

# Can You Still See Me?: Reconstructing Robot Operations Over End-to-End Encrypted Channels

Ryan Shah, Chuadhry Mujeeb Ahmed, Shishir Nagaraja

University of Strathclyde, Glasgow

UK

{first.last}@strath.ac.uk

## ABSTRACT

Connected robots play a key role in Industry 4.0, providing automation and higher efficiency for many industrial workflows. Unfortunately, these robots can leak sensitive information regarding these operational workflows to remote adversaries. While there exists mandates for the use of end-to-end encryption for data transmission in such settings, it is entirely possible for passive adversaries to fingerprint and reconstruct entire workflows being carried out – establishing an understanding of how facilities operate. In this paper, we investigate whether a remote attacker can accurately fingerprint robot movements and ultimately reconstruct operational workflows. Using a neural network approach to traffic analysis, we find that one can predict TLS-encrypted movements with around ~60% accuracy, increasing to near-perfect accuracy under realistic network conditions. Further, we also find that attackers can reconstruct warehousing workflows with similar success. Ultimately, simply adopting best cybersecurity practices is clearly not enough to stop even weak (passive) adversaries.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• Security and privacy → Systems security; Network security; Side-channel analysis and countermeasures.

## KEYWORDS

industrial robot, security, privacy, TLS, side-channel attack, traffic analysis, SDN, neural network

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The field of robotics has seen a rise in implementations for a wide variety of sectors, including the automotive and healthcare industry, bringing promise of higher levels of accuracy and minimised risk of liability and arising complications [65, 71]. Whilst robotic systems traditionally pose many safety challenges, being Internet-connected with networks of sensors and other embedded devices exposes them to attacks in the cyber domain, such as fingerprinting attacks [11, 54].

Teleoperated robotics systems are becoming more prominent in a wide array of environments, most notably in industry (i.e. warehouse robots [8, 66]) and healthcare (i.e. surgical robots [31, 75]). In most teleoperated robots we observe a similar architecture. This consists of a controller (or pendant) that is connected to the robot and provides feedback to the (human) operator, as well as allowing complete control or selection of pre-defined tasks.

While prior art has demonstrated several types of attacks on teleoperated robotic systems, ranging from active targeted attacks such as modifying/dropping commands in-flight and modifying

feedback to operators [4, 13, 22, 63], there has been less focus on reconnaissance aspects. Although eavesdropping and fingerprinting is a more passive opportunity for attackers, the resulting attacks on robotic operations are still of importance. Even if strict security requirements are conformed to, such as using cryptographic measures to ensure the confidentiality of transmitted data, there are still arising threats that cannot be ignored. The question we aim to address is whether it is still possible for an adversary to infer information about what operations a robot is carrying out? Further, can this be successful even when the communication is protected by appropriate channel security technology (e.g. TLS)?

**End-to-End Encryption Measures.** While it is common sense to ensure the integrity/confidentiality of data transmission in Internet-connected robotics systems, in industrial contexts the use of end-to-end encryption is not mandated nor is it defined as a standard protection measure. Interestingly, in other areas such as surgical robots, the use of TLS is required for legal compliance as set out by legislation such as HIPAA [6, 51, 57] and MDR [59]. In any case, however, although TLS is used to protect the confidentiality of transmitted data, we find in this work that this is not enough to ensure confidentiality of operational workflows.

**Our Contributions.** In this work, we explore the threats to the privacy of the physical processes and people involved in the outcomes of such an attack. The key idea is to extract unique traffic features on the movements of a teleoperated robot from the network layer data. For our experiments, we collected samples of TLS-encrypted traffic by eavesdropping on the communication channel between a robot and controller in a teleoperated architecture. By analysing this traffic, we show that an adversary could pin-point individual movements, however combinations of movements are not so easy to infer. This provoked a response to use a neural network, which has shown to be successful in other areas such as website/user fingerprinting [1, 58]. By using a neural network, we show that an adversary can identify movement patterns averaging around ~60% accuracy, reaching perfect accuracy under realistic network conditions of variable packet loss and link delay. Furthermore, we demonstrate that this adversary can also reconstruct warehousing workflows with high accuracy. To conclude, we also investigate the use of Tor as a countermeasure against our proposed attack.

**Organisation.** The remainder of the paper is organised as follows: In Section 2, we provide a more in-depth background on robotic systems and the problem space. In Section 3, we discuss the environment in which we conducted traffic analysis and detail our findings. In Section 5 we provide a discussion of this work, and related work is described in Section 6. We then conclude in Section 7.

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Teleoperated Robotics

The use of robotic systems in safety-critical environments has increased, with promise of higher levels of accuracy and precision of operation, and ultimately minimising the risk of complications that arise during and after operation. Reuters describe that the shipments for robotic systems has increased by nearly 16% from 2017, which ultimately corresponds to an increase in robotic installations [65]. While previous robotic suites were configured based on pre-planned operations [7, 71], many modern robotic suites are teleoperated [4, 13, 21, 75]. These systems share a common architecture [63], consisting of a controller (e.g. a surgeon’s console or teach pendant), a set of input and output devices (e.g. sensors and actuators) and a network in which the robot operates, linked together via an electronic control system (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Typical Teleoperated Robot Architecture

The link between the controller and main control system is a key safety-critical component of system operation, where feedback from the robot and inputs to the robot traverse. The type of controller differs between operational contexts, however the fundamental use of the controller (i.e. to send control commands) remains the same. For example, in surgical robotic systems the controller has evolved into a console [31, 75] which is operated by a human who uses finger controllers and foot pedals that translate human movements into instructions the robot can interpret. In contrast, industrial robots are equipped with a teach pendant [21, 63] that consists of touch screen with an interactive GUI or physical buttons to control the robot.

### 2.2 Threat Model

Although several defenses and safety mechanisms have been proposed [4, 13, 22, 63], many attacks focus on an active adversary,




Figure 2: Robot and Traffic Analysis Setup

with little attention paid to weaker (capabilities of) passive adversaries and their impact on operational privacy. Here, we consider a passive adversary to be able to eavesdrop on the communication channel between the key component of modern robotic systems, the controller, and the robot itself (Figure 2). First, an insider (e.g. technical staff who can access the internal organisational or robot network) can potentially eavesdrop on robot operations. By collecting the observed traffic and combining this with other data, information leakages about the operational environment exposes another degree of detail. The technical staff could potentially be bribed to sell this data on, or even possibly attempt to discredit the operator or company, at the expense of breaching operational privacy. Second, in the case of a passive outsider, competing organisations could use operational information to compare performance or, further, also use this information to compromise operational privacy. In either case, we investigate whether it is possible for an adversary to identify robot movements even when appropriate channel security is employed.

**Hypotheses and Goals** Prior art has demonstrated traffic analysis over plain-text robot traffic [49], or compromising privacy by tracking system users [69], with security solutions such as ciphering messages and encrypting network communication using SSL/TLS [82]. However, the question remains as to whether it is still possible to identify a robot’s movements even when measures such as TLS are employed? In this work, our primary goal is to determine whether an adversary can infer robot movements from encrypted traffic flows alone. Second to this, we hypothesise whether a higher level of granularity is present in this case with potential reconstruction of procedures. By doing this, it is entirely possible to pinpoint operational patterns and ultimately piece together entire workflows.

## 3 SYSTEM DESIGN

To these hypotheses and goals, we investigate whether an adversary can identify our robot’s operations and ultimately reconstruct entire workflows. The focus of our study is on modern teleoperated robot architectures, where the key communication channel is between the controller (i.e. a teach pendant) and the robot itself, as shown in Figure 2. We made use of uFactory’s uARM Swift Pro, which is operated by an Arduino Mega 2560 running MicroPython. The robot is connected to a controller to mimic the teleoperated robot architecture, which is run on a Windows 10 laptop using the uARM Python (3.8.X) SDK. In accordance with communications used for teleoperated robots [86], we follow a master-slave communication topology in which an asynchronous TCP/IP socket is established for peer-to-peer communication. The message structure in our implementation involves only a change to the robot system message (payload) in which system status and position information is to be transmitted. The session management data class in prior work is handled via TLS session establishment. To enable TLS-encrypted communications between the robot and controller, we route traffic through a software-defined network (SDN) using Mininet 2.3.0, running a TLSv1.2 client-server network for simulating realistic network conditions. Ultimately, this protocol can be generalised to teleoperated robots in general due to similarities they share in their architecture. The key generalisation here in terms of the

packet structure is movement data. Additional information such as imaging, system information and sensor data do not directly contribute to movement inference in non-autonomous systems, beside influence on human operators to make decisions on these movements. Further, while our robot only has 3 degrees of freedom (for position), additional degrees of freedom will only increase payload. This may slightly influence inter-arrival and round-trip times. In any case, this would be interesting to see the impact as a point of future work for this attack. Finally, we used Wireshark to capture the encrypted communication between the robot and controller, imitating our passive adversary.


