

SoK: Evaluating the Security of Satellite Systems

Roy Peled, Eran Aizikovich, Edan Habler, Yuval Elovici, Asaf Shabtai
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Abstract—Satellite systems are facing an ever-increasing amount of cybersecurity threats as their role in communications, navigation, and other services expands. Recent papers have examined attacks targeting satellites and space systems; however, they did not comprehensively analyze the threats to satellites and systematically identify adversarial techniques across the attack lifecycle. This paper presents a comprehensive taxonomy of adversarial tactics, techniques, and procedures explicitly targeting LEO satellites. First, we analyze the space ecosystem including the ground, space, Communication, and user segments, highlighting their architectures, functions, and vulnerabilities. Then, we examine the threat landscape, including adversary types, and capabilities, and survey historical and recent attacks such as jamming, spoofing, and supply chain. Finally, we propose a novel extension of the MITRE ATT&CK framework to categorize satellite attack techniques across the adversary lifecycle from reconnaissance to impact. The taxonomy is demonstrated by modeling high-profile incidents, including the Viasat attack that disrupted Ukraine’s communications. The taxonomy provides the foundation for the development of defenses against emerging cyber risks to space assets. The proposed threat model will advance research in the space domain and contribute to the security of the space domain against sophisticated attacks.

1. Introduction

1.1. Security of Satellites

Since the launch of Sputnik in 1957, space technology has played a crucial role in shaping the information age, significantly impacting our daily lives. Today, satellites are essential in the provision of various services, including meteorology [51], [72], [94], navigation [96], [97], [101], communications (SATCOMs) [29], [35], [74], [75], [137], and intelligence [36], [110]. The expanding role of satellites in services such as these, along with recent technological advancements and the availability of commercial off-the-shelf satellite hardware [41], [108], have dramatically reduced the cost of satellite-based space missions [69]. As a result, the number of satellites orbiting the Earth has risen by more than 192% in just three years, increasing from 4,867 in 2019 to 9,350 in 2022 [46], according to *Statista*,¹ the growth in the number of active satellites in space from 1957 to 2022 is nearly exponential [95].

With the space industry in the midst of a renaissance, the need to protect satellite systems against cyberattacks is becoming more and more important. As a result, a group

of companies formed a consortium called Space ISAC,² to collaborate in this area, and together they are actively taking steps to protect space assets. In addition, Aerospace’s annual *space threat assessment* report contributes valuable insights regarding cyber threats in the space domain [68].

While information security and privacy related to satellite systems have received limited attention from industry and academia, satellites’ attack surface continues to grow. The authors of [90] reported that the number of attacks between 2009-2018 was five times higher than that between 2000-2008. Several recent studies have pointed out the lack of regulations in the space domain [31], [40], [41], [44] and demonstrate how attackers can take advantage of weaknesses in satellites’ core systems [128].

1.2. Scope and Purpose

To ensure the security of the space ecosystem and the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of the systems that rely on satellite technology, it is critical to systematically examine the vulnerabilities of satellite systems, the potential threat actors, and the space environment. Such analysis will enable the classification of attacks and improve understanding of the existing threats. The categorization of adversaries and attacks will help stakeholders identify weak points in satellite systems, map the various stages of an attack, and take preventive measures.

There are several knowledge bases providing a common taxonomy for offense and defense against cyber adversaries targeting enterprise networks. In this paper, we follow the MITRE ATT&CK [115] framework’s approach to classify attack tactics, techniques, sub-techniques, and procedures (see Section 6). The MITRE ATT&CK taxonomy is used across multiple platforms and networks (enterprise, mobile, cloud, and industrial control systems). The Aerospace Corporation’s Space Attack Research and Tactic Analysis (SPARTA³) is an example of an attack knowledge base for spacecraft. Its objective is to provide analysis and recommendations on space policy and architecture to diverse stakeholders, including the U.S. government, military, and civil space sectors.

