



STRENGTHENING EPC TAGS AGAINST CLONING

Ari Juels

RSA Laboratories

Bedford, MA, USA

WiSE'05, September 2, 2005, Cologne, Germany. Pg 67-75

Presented by: Sagar Kapoor



SUMMARY

- This article discusses the possibility of EPCglobal Class1 Generation2 UHF tags(EPC tags) as a potent mechanism for object identification.
- Article presents simple techniques to strengthen the resistance of EPC tags against elementary cloning attacks.



PROTOCOLS

BasicTagAuth⁺[q]

FULFILLMENT CONDITIONAL PIN DISTRIBUTION (FCPD)

```

T → R → V: T
V: if T = Tx for some 1 ≤ x ≤ N then i ← x
    else without “unknown tag” and halt
V: (j, {Pi(1), ..., Pi(q)})
    ← GeneratePINSet(i)[q];

```

Prevents en bloc theft of PINs by compromised reading devices.

```

V → R: {Ri(k)}k=1q
for k = 1 to q do

```

User may only download PIN's for particular set of tags if it appears to have physical access to tags

```

R → T: PIN-test(Pi(k))

```

Aim is to ensure proper behaviour by R and authenticity of tags

```

T → R: R(k)

```

Easy to get information of Tx by skimming the tag, but not 32 bit PIN.

```

R → V: {R(k)}k=1q;
M ← “valid”;
for k = 1 to q do

```

To guess Access PIN and finally guessing Kill PIN.
 Probability to guess the 32 bit PIN = 2⁻³², i.e 1 in a billion
 Probability is 2⁻³² i.e. One in a million

```

    if R(k) = ‘1’ and k ≠ j
    then M ← “invalid”;

```

For Non-Compliant clones, the reading device tests the response of tag to randomly presented PINs that are not valid.

For untrusted readers

Probability of successful attack is just 1/q.

Probability of successful attack is just 1/q.



APPRECIATION 1

- Techniques presented looks promising.
- Current scenario is being discussed with facts
 - “ **Media reports** have suggested such a plan by the European Central Bank to combat counterfeiting of Euro banknotes ”
 - “ More recently, the U.S. FDA (Food and Drug Administration) has issued a report that endorses RFID as a tool to combat the counterfeiting of pharmaceuticals ”
 - “The United States Department of Defence and several dominant retail corporations such as Wal-Mart have mandated the use of RFID tags by their top suppliers beginning in 2005 ”
- No false promises made.
 - “ These protocols do not defend against a full range of attacks, but still have significant practical application. ”
 - “ We emphasize that our techniques defend only against a limited set of attacks ”
- Bold challenges
 - “ Our techniques can strengthen EPC tags against cloning even in environments with untrusted reading devices. ”
 - “EPCglobal Class-1 Generation-2 UHF standard for EPC tags, which is likely to predominate in supply chains. ”
 - “ we believe that users will come to rely implicitly on RFID tags to authenticate goods. ”



CRITICISM 1

- Does it work .. ??
 - Nothing is presented in the article showing that the schemes were tested.
- Schemes proposed not discussed in details
- Examples mainly human engineered.
 - Excon Corp- a shipping company- **swaps in the bogus cases** while it has custody of the real ones.
 - Dupyu Stores- **Dupyu staff attach cloned tags** to counterfeit, look-alike packages
 - A **seller of counterfeit handbags can attach EPC tags** carrying duplicated, valid EPCs



CRITICISM 2

- Failed to define “ Valid ”
 - For clarity of notation, let us denote by $\text{PIN-test}(K)$ an EPC-tag (meta-)command that causes a tag to output a bit-response b . *The value of b is a '0' if K is the correct kill PIN for the tag and '1' otherwise*
- Assumption of a secure reader and server
- Techniques proposed cannot be used for stronger attacks.



QUESTION

Can we rely on the techniques presented in the article?
Doesn't the assumption of secure server/reader looks
like a compromise to security?

THANK YOU