There are several challenges to carrying out procedure reconstruction:

- (RQ<sub>1</sub>) Can we detect individual robot movements on each axis?
- (RQ<sub>2</sub>) Can we detect combinations of robot movements?
- (RQ<sub>3</sub>) Is it possible to reconstruct operational workflows that correspond to a set pattern of movements?
- (RQ<sub>4</sub>) How is the identification of movements affected by the distance and speed in which the robot moves?
- (RQ<sub>5</sub>) How do realistic network conditions such as network delay affect the identification of robot movements?

### 3.1 Challenges in Applying Traffic Analysis Approaches

In order to understand the challenges better, we carry out a preliminary analysis of the problem setting. In this work, the focus is on teleoperated industrial robots and the reproduction of warehousing operations via the traffic analysis side channel. We believe that our robot and network setup is a suitable replication candidate for a traffic analysis study, in comparison with the likes of other single-arm robots (of at least 3 degrees-of-freedom) used in warehouses. This is because the majority of these robots consist of the same principal components as our robot for movement inference (i.e. stepper motors, actuators, etc.). Ultimately, the only meaningful data for movement fingerprinting from a traffic analysis perspective is the transmission of control commands which would affect timing patterns and message payload, among others. Data from other components, such as sensing equipment, would be indistinguishable to data provided by actuators and motors which operate via control commands sent by the controller. However, these other components may provide useful information from other side channels, such as acoustic or power, which can be used in combination with the traffic analysis side channel. Ultimately, the first step to addressing our challenges is to generate appropriate traffic traces which will clarify the challenges involved in applying traffic analysis approaches.

**Robot Traffic Traces.** We follow an emulation approach to generate a variety of traffic behaviour. We programmed the uARM robot to carry out a set of movement operations it allows along the X, Y and Z axes. In addition to capturing single movements, we also programmed combined movements (i.e. movement along the X and Y axes simultaneously). As well as combined movements, for more fine-grained analysis we also programmed movements with varying distances (in mm), as well as varying speeds of movement (mm/s) for a more fine-grained analysis. Finally, we wanted to determine whether an adversary can fingerprint these movements under realistic network conditions. The justification for our choice




**Figure 3: Packets per Second for Robot Movements**

The flow of packets per second across movements show that time-series analysis alone does not provide enough basis for fingerprinting movements of network emulation framework is given in Section 5. Within the emulated network, we programmed varying network link delays (between the controller and robot) and packet losses over this link. The dataset for the range of experimental parameters contains around 150,000 samples.

Within our dataset, we collected the traffic features for packets travelling between the robot and controller in the teleoperated architecture. Within each packet sent from the controller to the robot, the payload data contains the set of G-code instructions for the corresponding robot operation(s) to be performed. From our traffic capture, we look at the following features: *Packet Time*, *Frame Length*, *FrameCapLen* (frame length stored in the capture file), *IP Length*, *TCP Length*, *Bytes In Flight*, *Push Bytes Sent* (bytes sent since last PSH flag), *ACK Round-Trip-Time (RTT)*, and *TLS Record Length*.

**Packet Feature Analysis.** First, we wanted to determine how *time-frequency* representations of traffic features may offer clues towards what robot movement is being carried out (Figure 3). We note that among all movements, an average of 2 packets are sent between the robot and controller per second. The second interval between packets sent corresponds to the programmed movement interval in order to capture each movement’s traffic data properly. We observe an increase in packets at the start of each operation, which corresponds to the initialisation of the communication between the robot and controller (such as TLS initialisation and robot-controller configuration) and not the movements, and thus are discounted. We found that the frequency of packets across time does not vary past the initialisation at the beginning of each data collection step.

We then explored how each of the traffic features contained within these packets vary across our movement samples (Figure 4). Here, the x-axis is the movement and the y-axis is the size of the traffic feature. Initially, across most of the features (aside from Packet Time and RTT), we observe a similar pattern, with the XYZ movement being the most *identifiable* in comparison. Both the X and Z movements appear to be more similar, also seen with the XY and YZ movements, however the median values in each case are at opposite ends of the inter-quartile range (which is the same for both sets of movements in this comparison, respectively). Interestingly,




**Figure 4: Traffic Features Across Movements**

the packet time and RTT are relatively similar with little difference in the case of outlying values. For the uARM robot, each packet and its corresponding traffic features constitute a flow (each movement operation corresponds to a flow). In other robotic systems, this flow may be split up and is a consideration for future work. Overall, we found that simple approaches such as *eye-balling the dataset* or *basic frequency analysis* is not enough to answer the challenges listed above.

### 3.2 Workflow Reconstruction Approach

For our reconstruction approach we chose to take a neural network approach to recognise traffic features, identify robot movements and thereby reconstructing warehousing workflows. This is based on a set of features from the encrypted robot traffic. The effectiveness of applying machine learning techniques on encrypted traffic has been demonstrated in other applications such as VoIP [45, 56, 80]. Our reconstruction technique involves several stages. First, we pre-process the data to remove noise. Second, we identify basic traffic features. Next, we construct a neural network to classify the features into robot behaviours in order to fingerprint encrypted traffic flows thus aiding workflow reconstruction.

**Dataset Pre-Processing.** In order to allow for a deep learning approach, we pre-processed our robot movement dataset (Section 3.1)



**Figure 5: Neural Network Architecture**

to remove fields with constant values that would have no impact on the outcome (i.e. TCP flags which were the same for all samples) and handle any NaN/null values. We then normalised our dataset using the *sklearn* [61] *MinMaxScaler* which scales and translates each feature individually to a real number in the range of (0, 1) on the training set. Due to the Y and YZ movements having a larger distance range compared to other movements, there is a larger sample size. Therefore, we also use *sklearn* to stratify and weight our dataset. We then used the *train\_test\_split* function to produce our training and testing datasets. Specifically, during the randomised splitting process, 20% of samples were used for testing and from the training set a further 20% of the samples were used for validation. This resulted in a 60/20/20 split for training, testing and validation respectively.

**Deep Neural Network Architecture.** After pre-processing the samples, we then constructed our neural network. To create the network, we use the *Keras* [16] Python library to construct a sequential model (Figure 5). The input layer consisted of 16 neurons for our 16 feature columns. After the input layer, we use one hidden layer. This is a *Dense* layer with 108 neurons. The choice of the number of neurons for this layer is based upon keeping the number of neurons below  $N$  to prevent over-fitting. We calculate  $N$  using the following formula [24], for a single hidden layer:

$$N_h = \frac{N_s}{(\alpha * (N_i + N_o))}$$

where:

- $N_i$  = Number of input neurons
- $N_o$  = Number of output neurons
- $N_s$  = Number of samples in training dataset
- $\alpha$  = Arbitrary scaling factor

The alpha ( $\alpha$ ) value is the effective branching factor (number of non-zero) weights for each neuron, which we give a value of 2. The value of  $N_s$  is 4968, the number of samples in the training set for our baseline, such that we can effectively compare against our other experiment parameters (Section 4.3), giving us a maximum (optimum) number of neurons 108. This layer uses the ReLU activation function [25] to have the output in the range of [0, 1] for use as predicted probabilities, with categorical cross-entropy [87] for our loss function. We used Adam with a learning rate of 0.00001 for our optimiser, with higher learning rates resulting in lower accuracy scores. As we are using softmax activation, this layer has 7 neurons with each corresponding to one of our movement classes.

| Movement | Precision | Recall |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| X        | 70%       | 85%    |
| Y        | 69%       | 54%    |
| Z        | 80%       | 63%    |
| XY       | 21%       | 60%    |
| XZ       | 68%       | 92%    |
| YZ       | 81%       | 31%    |
| XYZ      | 72%       | 97%    |

**Table 1: Baseline Classification Results**

**Choice of Activation and Optimisation Functions.** We chose to use the ReLU activation function over other activation functions as the reduced likelihood of vanishing gradient allows for a constant gradient resulting in faster learning. Further, the sparsity of representations are shown to be more beneficial than dense representations, as seen in other activations such as sigmoids [3, 42, 44]. We use the softmax activation function, combined with categorical cross-entropy [87] for our loss function as this is a multi-class classification problem. Simply, a sample can belong to one of our 7 classes, with each class corresponding to one of the robot movements. As well as this, we make use of the Adam optimiser – an extension to the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) method based on adaptive estimation of first- and second-order moments [40]. Specifically, it allows for the updating of network weights iteratively based on the training data. We chose this widely recommended optimiser as it fits best with our weighted sample sets in opposition to other tried methods such as standard SGD, RMSProp and SGD + Nesterov Momentum.