The security analysis that we performed in this paper is based on NIST Ontology for modeling enterprise security, on which we elaborate in Appendix A. We systematically navigates through key concepts cyber threat analysis. We begin with providing an introduction to the various segments within the satellite ecosystem (Section 2), delving into the satellite subsystems and their significance as potential target assets (detailed in Appendix B). Next we present an analysis of satellite vulnerabilities (Section 3)

1. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/897719/number-of-active-satellites-by-year/>

2. <https://s-isac.org/>

3. <https://sparta.aerospace.org/>

and the related risk, and we address the capabilities of adversaries and categorize them into six tiers based on their abilities, potential for harm, and available resources (Sections 4). Then, we provide a concise overview of satellite attacks throughout history, summarizing the significant attacks (Section 5). The principal objective is to suggest an extension of the MITRE taxonomy specifically tailored to low earth orbit (LEO) satellites. To ensure alignment with the MITRE ATT&CK taxonomy, we identified distinct actions (techniques) and categorized them into groups (tactics) corresponding to different adversarial attack life cycle stages (Section 6). We also demonstrate two significant attacks on satellites and explain how they fit into our taxonomy (Section 7). The first is an attack performed in the current war between Russia and Ukraine, known as the Viasat attack, and the second is an attack on a satellite network known as ICARUS. We examine these attacks closely and explain how they can be classified using our taxonomy.

Table 1 provides a comparison between our work and recent studies [90], [103], [104], [119], [128], [138] analyzing threats to various satellite systems. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to provide a comprehensive evaluation of all the satellite systems and subsystems. Our paper is also unique in that we present a taxonomy for cybersecurity analysis of LEO satellite systems which is an extension of the MITRE taxonomy, along with various case studies demonstrating the taxonomy's use.

1.3. Contributions

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows: (i) A comprehensive overview of space ecosystems, specifically LEO, including their segments, subsystems, and networks, that highlights their security vulnerabilities, attack vectors, and threats; (ii) An overview of recorded attacks on the space ecosystem, emphasizing attacks on LEO satellite, along with a categorization of these attacks based on a predefined taxonomy used to describe attack strategy; (iii) A review of diverse mitigation techniques aimed at addressing the security issues associated with LEO satellite; (iv) A novel taxonomy that categorizes adversarial behavior targeting the various attack surfaces and systems of LEO satellite; this taxonomy is an extension of the MITRE taxonomy specifically for the space domain; and (v) A demonstration of the application and use of the taxonomy with use cases involving recent real-life cyberattacks on a satellite.

2. Satellite Ecosystem

In this section, we provide an overview of the satellite ecosystem, encompassing the ground, communication, and space segments. Furthermore, we delve into the roles and structures of each segment.

2.1. Ground Segment

The ground segment plays a crucial role in satellite communications. It controls and manages the space segment, ensuring proper satellite operation, data processing and transmission, and mission execution.

The ground segment includes various types of ground stations (GS), which act as interfaces between terrestrial and satellite networks. The GS relay data between satellites and users [105]. These GSs serve multiple roles, including tracking, telemetry (monitoring the satellite's position, speed, and health status and transmitting this information to the ground control center), command and control (sending commands to the satellite to control its operation and ensure its proper functioning), and data acquisition and processing (receiving and processing data from the satellite and forwarding it to the appropriate user or data processing center) [53], [90].

Traditional ground stations are physical installations with reception antennas, feed horns, waveguides, and receivers mounted on a pedestal. They communicate with satellites by receiving downlinked data and sending up-link commands [58]. *Cloud-based ground stations* (or ground station as a service - GSaaS) are hosted and operated in the cloud. Cloud-based ground stations, such as GSaaS offered by AWS, K-Sat, and Azure, provide satellite operators with a cost-effective way for gathering data. This architecture facilitates low-latency connections between satellites and cloud services, expanding satellite communication coverage worldwide, utilizing global partner that includes ground station networks, cloud modems, and telemetry, tracking, and control functions [15], [127]. *Remote ground stations* are positioned at different locations around the globe to maintain uninterrupted satellite communication while the satellites orbit the Earth. Typically, these stations are comprised of large antennas located at a teleport that connect to one or more smaller antennas located at remote locations. This setup allows bidirectional communication between two points on Earth [13]. *Custom ground stations* are created using off-the-shelf components, and they do not adhere to a primary architecture [128].

