternals/resources/inside-native-applications>, 2006
(accessed 8 April 2024).
- [88] GrantMeStrength, alvinashcraft, guyharris, GHubAnthony, Karl-Bridge-Microsoft, DCtheGeek, drewbatgit, stevewhims, v-kents, JKirsch1, jameshkramer, mijacobs, msatranjr, Windows API index, Microsoft website. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/apiindex/windows-api-list>, 2018 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [89] Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., Universally unique identifier, Wikipedia,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universally_unique_identifier, 2021 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [90] Microsoft, Inc., WM_DEVICECHANGE message, Microsoft website.
<https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/devio/wm-devicechange>, 2021 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [91] Microsoft, Inc., DEV_BROADCAST_DEVICEINTERFACE_A structure (dbt.h), Microsoft website. https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/dbt/ns-dbt-dev_broadcast_deviceinterface_a, 2021 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [92] Microsoft, Inc., Microsoft, SQL Server Compact 4.0. <https://www.microsoft.com/zh-tw/download/details.aspx?id=30709>, vol. SP1, 2020 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [93] Microsoft, Inc., OLE DB Driver for SQL Server (OLE DB) Interfaces.
<https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/sql/connect/oledb/ole-db-interfaces/oledb-driver-for-sql-server-ole-db-interfaces?view=sql-server-ver16>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).

- [94] V. Blecha, Combining raw input and keyboard hook to selectively block input from multiple keyboards. <https://www.codeproject.com/Articles/716591/Combining-Raw-Inputand-keyboard-Hook-to-selective>, 2014 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [95] Microsoft, Inc., BCryptGenRandom function (bcrypt.h), Microsoft Website. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/win32/api/bcrypt/nf-bcrypt-bcryptgenrandom>, 2016 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [96] N. Sofer, FileActivityWatch v1.70. https://www.nirsoft.net/utis/file_activity_watch.html, 2018 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [97] N. Sofer, DNSQuerySniffer v1.95. https://www.nirsoft.net/utis/dns_query_sniffer.html, 2013 (accessed 8 April 2024).
- [98] K. Alzhrani, A. Aljaedi, Windows and linux random number generation process: A comparative analysis, *Int. J. Comput. Appl.* 113 (2016) 17–25. <https://doi.org/10.5120/19847-1710>.
- [99] S. Cohney, A. Kwong, S. Paz, D. Genkin, N. Heninger, E. Ronen, Y. Yarom, Pseudorandom Black Swans: Cache Attacks on CTR_DRBG. in: 2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), San Francisco, CA, 2020.
- [100] T. Hoang, Y. Shen, Security analysis of NIST CTR-DRBG. in: 40th Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO, Santa Barbara, CA, 2020.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. Abstract communication layers potentially exposed by peripheral vulnerabilities [9]

Fig. 2. Composite USB device with two configurations [9]

Fig. 3. Enumeration between device and host [9]

Fig. 4. USBIPS structure

Fig. 5. USBIPS device classifier

Fig. 6. Allowlisting-based USBIPS access controller

Fig. 7. USBIPS HID behavior observer

Fig. 8. USBIPS illegal storage access behavior detector

Fig. 9. USBIPS illegal network usage detector

Fig. 10. Experiment structure for evaluating effectiveness of allowlisting-based access control and behavior-based detection of USBIPS

Fig. 11. USBIPS allowlists

Fig. 12. Usage records of USB devices plugged into host

Fig. 13. Effectiveness of behavior-based detection of rubber ducky

Fig. 14. Experiment results of detecting data theft attack using USBIPS

Fig. 15. Experiment results of detecting DNS spoofing attack using USBIPS

Vitae



Chun-Yi Wang received his Ph.D. degree in Computer Science and Information Engineering from National Central University, Taoyuan, Taiwan (R.O.C.) in 2022. He is a cybersecurity architecture at FaceHeart Corp., Taiwan. His research interests include system security, mobile device security, USB peripheral security, network security, and digital image

processing.



Fu-Hau Hsu received his Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from Stony Brook University, New York, USA in 2004. He is a professor at the Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering of National Central University, Taiwan (R.O.C.). His research focuses on system security, network security, smart phone security, IoT security, vehicle

security, web security, and security of industry 4.0.