## 4 EVALUATION

### 4.1 Baseline Evaluation

In accordance with our hypotheses, the first two ( $RQ_1$  and  $RQ_2$ ) aim to determine whether we can detect the individual robot movements on each of our robot’s axes, as well as combinations of movement. Each movement corresponds to the robot arm moving from some reference point to a destination in specified directions. We term our first set of experiments the baseline, where the distance of movement is set to 1mm and the lowest speed (12.5mm/s) with no network parameters (link delay or packet loss) in effect. This allows us to compare the impact of all parameters individually on classification accuracy.


As depicted in Table 1, we can view the precision and recall, as well as the classification accuracy for our baseline [34]. The precision metric is the ratio of correctly predicted positive movements to the total predicted positive movements. In the case of our baseline, we can observe relatively good precision for most classes averaging around ~65%, with the exception of the XY movement. Notably, the Z and YZ movements show the highest precision of around 80%. In the case of recall, the frequency of predicted movements are correctly classified, which we can see is outstanding for the X, XZ and XYZ movements. However, as with precision, the recall for the movements involving Y show to be the lowest. From Figure 4, we can observe that this is likely due to the similarities in traffic features across these movements. In the context of this study, good or perfect recall is desirable but not the most important if certain

movements may be missed. We see that the recall across most movements is good and thus, the combination of certain movements – even with some missing – can still lead to the identification of entire workflows.

### 4.2 Workflow Reconstruction

From this, the next stage of our experiments focuses on our second hypotheses ( $RQ_3$ ), to determine whether we can indeed reconstruct warehousing workflows which are made up of combinations of these baseline movements. And, if so, to what degree of accuracy can they be recovered? For this experiment, the focus was on a subset of common warehousing workflows that involve robotic arms. This includes: pick-and-place, push, pull and packing operations. We chose these workflows, as they represent those that are unique and common operations to a realistic warehouse which makes use of these robots [12, 39, 76, 81]. Quantifying the accuracy of recovering these workflows allows us to meaningfully demonstrate that an adversary could reveal daily operating environments within logistics supply chains.

For these operations, we took inspiration for movement trajectories from existing industrial robot datasets, such as the *Forward Dynamics Dataset Using KUKA LWR and Baxter* [62] for pick and place and the *Inverse Dynamics Dataset Using KUKA* [70] for push/pull. At the heart of these workflows is the actual dynamic movements themselves which may be aided by additional input (i.e. from sensors). Ultimately, given that movement patterns are the primary factor which establishes these workflows, it is reasonable to conduct our experiment on reconstructing workflows from traffic patterns solely using position data. In total, we have over 100 sets of test samples for each workflow with varying speeds of movement, distances and directions to be evaluated using our neural network approach.



**Figure 6: Warehousing Workflows**  
(a) Push; (b) Pull; (c) Pick and Place; (d) Packing.

As shown in Table 2, we can observe that on average the manufacturing workflows can be recovered much better than individual movements, averaging around 90% accuracy. This is an important result as it demonstrates that continuous monitoring of movement patterns can reveal potentially confidential workflows and could be

given to competing facilities, for example. Further, this information can even be combined with other side-channels such as acoustic or power which may provide another level of granularity regarding information leakage (i.e. identifying the weight of products being cross-docked (pick-and-place) through acoustic reflections could potentially provide an indicator for its contents).

| Operation      | Recovery Rate | Pos Changes |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|
| Push           | 97%           | 2-3         |
| Pull           | 97%           | 2-3         |
| Pick-and-Place | 84%           | 7-9         |
| Packing        | 88%           | 6-9         |

**Table 2: Workflow Reconstruction Results**

### 4.3 Impact of Experimental Parameters on Movement Classification

In our next set of experiments, we want to determine the impact of robot parameters (distance and speed –  $RQ_4$ ) and network parameters (jitter and packet loss –  $RQ_5$ ) on the classification accuracy. In real-world networks the channel between the controller and robot may experience jitter, packet losses or delays. Jitter and packet loss in real-world networks are known to follow a Poisson distribution [20, 33, 43, 50, 55], particularly in the case of single-link communication (such as the case of teleoperated robots) whose interaction can be abstracted to the likes of an M/M/1 queue for example [41, 47]. To realistically emulate link characteristics, we make use of link parameters in the Mininet SDN for delay and packet loss between the robot and controller. Notably, Mininet follows a Poisson process for packet arrival in a single link system, which meets our expectations for real-world network emulation. Further, in our Mininet SDN we use a link speed of 100Mb/s which has shown that emulating link properties of delay and packet loss at this rate can be done realistically [84]. In the following experiments, we use a base distance of 1mm and speed of 25k (corresponding to 12.5mm/s, with future speed iterations being a factor of 2000 with a maximum speed of 100mm/s).

**4.3.1 Impact of Movement Distance on Classification Accuracy.** The first parameter we tested was the distance the robotic arm moved in a particular direction. The results of this experiment can be seen in Table 3. For comparison, the baseline distance can be observed at a single distance unit ( $D = 1$ ). At 2 distance units (mm), we can observe a decrease in precision among the X, Z, XZ and YZ movements. The X and Z movements and XZ samples seem to be incorrectly classified as each other, with most of the XZ samples being predicted actually being Y samples. Interestingly, the low precision of XY is due to incorrect classifications of either Y or YZ, perhaps due to the similarities in pack features between them. In most cases we found an increase in recall. For the baseline, we already found that movements involving the Y axis were lower in comparison with other movements, but with this first increase in distance we find an increase in their precision. At 5 distance units, we observe that the results are fairly similar, with the XY movement precision increasing but with incorrect predictions of Y and YZ movements as with 2 distance units. Notably, the Z movement has perfect recall. With the XZ movement, we observe that the precision and recall

decrease further again, with most samples here being incorrectly as X or Z. At 10 distance units, we see decreases in precision and recall across all movements aside from the Y and XY movements. At 25 units, we observe similar results to those seen at 10 units, with the exception of YZ which has a precision of around 96% and the recall of XYZ movements being perfect. Finally, at 50 distance units, the XZ movement is classified correctly but not successfully, as seen at lower distance units.

**Findings.** Overall we found that not only does the distance of movement provide more granularity to inferred movements, but does also influence the adversary’s ability to fingerprint them. While an increase in distance does reduce the accuracy of classifying some movements, we believe that changes in the payload (i.e. larger number for distance in plaintext) and round trip time better showcase trends on the Y-axis as distance increases. Further, among some movement classes, we found that increasing the distance parameter does correlate with incorrect predictions among similar classes (i.e. XZ with both the X and Z movements).

**4.3.2 Impact of Movement Speed on Classification Accuracy.** For our next experiment, we look into how the speed of the movement affects the classification accuracy, with the results depicted in Table 4. For comparison, the baseline speed can be observed at  $S = 25k$ . At  $S = 50k$ , we notice a slight decrease in precision for most movement classes, aside from the Z and XY movements which show a slight increase. Similar to the distance parameter, most XY predictions are actually Y and YZ movement samples which we believe to be due to close similarities in traffic features, however this is lower than the baseline leading to the slight increase in precision. Similarly, we also observe a decrease in recall in the same cases, aside from the X and XY movements. At  $S = 100k$ , we observe further decreases in precision and recall for the Y, XZ, YZ and XYZ movements. Notably, the X movement has perfect precision and recall, and the Z and XY movements show both improved precision and recall from the previous speed iterations. At  $S = 150k$ , we can see that the precision and recall for the X movement drop to similar results as with  $S = 50k$ . Similarly, among the Y, YZ and XYZ movements we notice an increase in precision with others decreasing slightly compared to previous results. The recall in most cases show a decrease, aside from the YZ and XYZ movements which have the highest recall respectively among all speed iterations. Finally, at  $S = 200k$ , the results show to be similar to the  $S = 100k$  results but with lower recall.

**Findings.** In this experiment we find that movement speed gives improvements to movement classification compared to the baseline, specifically at  $S = 100k$ . We can also see that overall, we gain slightly better results for fingerprinting movements are provided from the speed parameter when compared to the distance parameter.