The architecture of the ground segment are fitted to align with the mission objective, type of service provided, and required communication interfaces. For this purpose, custom equipment, such as radios, modems, data processing, and management components, are being used [113].

2.2. Space Segment

The space segment refers to space vehicles. There are three main types of space vehicles, which differ in terms of their altitude. Geostationary Earth orbit (GEO) satellites are positioned around 36,000 kilometers above the Earth's surface [80]; medium Earth orbit (MEO) satellites occupy altitudes ranging from approximately 2,000 to 36,000 kilometers; and low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites, positioned in the low earth orbit, are situated at altitudes ranging from approximately 160 to 2,000 kilometers above the Earth's surface [60], [120]. In the context of satellites, constellations are networks of satellites in specific orbital slots, e.g., LEO, working together to offer comprehensive global services, including communication, Internet coverage, and Earth observation, extending space-based capabilities and reach [25].

This paper focuses on *LEO satellites*, which are developed using new technologies and commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware, significantly reducing operational

TABLE 1: Categorization of related work.

	GS			Communication				Subsystems						User	history	Taxonomy	
	cloud	standard	custom	ISL	S2G	G2S	S2U	EPS	ADCS	COMMS	IT&C	TCS	PCS				C&DHS
Our paper	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
[104]	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
[103]	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
[90]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	×
[119]	×	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	×
[138]	×	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	×
[128]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	✓	×	×

costs [71]. Recent efforts have shown that user equipment (UE) can communicate with constellations of LEO satellites at a relatively high speed [82] with global coverage⁴⁵ [111], [132]. As a result, satellite constellations like Kuiper [117], Starlink,⁶ OneWeb,⁷ and Lightspeed⁸ are expected to play a significant role in the 5G and 6G ecosystems [29], [35], [74], [137].

The LEO satellite encompasses the following critical subsystems: the electrical power subsystem (managing the power supply to the satellite), the attitude determination and control subsystem (maintaining the satellite’s orientation), the communication subsystem (containing the communication of the satellite), the telemetry, tracking, and command subsystem (collecting telemetry data from other subsystems and transmitting them to GS), the thermal control subsystem (maintaining an optimal temperature environment for the satellite), the propulsion control subsystem (managing the propellant to thrusters for controlling the satellite’s movement), and the command & data handling subsystem (the satellite’s central core control and processing unit). Apart from the subsystems, a satellite also consists of a payload that comprises specific equipment or instruments and serves the mission objectives of the satellite. Unlike the subsystems, which are essential infrastructure for the satellite, the payload is focused on the satellite’s specific applications like communication, Earth observation, weather monitoring, scientific research, or navigation.

A detailed description of these key subsystems is provided in Appendix B. These subsystems are connected to the satellite’s main communication bus (linear or star) [12], which is also described in Appendix B.

2.3. Communication Segment

This section provides an overview of the standard architecture and various communication links within a satellite communication (SATCOM) system, illustrated in Figure 1. A SATCOM system interconnects the space, ground, and user segments; each segment ensures seamless communication within the satellite environment.

The *space segment communication* includes inter-satellite (ISL) links, facilitating communication between

satellites and satellite-to-ground (S2G) links, and connecting satellites to ground stations. The *ground segment communication*, managed by satellite operators or gateways and network operators, supports ground-to-satellite (G2S) and ground-to-ground (G2G) links, as well as forwarding communication from satellites to the ground (S2G) and communication from satellites to users (S2U). The *user segment communication* encompassing terminals in airplanes, ships, and satellite smartphones, this segment enables user-to-ground (U2G) and user-to-satellite (U2S) links [79], [119].

The ground segment facilitates communication between satellites and user terminals through the forward link [11]. While the user segment communication leverages various technologies to connect with gateways. Notably, satellite constellations such as Iridium,⁹ Globalstar,¹⁰ Thuraya,¹¹ and Inmarsat¹² enable direct communication between user handsets and satellites via the U2S link, bypassing the need for intermediary ground stations [65].

