

IoT-AI 2025

ALEXANDER LAWALL

Cybersecurity in Civil Aviation – Threat Landscape and Vulnerability Assessment of Attack Vectors

Venice, July 2025



Academic Roles

- Program Director, B.Sc. & M.Sc. Cyber Security and Cyber Security Management
- Professor in Cyber Security (Distance & On-site Learning)

Expertise

- System & Network Security
- Web Application & Cloud Security
- IoT and Industrial IT Security

Professional Affiliations

- Leadership Committee, "Management of Information Security" (Society for Informatics, GI)
- Professional Lead, "Security & GRC in IT" (Summit Leipzig)
- Member, Association of Cyber Forensics and Threat Investigators (ACFTI)
- Member, Zentrum Digitalisierung Bayern (ZD.B)
- Conference Committees Board Chair (IARIA)
- Steering Committee of the Conference SECURWARE & IoT-AI (IARIA)

Research & Publications

- Focus Areas: Cyber Security, Information Security, Industry 4.0/5.0, IoT, Rights Management
- Publications in national/international Journals and Conferences
- Keynote Speaker, Program Chair, Panel Expert of International Conferences



Motivation & Problem Statement

- ❖ Aviation's fragility: past attacks (e.g., ransomware on airports, spoofed GNSS)
- ❖ Lack of encryption/authentication: many critical systems (e.g., ADS-B, ACARS)
- ❖ Regulation and legacy design: constraints for security upgrades
- Problem: Increase in digitized aviation → Raise of Cyber Risks

MOTIVATION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Questions & Goal

RQ1: *Who are the relevant threat actors targeting civil aviation?*

RQ2: *What are the critical attack vectors exploited in this domain?*

RQ3: *How vulnerable are current aviation systems to these evolving threats?*

Goal: *Synthesize expert insights with literature for actionable findings*

Methodology

- ❖ Qualitative Design: Semi-structured interviews with cybersecurity experts (aviation authorities, OEMs, consultants).
- ❖ Analysis: Inductive coding of themes: attack types, system weaknesses, feasibility
- ❖ Sources: Academic, regulatory, and technical documents support findings

THREAT ACTOR LANDSCAPE

Actor Type	Motivation	Capability
Nation-states	Espionage, sabotage	APTs, 0-days, stealth
Cybercriminals	Ransom, fraud	Malware, phishing
Hacktivists	Ideological disruption	DDoS, defacement
Insiders	Abuse of privileges	Deep access, hard to detect

- ❖ Insiders and nation-states pose the most critical safety risks

ATTACK SURFACE CATEGORIZATION

Threat vectors were grouped across three domains:

- ❖ **Airborne Systems** (e.g., onboard avionics, satellite communication modules (SATCOM), flight management systems (e.g., ADS-B))
- ❖ **Ground Infrastructure** (e.g., airport IT, air traffic control (ATM) systems)
- ❖ **Communication Links** (e.g., ACARS, VHF radio, SWIM)



AIRBORNE SYSTEM VULNERABILITIES

Actor Vector	Likelihood	Impact
ADS-B spoofing	High	High
GNSS jamming/spoofing	High	High
SATCOM command injection	Medium	High
Legacy avionics exploitation	Medium	High

- ❖ ADS-B lacks encryption/authentication
- ❖ GNSS spoofing validated in real-world cases
- ❖ Legacy avionics resist patching due to certification limits

GROUND INFRASTRUCTURE RISKS

Actor Vector	Likelihood	Impact
Airport IT ransomware	High	Medium
ATM system compromise	Medium	High
Maintenance system manipulation	Medium	High

- ❖ Ground systems often use Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) components with weak segmentation
- ❖ High exposure due to third-party access and legacy software

COMMUNICATION LINK THREATS

Actor Vector	Likelihood	Impact
ACARS interception	High	Medium
SWIM data injection	Medium	Medium-High
VHF/UHF spoofing	Low-Medium	Medium

- ❖ ACARS uses plaintext over VHF/SATCOM channels
- ❖ SWIM increases attack surface via IP-based APIs
- ❖ Threat affect flight planning and awareness

COMPARATIVE RISK OVERVIEW

System Category	Likelihood	Impact
Airborne Systems	Medium-High	High
Ground Infrastructure	Medium-High	Medium-High
Communication Links	Low-High	Medium-High

- ❖ Airborne systems: lower likelihood but highest impact
- ❖ Ground systems: high attackability, less direct safety impact

Consensus

- ❖ ADS-B, ACARS, and legacy avionics = top risks
- ❖ Ground systems most accessible to attackers

Disagreements

- ❖ Severity of ACARS/VHF compromises
 - ❖ Role of redundancy in mitigating communication failures
- *Need for scenario-based modeling to quantify cascading effects*

SECURITY GAPS IDENTIFIED

- ❖ **Outdated, unpatchable technologies (i.a. legacy systems):**
unpatched avionics and ATM software
- ❖ **Unsecured Protocols:** ADS-B, ACARS, VHF use plaintext
- ❖ **Poor Segmentation:** IT/OT boundaries are weak (lateral movement)
- ❖ **Limited detection and response capabilities:** Lacking real-time anomaly detection
- ❖ **Fragmented organizational accountability:** lack of rapid response and coordinated defense

- ❖ **Complex Ecosystem:** Airlines, airports, vendors, OEMs – fragmented accountability
 - ❖ **Weak Governance:** Voluntary guidelines (e.g., ICAO, EASA) lack enforcement
 - ❖ **Delayed Patching:** Responsibility unclear; updates slow
- *Call for harmonized regulations and minimum mandatory baselines*

STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❖ Encrypt and authenticate all communication protocols (e.g., secure ADS-B, SWIM over TLS)
- ❖ Retrofit avionics with secure overlays, considering certification timelines
- ❖ Enforce network segmentation and AI-based anomaly detection
- ❖ Run joint cyber exercises and improve real-time threat intelligence sharing

CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

RQ1: *Who are the relevant threat actors targeting civil aviation?*

RQ2: *What are the critical attack vectors exploited in this domain?*

RQ3: *How vulnerable are current aviation systems to these evolving threats?*

Key Takeaways

- ❖ Aviation is highly exposed to cyber risks with severe safety implications
- ❖ Threats are technical and organizational in nature
- ❖ Security must be proactive, layered, and harmonized

Future Directions

- ❖ Scenario-based simulations for risk propagation
- ❖ Real-time ML for threat detection
- ❖ Policy research for better cross-national cyber security governance

How can we enforce global cybersecurity standards in civil aviation, when the regulatory landscape is fragmented and aircraft operate across multiple jurisdictions every day?

Given the long life cycles and certification constraints in aviation, how can we design security systems today that remain resilient 20 or even 30 years from now?