**4.3.3 Impact of Network Link Delay on Classification Accuracy.** The next step is to observe the impact of varying network parameters on the accuracy of our fingerprinting attack. Specifically, we first look at the link delay to observe the impact on classification over real-world network scenarios. In Mininet, this parameter corresponds to the packet delay time over the link – in this case between the robot and controller. While it is possible to emulate a series of random delays throughout movement transmissions (as delays may

| D = Distance (mm), P = Precision, R = Recall |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |      |      |      |     |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|
|                                              | D=1 |     | D=2 |     | D=5 |      | D=10 |     | D=25 |      | D=50 |     |
|                                              | P   | R   | P   | R   | P   | R    | P    | R   | P    | R    | P    | R   |
| X                                            | 70% | 85% | 60% | 59% | 62% | 84%  | 38%  | 63% | 36%  | 57%  | 52%  | 38% |
| Y                                            | 69% | 54% | 76% | 49% | 69% | 45%  | 75%  | 45% | 54%  | 37%  | 67%  | 8%  |
| Z                                            | 80% | 63% | 72% | 78% | 74% | 100% | 30%  | 62% | 31%  | 82%  | 41%  | 86% |
| XY                                           | 21% | 60% | 28% | 58% | 38% | 74%  | 68%  | 94% | 67%  | 14%  | 26%  | 55% |
| XZ                                           | 68% | 92% | 43% | 74% | 33% | 35%  | 0%   | 0%  | 0%   | 0%   | 38%  | 65% |
| YZ                                           | 81% | 31% | 67% | 48% | 80% | 47%  | 72%  | 28% | 96%  | 71%  | 84%  | 62% |
| XYZ                                          | 72% | 97% | 78% | 88% | 61% | 97%  | 36%  | 94% | 54%  | 100% | 53%  | 77% |

**Table 3: Classification Results With Distance Parameter**

*Examining movement distance gives us a more fine-grained inferral of movements, with classification accuracy increasing with movement distance in most cases compared to the baseline.*

| S = Speed (mm/s), P = Precision, R = Recall |       |     |       |     |        |      |        |     |        |     |
|---------------------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|------|--------|-----|--------|-----|
|                                             | S=25k |     | S=50k |     | S=100k |      | S=150k |     | S=200k |     |
|                                             | P     | R   | P     | R   | P      | R    | P      | R   | P      | R   |
| X                                           | 70%   | 85% | 66%   | 89% | 100%   | 100% | 67%    | 88% | 66%    | 85% |
| Y                                           | 69%   | 54% | 62%   | 46% | 61%    | 28%  | 65%    | 34% | 56%    | 45% |
| Z                                           | 80%   | 63% | 82%   | 60% | 90%    | 98%  | 80%    | 62% | 75%    | 65% |
| XY                                          | 21%   | 60% | 24%   | 70% | 26%    | 76%  | 20%    | 46% | 23%    | 41% |
| XZ                                          | 68%   | 92% | 61%   | 86% | 37%    | 83%  | 34%    | 70% | 42%    | 68% |
| YZ                                          | 81%   | 31% | 79%   | 28% | 69%    | 24%  | 74%    | 45% | 66%    | 39% |
| XYZ                                         | 72%   | 97% | 68%   | 95% | 66%    | 97%  | 86%    | 97% | 73%    | 97% |

**Table 4: Classification Results With Speed Parameter**

*Examining the speed of movement gives us a more fine-grained movement fingerprint with classification accuracy showing similar increases across some iterations as with distance.*

| L = Link Delay, P = Precision, R = Recall |        |      |        |      |         |      |      |      |
|-------------------------------------------|--------|------|--------|------|---------|------|------|------|
|                                           | L=10ms |      | L=50ms |      | L=100ms |      | L=1s |      |
|                                           | P      | R    | P      | R    | P       | R    | P    | R    |
| X                                         | 64%    | 89%  | 99%    | 100% | 100%    | 100% | 98%  | 100% |
| Y                                         | 100%   | 100% | 100%   | 99%  | 100%    | 100% | 100% | 99%  |
| Z                                         | 80%    | 63%  | 100%   | 100% | 100%    | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| XY                                        | 99%    | 90%  | 100%   | 100% | 100%    | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| XZ                                        | 89%    | 83%  | 76%    | 100% | 100%    | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| YZ                                        | 100%   | 99%  | 100%   | 85%  | 100%    | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| XYZ                                       | 100%   | 99%  | 89%    | 100% | 100%    | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**Table 5: Classification Results With Network Link Delay**

*We observe a significant improvement when a low link delay is introduced, with the precision, recall and accuracy reaching perfect as the delay increases.*

typically be unpredictable in terms of magnitude in a realistic setting), we wanted to observe the impact of packet delay times over a range of values that may be considered reasonable for continued operation in safety-critical contexts.

First, we look at the impact of network link delay on movement classification, with the results shown in Table 5. In comparison with the baseline results shown in Table 1, we observe a significant increase in both precision and recall in all cases, with the majority of movements having perfect precision and recall. As seen in the table, the X movement initially has the poorest precision and Z with the poorest recall. In this case, a proportion of the X movements are incorrectly classified as Z and vice-versa – a similar trend seen

in previous experiments. However, overall as the delay increases we see significant improvements.

**Findings.** In this set of experiments, we find that introducing a low link delay significantly improves the precision and recall of all movements. As the delay increases over the robot-controller link, our results show that an adversary can infer movements with some degree of link delay almost perfectly where there are *acceptable* delays, and even better with larger delays. We note that this significant increase – in comparison with our other experiments and the baseline – may be due to differences in round-trip time and packet interarrivals for each movements, increasing the variation among them collectively, unlike distance and speed which seem to only affect the payload of the collected traffic.

#### 4.3.4 Impact of Network Packet Loss on Classification Accuracy.

Next, we look into the effect of network packet loss on classification of movements. Realistically, failures or inefficiencies of network components that carry the data, such as a faulty router or weak wireless signal, can cause lost or dropped packets and thus should be accounted for. In a TLS connection, *TCP flow control* detects packet losses and attempts to retransmit these messages for reliable communication and results in decreased throughput, which we believe may have an impact on time series data gathered from our attack. In a realistic scenario, the question surrounding potential and acceptable packet losses are important. In many applications, quality of service considerations are given based on the type of data sent. For a safety-critical IoT system such as industrial robots, even the loss of some amount of packets could result in delays that

could lead to or be unable to prevent serious harm. It has been noted that losses between 5% and 10% of the total packet stream seriously impacts the quality of service [48]. For completeness, we start with a 10% loss and move up to 50% loss. While this may be rare and potentially unavoidable if this is the case, we feel that it is still useful to determine the feasibility of our attack. Even given a larger number of packet loss, movement data may still be present with (spuriously) retransmitted packets if the network was deemed unfit for a robot to continue reliably performing operations over. In Mininet, the packet loss is the rate of packet loss (% of random packets per second) over a given link. The results for this experiment can be seen in Table 6. In comparison with the baseline, we observe similar results with the effect of network link delay shown in Table 5 with a significant increase across all movements. At 10% loss, we observe near perfect accuracy of the model with only slight drops in precision most notably for the X movement. This is due to some X samples being mis-predicted as XZ movements. At 25% packet loss, we see much more of an improvement with most classes having 100% precision and recall. The X movement here improves, however the Z movement precision decreases in comparison to that at 10% loss, where some predicted XZ movements are Y movements. Finally, at 50% loss, we again see similar trends. However, the precision for the X, Z and XZ movements decreases but still notably better than the baseline results.

**Findings.** As with our other network parameter experiment (link delay), introducing a percentage packet loss over the robot-controller link also results in greater precision, recall and overall classification accuracy of our robot’s movements in all cases. Given the use of TLS as our secure channel technology for the robot-controller link in the emulated network, drops in packet arrivals will result in transmissions with increased interarrival times. Notably, some work highlights a possible correlation between packet loss and higher link utilisation which can increase packet interarrival times [78].

| L = Packet Loss, P = Precision, R = Recall |       |      |       |      |       |      |
|--------------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
|                                            | L=10% |      | L=25% |      | L=50% |      |
|                                            | P     | R    | P     | R    | P     | R    |
| X                                          | 86%   | 100% | 100%  | 100% | 92%   | 100% |
| Y                                          | 100%  | 100% | 100%  | 88%  | 100%  | 100% |
| Z                                          | 100%  | 100% | 100%  | 100% | 84%   | 100% |
| XY                                         | 100%  | 100% | 100%  | 100% | 100%  | 90%  |
| XZ                                         | 91%   | 83%  | 73%   | 100% | 89%   | 83%  |
| YZ                                         | 99%   | 97%  | 100%  | 100% | 100%  | 97%  |
| XYZ                                        | 100%  | 99%  | 100%  | 100% | 100%  | 100% |

**Table 6: Classification Results With Network Packet Loss**

*We observe near perfect accuracy in most cases, with the precision and recall increasing as the loss increases.*

#### 4.4 Open-World Evaluation

In our main set of experiments, we conducted closed-set testing where we assume the attacker to detect a known, strict set of movements. However, realistically, the attacker may only know a subset. Thus, this naturally provokes the need to understand the impact on classification when only some movements are known. In this

case, a comprehensive approach for our dataset is labelling each movement progressively and leaving the rest of the movements unlabelled, to observe the impact of increasing numbers of unlabelled classes.