The adoption of 3GPP standards is causing a shift in traditional SATCOM architecture for non-terrestrial satellite networks [66]. These standards define various communication scenarios, channels, and modulation formats catering to non-terrestrial communication modes such as GNSS, high-altitude platform stations (HAPS), and air-to-ground communications [82].

For a secure SATCOM system, implement robust security measures in all segments, including ground and satellite communication channels. Ensure data integrity and confidentiality, regardless of destination or technology.

2.4. User Segment

The user segment of satellite systems encompasses a variety of practical applications, including navigation, television, and communications, and requires specialized hardware for operation. To watch satellite TV, users require a satellite dish and set-top box to decode transmissions and access channels. In navigation, GNSS receivers in mobile phones or satellite navigation systems receive signals from satellite constellations to determine the device’s location, which helps in planning routes [90].

4. <https://youtu.be/yjpCvcCnxig>

5. <https://youtu.be/sXQXq4wSxWQ>

6. <https://www.starlink.com/technology>

7. <https://oneweb.net/>

8. <https://www.telesat.com/leo-satellites/>

9. <https://www.iridium.com/network/>

10. <https://www.globalstar.com/en-ap/about/our-technology>

11. <https://www.thuraya.com/en/services/thuraya-4-ngs>

12. <https://www.roadpost.com/inmarsat-satellite-network>




Figure 1: Overview of satellite communication (SATCOM) segments and user interfaces.

While some users receive satellite signals directly via dedicated receivers, others access satellite data through terrestrial networks managed by satellite operators. This approach, used in Earth observation, signal intelligence, and meteorological and scientific applications, eliminates the need for users to purchase or install hardware. Operators provide data access through various means, such as web APIs, cloud-based customer portals, and installable software. Companies like Planet¹³ and HawkEye 360¹⁴ offer applications and APIs for accessing imagery and signal mapping data, while scientific datasets, like those from the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP), are freely available online [90].

The user segment includes various ground stations that facilitate satellite communication and serve the different applications [63]. As shown in Figure 1, these include: *Maritime ship ground stations (SGS)* installed on boats and ships, equipped with antennas of varying gains (e.g., FleetBroadband [107] and Global Xpress terminals [54]); *land mobile ground stations (LMGS)* used in vehicles and portable setups, such as Inmarsat’s Broadband Global Area Network (BGAN) [47] terminals; and *personal ground stations (PGS)*, encompassing portable devices like Inmarsat’s IsatPhone [102], [106].

The proper installation and selection of the correct type of antenna (omnidirectional, directional, mechanically steered, or electronically steered) are crucial for reliable communication. Installation considerations include ensuring a clear line of sight, avoiding obstructions, and maintaining a safe distance from other equipment. Major satellite operators and services, such as Inmarsat GEO, Iridium LEO, O3B MEO,¹⁵ and DVB-RCS GEO [9], provide a wide range of global voice, data, Internet, and video services, ensuring comprehensive coverage.

3. Satellites’ Vulnerability

In this section, we identify and discuss the potential vulnerabilities of the LEO satellite ecosystem (presented in Section 2) and subsystems (described in Appendix B).

3.1. Ground Segment Vulnerabilities

Adversaries typically target the ground segment as a means of gaining remote control of a satellite [104], [122]. As a result, the ground segment faces vulnerabilities that span from supply chain risks to potential threats posed by personnel operating within the GS. The main vulnerabilities of the ground segment are as follows:

1) Physical Security: The GS is vulnerable to physical attacks. In this case, unauthorized individuals gain access to critical hardware or data, potentially gaining control of the satellite or information theft. A notable case, reported by NASA [91], involved the theft of an encrypted notebook computer, resulting in the loss of command and control algorithms used in the International Space Station. Other potential vulnerabilities include the unauthorized use of removable media, such as USB drives, which could lead to data corruption or system compromise [49].

2) Computer Network: The GS is at risk due to potential weaknesses in its connected network infrastructure. These vulnerabilities can be exploited through various means, including but not limited to system vulnerabilities, phishing attacks, or other forms of social engineering. Successful exploitation could lead to unauthorized access, data breaches, or manipulation of satellite operations.