As shown in Table 7, we present an open-set approach which involves labelling each class progressively, leaving the rest unlabelled. The aim of this is to observe the impact of n-unknown classes. Within this set of experiments, we do not count 1 unknown class, as this would be the same as our baseline. First, for 2 unknown classes ( $U = 2$ ), we see fairly similar outcomes when compared to the baseline results shown in Table 1. For 3 unknowns, we see improvements in precision and recall for all remaining movements. At 4 unknowns, we only see slight improvement for the Z movement, and the recall of the X and Y movements, but a reduction in precision for X and Y compared to 3 unknowns. For 5 unknowns, precision and recall for the Y movement stay relatively consistent, but the precision for X drops greatly with the recall increasing. A greater percentage of X movements are incorrectly predicted where they should fall into the unknowns. Finally at 6 unknowns, we see similar results to 5 unknown classes but the recall is near perfect for the X movement. Overall, we observe that the increase in precision and recall for unknown movements increases and this is expected. Furthermore, the increase in recall in most cases for movements still known is also expected given that the subtle feature differences are more present given a larger variance in feature values for the unknown set.

## 5 DISCUSSION

We have presented the results of experiments investigating whether an adversary can identify robot movements, even when the traffic has been encrypted. In our case, we investigated whether a movement can be identified from preliminary analysis of traffic features such as flow length, and then provide a shallow-learning approach to use these traffic features and select the best features for classifying movements. We then further looked into the ability to reconstruct procedures, specifically in the context of industrial warehouses.

From our preliminary analysis, we found that simply observing variations among traffic features in our sample set one can identify individual movements with some ease. However, similarities arise among all traffic features for other movements (i.e. combined movements such as XY) which makes them harder to identify in this manner (Figure 4). This motivates the need for a deep learning approach to identify robot operations over a TLS-secured channel.

Our evaluation shows that it is indeed possible for a passive attacker to reconstruct procedures even when the traffic is encrypted under TLS, with high accuracy. As a baseline, we show that most movements which our robot can carry out can be predicted with at least 60% accuracy and precision. However, in a realistic setting this may be less than ideal. For example, let’s consider MIT and Boston Dynamic’s *Dr. Spot* [19, 32], which makes use of a tele-operated quadruped robot for measuring patient vital signs. Our work demonstrates that parameters such as distance, for example in the case of the quadruped robot from patient and angle of view, could reveal what vitals are being measured. In combination with other sources of information such as GPS information, this may

| U = # Unknowns, P = Precision, R = Recall |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|-------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                                           | U=2 |     | U=3 |     | U=4 |     | U=5 |     | U=6 |     |
|                                           | P   | R   | P   | R   | P   | R   | P   | R   | P   | R   |
| X                                         | 68% | 84% | 73% | 86% | 71% | 87% | 52% | 99% | 54% | 99% |
| Y                                         | 68% | 55% | 71% | 65% | 62% | 79% | 61% | 82% |     |     |
| Z                                         | 79% | 63% | 79% | 71% | 79% | 65% |     |     |     |     |
| XY                                        | 23% | 67% | 25% | 74% |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| XZ                                        | 67% | 90% |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Unknown                                   | 95% | 54% | 97% | 62% | 88% | 74% | 90% | 65% | 99% | 92% |

**Table 7: Open-World Classification Results**

*These results show the impact on classification accuracy when decreasing the number of known movements while increasing the number of unknown movements. We observe a correlation of decreased accuracy decreases as the number of known movements increase.*

point to what triage zones were visited. This provoked us to explore another level of granularity of movement, specifically in our robot – the distance and speed of movements. In our results, we show that these parameters are meaningful to an attacker, with the accuracy and precision increased by at least 10%. Furthermore, in realistic case settings such as Dr. Spot, teleoperation would be conducted over a wireless network where factors such as packet loss and delay/latency come into play. In our experiments, we show that under such realistic teleoperating conditions, an attacker can identify robot movement operations with very high accuracy.

We take this a step further and demonstrate that we can identify a higher-level of abstraction. Specifically, identifying warehousing workflows (i.e. pick-and-place) where the intuition behind this shows promise to ultimately piecing together entire manufacturing workflows. From here, it could then be possible to compromise operational confidentiality by combining information from this attack with other sources (such as delivery times, package meta-data, information from other side-channels, etc.).

**Emulation of Network Link Characteristics** For measuring the impacts of link characteristics such as packet loss and delay/jitter, a suitable network emulation environment is required. We consider several options such as PlanetLab [17], DETER [9, 10], Emulab [35], NS3 [68] and Mininet [28, 37]. We chose Mininet as it is best suited for modelling arrivals as a Poisson process, a similar behaviour as in teleoperated robots [60]. The justification for not using other approaches is as follows. PlanetLab [17] is a global testbed for network systems research with nodes spread across the earth. The main challenge associated with this is that results are not reproducible as network conditions can vary over time [74]. Other real-world emulation testbeds such as DETER [9, 10] and Emulab [35] face similar challenges, where resources are shared among many researchers which can skew results. NS3 [68] on the other-hand is designed as a discrete-event network simulator and thus, is therefore unsuitable for this work as the network layer will be simulated even if the robot-edge runs live. While Mininet is not without limitations – primarily scalability (due to single threaded components in the core) – in our case of a small network with a few nodes and switches, these limitations do not manifest. Ultimately, it would be interesting to observe how other arrival models for delay and loss would impact movement classification [18, 53].

| Movement | Precision | Recall |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| X        | 38%       | 57%    |
| Y        | 53%       | 88%    |
| Z        | 76%       | 8%     |
| XY       | 35%       | 45%    |
| XZ       | 86%       | 49%    |
| YZ       | 44%       | 27%    |
| XYZ      | 60%       | 80%    |

**Table 8: Tor Classification Results**

## 5.1 Limitations

**Ageing Effects.** Our attack is evaluated on a single robot. However, one question which arises is that if the classifier is trained on a new unit, would it be possible to demonstrate whether the classifier deteriorates over time as the robot ages? In the case of our fingerprinting attack via TLS traffic analysis, this should be mostly unaffected with the payload information staying the same throughout its age. However, network component ageing may have an impact over time on possible link delays and losses, for example, with this demonstrated in Section 4.3.3 and 4.3.4. In any case, to address the concept of ageing in the case of the robot itself, the exploration of other side channels (such as acoustics and power analysis) could be studied to observe the impact of ageing on movement fingerprinting. This is due to the fact that side-channels based on physical processes are subject to ageing, such as with belt-driven robots developing slack over time which can induce drift in physical characteristics (i.e. noise). Further, the impact of device calibration over time could result in variations of robot movements (such as uncalibrated motor axes which can result in unpredictable degrees of movement).

## 5.2 Countermeasures (Tor)

Tor is a potential countermeasure to fingerprinting robot operations via traffic analysis. Tor is a low-latency, circuit-based overlay network which enables anonymous communication by allowing different streams to overlap each other such that traffic volumes will still be hidden. Given that Tor shows some success as a defence, such as in website fingerprinting [36], it is important to see how Tor performs as a countermeasure in the context of our robot. To do this, we setup a Tor hidden service which receives the control commands sent by our controller over HTTPS to the hidden service. Using Wireshark, we were able to monitor incoming traffic


to the hidden service machine and capture common flows which correspond to the robot traffic. Within this experiment, the traffic was routed through multiple autonomous systems over around 20 circuits. From the results in Table 8, we can see that in comparison with our baseline results shown in Table 1, the precision across most movements decreases slightly (averaging ~20% decrease), with the exception of the XY and XZ movements which show an increase in precision of 14% and 18% respectively. In the case of recall, we also notice more decreases across the movements, with an increase of 34% only present for the Y movement. Notably, we also notice a substantial drop in recall for the Z and XZ movements with a decrease of 55% and 43% respectively. Further, looking into performance impact of Tor, we can see that the latency does not (overall) present as a big problem for many cases with packet times fairly sporadic but under 1s. However, in critical cases this wait time for control commands to be received may be less than desirable. We then explored the success of workflow reconstruction when Tor is employed as a countermeasure. The results are described in Table 9. In comparison with our reconstruction results found in Section 3.2, we find that the use of Tor as a countermeasure reduces the recovery rate by at least a factor of 2, which is a significant drop. However, this accuracy in comparison with baseline individual movements (non-patterns) is relatively similar.

| Operation      | Recovery Rate | Pos Changes |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|
| Push           | 45%           | 2–3         |
| Pull           | 47%           | 2–3         |
| Pick-and-Place | 51%           | 7–9         |
| Packing        | 48%           | 6–9         |

**Table 9: Tor Procedure Reconstruction Results**

Given that the use of Tor as a countermeasure shows to be successful, it is interesting to dive deeper and understand why exactly this is the case. In Figure 7, we observe the SHAP values [46] for analysing the most prominent features in both the TLS and Tor datasets. SHAP values allow for us to evaluate the impact of our features on the predictions made by our model. We can see that without the Tor countermeasure employed (Figure 7a), the packet time remains the most prominent feature, with TCP packet features such as application data, header length and payload considered highly important to the neural network. However, under Tor, it is interesting to observe that neither of these features are of much importance to the network for classification. Instead, features such as the window size and bytes in-flight are the key features.

In the case of TLS packet-size related features, Tor connections make use of padding cells sent in both directions at varying transmission intervals depending on consensus parameters. This leads to the payload of TCP packets to be transmitted in fixed-size cells of 514 bytes, or if the payload is smaller then the cell is zero-padded. While there may be some similarities between movement patterns, with regard to existing TCP features, a lack of variability leads to lowered reliance by the neural network. Interestingly, Tor does not affect the bytes in flight or the window size. The BytesInFlight feature is defined by Wireshark as an indicator for the amount of unacknowledged data that our controller has transmitted. The shorter the *distance* for receiving ACKs (faster time) results in lower bytes in-flight, and ultimately a lowered window size needed for



**Figure 7: SHAP Values for TLS/Tor Datasets**

optimal performance. The window size is an advertisement from the receiving robot of how many bytes of data it can receive at some point in time to control data flow, which may be dependent on the movement(s) being carried out. In Tor, the data is in equal-sized cells which leave the window size to be constant as multiple tor circuits are multiplexed through the same TCP connection [15, 27, 77]. In our experiments we use different circuits for each movement and conducted multiple runs for each movement on different circuits to minimise this, however window size seems to remain an important feature.

Overall, we find Tor does reduce the precision and recall in most cases which lowers success of fingerprinting movements. However, given that some decreases are only slight and a presence of increase in cases, it may still be possible for an attacker to fingerprint movements. Under Tor however, we find that the procedure reconstruction rate is greatly reduced, leaving little success left for an attacker to reconstruct operations. Future work related to this could be to conduct a similar study on different robots and communication architectures (such as the P2P subscriber model employed by ROS [64]) to better generalise the impact of this attack across robotics systems.

### 5.3 Future Work

As a part of future work, we consider two other potential countermeasures: (1) padding robot traffic and (2) mixing robot traffic with other background traffic.

**Padding.** First, we consider padding the robot traffic in an attempt to counter our proposed traffic analysis attack, with the idea based on the perfect secrecy theory proposed by Shannon [73] (constant-rate padding). Constant-traffic-rate techniques (inserting dummy packets to create padded traffic) have been shown to not prove as effective against statistical traffic analysis techniques, and in particular for our case which makes use of the traffic time-series features to detect movements. Fu et al. [29] propose a variant rate traffic padding countermeasure which can defend against attacks by leveraging sample variance and entropy to exploit correlations between traffic rate and packet inter-arrival times of padded traffic. Other approaches such as BuFLO [26] which removes side-channel information by sending packets of fixed-length at fixed intervals also show promise for areas such as HTTP traffic analysis. However in the case of many safety-critical robotics systems which are time-critical, this may be less than ideal. In any case, it would be interesting to determine the impact of a countermeasure that pads traffic using variable inter-arrival times, which have shown to be effective regardless of sample statistics collected by an adversary when sample distributions of the inter-arrival times for our robot’s traffic are analysed to produce a design guideline for a VIT-based approach [14, 29].

**Mixing.** Second, one can consider mixing in background traffic with the robot traffic. With some work demonstrating that approaches for regularizing traffic (i.e. constant-rate padding) and confusing the adversary, many require a high data overhead (more packets) or induce delays in general traffic, which question the suitability as a defense in a time-critical context such as industrial robotics. Instead, a more lightweight approach which does not require any additional infrastructure would be ideal. In this case, we look at the potential for mixing in background traffic with the robot traffic, such as GLUE [30] which adds in dummy traces (each corresponding to a single webpage) to have DNS traffic appear to the attacker as a longer consecutive trace. This makes it harder to identify end points with minimal overhead. This is shown to be more successful than existing defenses in the area of website fingerprinting, as many existing attacks rely on single traces. Ultimately, it would be interesting to determine if adding dummy movement traces has an impact on movement classification.

**Other Fingerprinting Attack Vectors.** As well as countermeasures, it would be interesting to consider other vectors which could contribute to the classification of robot movements, such as the ability to fingerprint sensor information. If an attacker was able to fingerprint sensor information would help to provide more fine grained information to aid in detecting operations. For example, a series of movement operations could relate to a pick-and-place operation, but the weight of packages and other metadata could be inferred from sensor outputs, which in combination with classified movement operations could paint a more detailed picture. Further, the Robot Operating System (ROS) [23, 49, 64] is becoming more prominent in robotics research and is envisioned to be an upcoming standard for robot middleware. Compared to the robot architecture we use in this work, ROS-based systems use a publisher-subscriber model where sensors and other input devices will act as publishing nodes and provide data to actuators (subscriber nodes), where the communication is peer-to-peer (P2P). Another point for future work

would be to analyse the traffic flowing within and out of ROS-based systems, and compare results with this study.

## 6 RELATED WORK

In this work, we determine whether we can detect robot movement operations from traffic patterns, when the channel is protected by TLS. The problem of detection and prediction of applications from encrypted traffic traces has been investigated from a variety of different angles. Early approaches to identification and prediction focused on identifying application traffic such as for firewalls, websites and quality of service mechanisms and identifying actions (such as device user actions) [5, 79]. Many of these early approaches focus on payload-based classification and signature-based detection, which do not work as well when traffic is encrypted [72]. Further, such approaches took either a graphical approach – through understanding of social networks and motifs to understand patterns of communication and relationships between features – or a simple statistical approach through probability density functions of traffic features and port-based classification [38, 79]. From these limitations, the advent of machine learning approaches have shown to be advantageous in relieving such limitations, combining statistical and graphical approaches to build patterns to associate traffic with application protocols [52]. However, machine learning approaches mainly apply to labeled data and require to be “taught” when results are incorrect, to which deep neural networks do not require human intervention to learn from mistakes (machine learning approaches almost always require structured data).

With the ubiquitous nature of network traffic, the prominence of deep learning techniques increased significantly in areas such as: traffic classification deep learning methods used for website [58]; device/user [1, 83] fingerprinting; and distinguishing between VPN and non-VPN traffic [45], among others [2, 67, 85]. While many of these techniques have shown success, there has been little on identification of safety-critical IoT systems such as robotics which is the focus of this work. Oh et al. [58] describe the use of deep neural networks for predicting website fingerprinting and show that in comparison to other state-of-the-art fingerprinting techniques, the deep learning approach demonstrated a significant increase in classification accuracy. Furthermore, the promise of deep learning approaches is backed up by similar successes in identification over TLS-encrypted traffic [2, 67, 85]. Further, these similar approaches describe that the additional features supplied to traffic with the adoption of TLS can bring higher accuracy compared to standard packet features used in earlier approaches, such as packet size and timing features.

## 7 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we present a case for evaluating whether a passive adversary can still identify robot movements, even when the traffic between a robot and controller (in a teleoperated architecture) is encrypted under TLS. We propose a deep learning approach, which shows that it is possible for an adversary to successfully classify our robot’s movements when protected by TLS with around 60% accuracy. Furthermore, we demonstrate that taking into account more fine-grained movement details such as distance of movement the accuracy increases, and when factors that impact network traffic, such

as packet loss and link delay, are taken into account, we can achieve perfect accuracy (100%) for classifying our robot's movements.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful for the support by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (11288S170484-102), the PE-TRAS Centre for IoT Cybersecurity, and the support of the National Measurement System of the UK Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, which funded this work as part of NPL's Data Science program.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Kota Abe and Shigeki Goto. 2016. Fingerprinting attack on Tor anonymity using deep learning. *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Advanced Network* 42 (2016), 15–20.
- [2] Giuseppe Aceto, Domenico Ciuonzo, Antonio Montieri, and Antonio Pescapé. 2018. Mobile encrypted traffic classification using deep learning. In *2018 Network Traffic Measurement and Analysis Conference (TMA)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [3] Abien Fred Agarap. 2018. Deep learning using rectified linear units (relu). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08375* (2018).
- [4] Homa Alemzadeh, Daniel Chen, Xiao Li, Thenkurussi Kesavadas, Zbigniew T Kalbarczyk, and Ravishankar K Iyer. 2016. Targeted attacks on teleoperated surgical robots: Dynamic model-based detection and mitigation. In *2016 46th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*. IEEE, 395–406.
- [5] Riyad Alshammari and A Nur Zincir-Heywood. 2011. Can encrypted traffic be identified without port numbers, IP addresses and payload inspection? *Computer networks* 55, 6 (2011), 1326–1350.
- [6] George J Annas et al. 2003. HIPAA regulations-a new era of medical-record privacy? *New England Journal of Medicine* 348, 15 (2003), 1486–1490.
- [7] William L Bargar, André Bauer, and Martin Börner. 1998. Primary and revision total hip replacement using the Robodoc® system. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research* 354 (1998), 82–91.
- [8] Khairidine Benali, Jean-François Brethé, François Guérin, and Marc Gorka. 2018. Dual arm robot manipulator for grasping boxes of different dimensions in a logistics warehouse. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT)*. IEEE, 147–152.
- [9] Terry Benzel, Bob Braden, Ted Faber, Jelena Mirkovic, Steve Schwab, Karen Sollins, and John Wroclawski. 2009. Current developments in DETER cybersecurity testbed technology. In *2009 Cybersecurity Applications & Technology Conference for Homeland Security*. IEEE, 57–70.
- [10] Terry Benzel, Robert Braden, Dongho Kim, Anthony D Joseph, B Clifford Neuman, Ron Ostrenga, Stephen Schwab, and Keith Sklower. 2007. Design, Deployment, and Use of the DETER Testbed. In *DETER*.
- [11] Bruhadeshwar Bezawada, Maalvika Bachani, Jordan Peterson, Hossein Shirazi, Indrakshi Ray, and Indrajit Ray. 2018. Behavioral fingerprinting of iot devices. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Workshop on Attacks and Solutions in Hardware Security*. 41–50.
- [12] Robert Bogue. 2016. Growth in e-commerce boosts innovation in the warehouse robot market. *Industrial Robot: An International Journal* (2016).
- [13] Tamara Bonaci, Jeffrey Herron, Tariq Yusuf, Junjie Yan, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Howard Jay Chizeck. 2015. To make a robot secure: An experimental analysis of cyber security threats against teleoperated surgical robots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.04339* (2015).
- [14] Jonas Bushart and Christian Rossow. 2020. Padding Ain't Enough: Assessing the Privacy Guarantees of Encrypted {DNS}. In *10th {USENIX} Workshop on Free and Open Communications on the Internet ({FOCI} 20)*.
- [15] Paulo Calvo, Jose Guevara-Coto, and Adrian Lara. 2020. Classifying and understanding tor traffic using tree-based models. In *2020 IEEE Latin-American Conference on Communications (LATINCOM)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [16] François Chollet et al. 2015. Keras. <https://keras.io>.
- [17] Brent Chun, David Culler, Timothy Roscoe, Andy Bavier, Larry Peterson, Mike Wawrzoniak, and Mic Bowman. 2003. Planetlab: an overlay testbed for broad-coverage services. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 33, 3 (2003), 3–12.
- [18] Andrzej Chydzinski. 2020. Queues with the dropping function and non-Poisson arrivals. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 39819–39829.
- [19] Darrell Etherington @ Tech Crunch. 2020. MIT and Boston Dynamics team up on "Dr. Spot," a robot for remote COVID-19 vital sign measurement. <https://techcrunch.com/2020/08/19/mit-and-boston-dynamics-team-up-on-dr-spot-a-robot-for-remote-covid-19-vital-sign-measurement>.
- [20] Hamza Dahmouni, André Girard, and Brunilde Sansó. 2009. Analytical jitter model for IP network planning and design. In *2009 First International Conference on Communications and Networking*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [21] Mohsen Moradi Dalvand and Saeid Nahavandi. 2014. Improvements in teleoperation of industrial robots without low-level access. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*. IEEE, 2170–2175.
- [22] Nicholas DeMarinis, Stefanie Tellex, Vasileios Kemerlis, George Konidaris, and Rodrigo Fonseca. 2018. Scanning the internet for ros: A view of security in robotics research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.03322* (2018).
- [23] Nicholas DeMarinis, Stefanie Tellex, Vasileios Kemerlis, George Konidaris, and Rodrigo Fonseca. 2019. Scanning the internet for ros: A view of security in robotics research. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 8514–8521.
- [24] Howard B Demuth, Mark H Beale, Orlando De Jess, and Martin T Hagan. 2014. *Neural network design*. Martin Hagan.
- [25] Rob A Dunne and Norm A Campbell. 1997. On the pairing of the softmax activation and cross-entropy penalty functions and the derivation of the softmax activation function. In *Proc. 8th Aust. Conf. on the Neural Networks, Melbourne*, Vol. 181. Citeseer, 185.
- [26] Kevin P Dyer, Scott E Coull, Thomas Ristenpart, and Thomas Shrimpton. 2012. Peek-a-boo, i still see you: Why efficient traffic analysis countermeasures fail. In *2012 IEEE symposium on security and privacy*. IEEE, 332–346.
- [27] Simone Fischer-Hübner and Nicholas Hopper. 2011. *Privacy Enhancing Technologies: 11th International Symposium, PETS 2011, Waterloo, ON, Canada, July 27-29, 2011, Proceedings*. Vol. 6794. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [28] Ramon R Fontes, Samira Afzal, Samuel HB Brito, Mateus AS Santos, and Christian Esteve Rothenberg. 2015. Mininet-WiFi: Emulating software-defined wireless networks. In *2015 11th International Conference on Network and Service Management (CNSM)*. IEEE, 384–389.
- [29] Xinwen Fu, Bryan Graham, Riccardo Bettati, and Wei Zhao. 2003. On countermeasures to traffic analysis attacks. In *IEEE Systems, Man and Cybernetics Society Information Assurance Workshop, 2003*. IEEE, 188–195.
- [30] Jiajun Gong and Tao Wang. 2020. Zero-delay lightweight defenses against website fingerprinting. In *29th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 20)*. 717–734.
- [31] Blake Hannaford, Jacob Rosen, Diana W Friedman, Hawkeye King, Phillip Roan, Lei Cheng, Daniel Glozman, Ji Ma, Sina Nia Kosari, and Lee White. 2012. Raven-II: an open platform for surgical robotics research. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 60, 4 (2012), 954–959.
- [32] Hen-Wei Huang, Claas Ehmke, Gene Merewether, Fara Dadabhoy, Annie Feng, Akhil John Thomas, Canchen Li, Marco da Silva, Marc H Raibert, Edward W Boyer, et al. 2020. Agile mobile robotic platform for contactless vital signs monitoring. (2020).
- [33] Adnan Huremovic, Mesud Hadzialic, and Fatima Skaka. 2014. Analytical model for jitter in networks with IPP traffic. In *2014 International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing Conference (IWCMC)*. IEEE, 334–339.
- [34] Ahmad Javadi, Quamar Niyaz, Weiqing Sun, and Mansoor Alam. 2016. A deep learning approach for network intrusion detection system. In *Proceedings of the 9th EAI International Conference on Bio-inspired Information and Communications Technologies (formerly BIONETICS)*. 21–26.
- [35] David Johnson, Tim Stack, Russ Fish, Daniel Montralio Flickinger, Leigh Stoller, Robert Ricci, and Jay Lepreau. 2006. Mobile emulab: A robotic wireless and sensor network testbed. In *Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM 2006. 25TH IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 1–12.
- [36] Marc Juárez, Mohsen Imani, Mike Perry, Claudia Diaz, and Matthew Wright. 2015. WTF-PAD: toward an efficient website fingerprinting defense for tor. *CoRR, abs/1512.00524* (2015).
- [37] Karamjeet Kaur, Japinder Singh, and Navtej Singh Ghumman. 2014. Mininet as software defined networking testing platform. In *International Conference on Communication, Computing & Systems (ICCCS)*. 139–42.
- [38] Jawad Khalife, Amjad Hajjar, and Jesus Diaz-Verdejo. 2014. A multilevel taxonomy and requirements for an optimal traffic-classification model. *International Journal of Network Management* 24, 2 (2014), 101–120.
- [39] Nobutaka Kimura, Kiyoto Ito, Taiki Fuji, Keisuke Fujimoto, Kanako Esaki, Fumiko Beniyama, and Toshio Moriya. 2015. Mobile dual-arm robot for automated order picking system in warehouse containing various kinds of products. In *2015 IEEE/SICE International Symposium on System Integration (SII)*. IEEE, 332–338.
- [40] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [41] Jochen Kögel. 2013. *One-way delay measurement based on flow data in large enterprise networks*. Inst. für Kommunikationsnetze und Rechnersysteme.
- [42] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2012. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 1097–1105.
- [43] Changle Li, Jia Dong Li, and Xuelian Cai. 2004. Performance evaluation of IEEE 802.11 WLAN-high speed packet wireless data network for supporting voice service. In *2004 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (IEEE Cat. No. 04TH8733)*, Vol. 3. IEEE, 1463–1468.
- [44] Yuanzhi Li and Yang Yuan. 2017. Convergence analysis of two-layer neural networks with relu activation. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 597–607.

- [45] Mohammad Lotfollahi, Mahdi Jafari Siavoshani, Ramin Shirali Hossein Zade, and Mohammadsadegh Saberian. 2020. Deep packet: A novel approach for encrypted traffic classification using deep learning. *Soft Computing* 24, 3 (2020), 1999–2012.
- [46] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [47] Michel Mandjes, Kees van der Wal, Rob Kooij, and Harrie Bastiaansen. 1999. End-to-end delay models for interactive services on a large-scale IP network. In *Proceedings of the 7th workshop on performance modelling and evaluation of ATM & IP networks (IFIP99)*. Citeseer, 28–30.
- [48] Kenneth C Mansfield Jr and James L Antonakos. 2009. *Computer networking for LANS to WANS: hardware, software and security*. Cengage Learning.
- [49] Jarrod McClean, Christopher Stull, Charles Farrar, and David Mascarenas. 2013. A preliminary cyber-physical security assessment of the robot operating system (ros). In *Unmanned Systems Technology XV*, Vol. 8741. International Society for Optics and Photonics, 874110.
- [50] Deep Medhi and Karthik Ramasamy. 2017. *Network routing: algorithms, protocols, and architectures*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [51] Rebecca T Mercuri. 2004. The HIPAA-potamus in health care data security. *Commun. ACM* 47, 7 (2004), 25–28.
- [52] Andrew W Moore and Denis Zuev. 2005. Internet traffic classification using bayesian analysis techniques. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGMETRICS international conference on Measurement and modeling of computer systems*. 50–60.
- [53] Ioannis D Moscholios and Michael Logothetis. 2019. *Efficient multirate teletraffic loss models beyond Erlang*. Wiley Online Library.
- [54] Nizar Msadek, Ridha Soua, and Thomas Engel. 2019. Iot device fingerprinting: Machine learning based encrypted traffic analysis. In *2019 IEEE wireless communications and networking conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [55] Samuel Muhizi, Gregory Shamshin, Ammar Muthanna, Ruslan Kirichek, Andrei Vldyko, and Andrey Koucheryavy. 2017. Analysis and performance evaluation of SDN queue model. In *International Conference on Wired/Wireless Internet Communication*. Springer, 26–37.
- [56] Shishir Nagaraja and Ryan Shah. 2019. VoipLoc: VoIP call provenance using acoustic side-channels. *IEEE Security and Privacy* 2020 (2019).
- [57] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). 2013. Guidance to Render Unsecured Protected Health Information Unusable, Unreadable, or Indecipherable to Unauthorized Individuals. <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/breach-notification/guidance/index.html>.
- [58] Se Eun Oh, Saikrishna Sunkam, and Nicholas Hopper. 2019. p1-FP: Extraction, Classification, and Prediction of Website Fingerprints with Deep Learning. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2019, 3 (2019), 191–209.
- [59] THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. 2017. "Medical Device Regulations – Official Journal of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017R0745>.
- [60] Vern Paxson and Sally Floyd. 1994. Wide-area traffic: the failure of Poisson modeling. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 24, 4 (1994), 257–268.
- [61] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [62] Athanasios S Polydoros and Lazaros Nalpantidis. 2016. A reservoir computing approach for learning forward dynamics of industrial manipulators. In *2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 612–618.
- [63] Davide Quarta, Marcello Pogliani, Mario Polino, Federico Maggi, Andrea Maria Zanchettin, and Stefano Zanero. 2017. An experimental security analysis of an industrial robot controller. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 268–286.
- [64] Morgan Quigley, Ken Conley, Brian Gerkey, Josh Faust, Tully Foote, Jeremy Leibs, Rob Wheeler, and Andrew Y Ng. 2009. ROS: an open-source Robot Operating System. In *ICRA workshop on open source software*, Vol. 3. Kobe, Japan, 5.
- [65] Reuters. 2019. U.S. companies put record number of robots to work in 2018. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-economy-robots/u-s-companies-put-record-number-of-robots-to-work-in-2018-idUSKCN1QH0K0>.
- [66] Rafael Rey, Marco Corzetto, Jose Antonio Cobano, Luis Merino, and Fernando Caballero. 2019. Human-robot co-working system for warehouse automation. In *2019 24th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 578–585.
- [67] Shahbaz Rezaei and Xin Liu. 2019. Deep learning for encrypted traffic classification: An overview. *IEEE communications magazine* 57, 5 (2019), 76–81.
- [68] George F Riley and Thomas R Henderson. 2010. The ns-3 network simulator. In *Modeling and tools for network simulation*. Springer, 15–34.
- [69] Francisco J Rodriguez-Lera, Vicente Matellán-Olivera, Jesús Balsa-Comerón, Ángel Manuel Guerrero-Higueras, and Camino Fernández-Llamas. 2018. Message encryption in robot operating system: Collateral effects of hardening mobile robots. *Frontiers in ICT* 5 (2018), 2.
- [70] Elmar Rueckert, Moritz Nakatenus, Samuele Tosatto, and Jan Peters. 2017. Learning inverse dynamics models in o (n) time with lstm networks. In *2017 IEEE-RAS 17th International Conference on Humanoid Robotics (Humanoids)*. IEEE, 811–816.
- [71] Arndt P Schulz, Klaus Seide, Christian Queitsch, Andrea Von Haugwitz, Jan Meiners, Benjamin Kienast, Mohamad Tarabolsi, Michael Kammal, and Christian Jürgens. 2007. Results of total hip replacement using the Robodoc surgical assistant system: clinical outcome and evaluation of complications for 97 procedures. *The International Journal of Medical Robotics and Computer Assisted Surgery* 3, 4 (2007), 301–306.
- [72] Subhabrata Sen, Oliver Spatscheck, and Dongmei Wang. 2004. Accurate, scalable in-network identification of p2p traffic using application signatures. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on World Wide Web*. 512–521.
- [73] Claude E Shannon. 1949. Communication theory of secrecy systems. *The Bell system technical journal* 28, 4 (1949), 656–715.
- [74] Neil Spring, Larry Peterson, Andy Bavier, and Vivek Pai. 2006. Using PlanetLab for network research: myths, realities, and best practices. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review* 40, 1 (2006), 17–24.
- [75] Ashutosh Tewari, James Peabody, Richard Sarle, Guruswami Balakrishnan, Ashok Hemal, Alok Shrivastava, and Mani Menon. 2002. Technique of da Vinci robot-assisted anatomic radical prostatectomy. *Urology* 60, 4 (2002), 569–572.
- [76] Gelu-Ovidiu Tirian. 2013. Automation of a warehouse by means of a robotic arm. *Annals of Faculty Engineering Hundoara—International Journal of Engineering* 11 (2013).
- [77] Florian Tschorsch and Björn Scheuermann. 2016. Mind the Gap: Towards a {Backpressure-Based} Transport Protocol for the Tor Network. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 16)*. 597–610.
- [78] Pal Varga. 2006. Analyzing packet interarrival times distribution to detect network bottlenecks. In *EUNICE 2005: Networks and Applications Towards a Ubiquitously Connected World*. Springer, 17–29.
- [79] Petr Velan, Milan Čermák, Pavel Čeleda, and Martin Drašar. 2015. A survey of methods for encrypted traffic classification and analysis. *International Journal of Network Management* 25, 5 (2015), 355–374.
- [80] Wei Wang, Ming Zhu, Jinlin Wang, Xuewen Zeng, and Zhongzhen Yang. 2017. End-to-end encrypted traffic classification with one-dimensional convolution neural networks. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics (ISI)*. IEEE, 43–48.
- [81] Yinghan Wang, Yi Liang, Diansheng Chen, Yongzhan Liu, and Min Wang. 2020. A goods sorting robot system for e-commerce logistics warehouse based on robotic arm technology. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Real-time Computing and Robotics (RCAR)*. IEEE, 310–314.
- [82] Ruffin White, Dr Christensen, I Henrik, Dr Quigley, et al. 2016. SROS: Securing ROS over the wire, in the graph, and through the kernel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07060* (2016).
- [83] Qiang Xu, Rong Zheng, Walid Saad, and Zhu Han. 2015. Device fingerprinting in wireless networks: Challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 18, 1 (2015), 94–104.
- [84] Lisa Yan and Nick McKeown. 2017. Learning networking by reproducing research results. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 47, 2 (2017), 19–26.
- [85] Ying Yang, Cuicui Kang, Gaopeng Gou, Zhen Li, and Gang Xiong. 2018. TLS/SSL encrypted traffic classification with autoencoder and convolutional neural network. In *2018 IEEE 20th International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communications; IEEE 16th International Conference on Smart City; IEEE 4th International Conference on Data Science and Systems (HPCC/SmartCity/DSS)*. IEEE, 362–369.
- [86] Quan Zeng, Shou-Jun Zhou, Hao Shen, and Cheng Wang. 2018. A network communication protocols for robotic-assisted vascular intervention systems. In *2017 2nd International Conference on Biological Sciences and Technology (BST 2017)*. Atlantis Press, 87–96.
- [87] Zhilu Zhang and Mert Sabuncu. 2018. Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 8778–8788.