3) Cloud Infrastructure: Cloud services for ground stations now offer users the ability to control satellites. However, these services can also be vulnerable to attacks. Attackers can capitalize on existing vulnerabilities within these services. By sending malicious data to a satellite or its payload, they could potentially cause a denial of service or, even worse, seize control of the system.

4) Ground Station Supply Chain: The security of the ground station supply chain is susceptible to various

13. <https://www.planet.com/geointelligence/>

14. <https://www.he360.com/>

15. <https://www.ses.com/our-coverage/o3b-meo>

vulnerabilities stemming from leaked software, accessible tools, exposed data sheets, open-source research, and reliance on standard components.

5) Third-Party Services/COTS Components Vulnerabilities: The ground segment may use third-party services or COTS components that could be vulnerable to cyberattacks. Such services and components may be outdated or unpatched and may even include known exploits [4]. In Section 5, we provide an example of using outdated VPN services in the Viasat attack.

3.2. Space Segment Vulnerabilities

While the majority of known attacks have targeted the signal and ground segments, there are also significant vulnerabilities associated with the space segment.

1) COTS Components: Prior research [39] discussed three major security concerns related to the increased use of COTS components seen in recent years: (1) the widespread availability of COTS components means that numerous individuals can access these components; consequently, hackers can analyze these components to identify their vulnerabilities; (2) COTS components require ongoing maintenance, and frequent security upgrades are needed in order to apply the necessary security patches; however many users fail to perform these updates, leaving the components susceptible to known vulnerabilities; and (3) the use of open-source COTS components increases the risk of malicious actors intentionally inserting vulnerabilities or backdoors [99].

2) Supply Chain: Space assets are unique in that they are highly intricate systems that depend on a diverse supply chain, in which the manufacturers might have complete control of critical components that an asset consists of. Even a minor flaw within the components of the satellite subsystems can have catastrophic consequences for a space mission or lead to satellite failures. The precision and delicacy of space systems amplify the potential impact of any shortcomings or vulnerabilities [40].

3) Lack of Standards & Regulations: The lack of standardized regulations for space cybersecurity is a significant concern. Unlike other industries other sectors such as aviation, which are regulated by organizations like the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), space assets, including satellites, have no specific cybersecurity standards enforced by a governing body. While the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) regulates some aspects (e.g., satellite communication frequencies, orbit registration), there are few overall standards for space cybersecurity. This absence of regulations and enforcement mechanisms raises the chance of satellites being exploited for malicious purposes [40].

3.3. Communication Segment Vulnerabilities

The communication segment is highly susceptible to cyberattacks; in this case, the attacks target the end user and not the satellite itself. The communication sector is vulnerable due to inadequate risk assessment at the premises level. Potential threats are often underestimated due to the misconception that space is inaccessible, resulting in security gaps.

1) Lack of Encryption: Some satellites do not use encryption on the telemetry (TM) or the telecommand (TC) [128]. Signal attacks like jamming, eavesdropping, spoofing, replay, and signal hijacking [90], [104] can be successfully performed due to the lack of encryption mechanisms.

2) Lack of Cybersecurity Measures: Research performed by the International Cospas-Sarsat Programme [24] demonstrated the lack of essential means of ensuring cybersecurity in various protocols and standard 406 MHz transmissions.

3.4. User Segment Vulnerabilities

The vulnerabilities within the user segment are of paramount concern, given their integration with multiple services, protocols, and networks. Their pivotal role in facilitating user access makes them a broad attack surface that demands significant focus to guarantee security and safety [114].

1) Satellite Service Providers (SSP): These providers are susceptible to attacks aimed at exploiting their services, Internet connectivity, and VSAT central hubs. Some of the specific vulnerabilities include routing attacks on ad-hoc networks, interception, eavesdropping, and recording of unencrypted VoIP calls [85], [93], as well as viruses, hijacking, spoofing, man-in-the-middle attacks on VPNs, flooding, black holes, jellyfish attacks on multicast services, and insertion of rogue devices into VSAT networks for eavesdropping [130]. Furthermore, if the VSAT central hub is compromised within a star topology configuration, it can result in a denial of service.

2) Points of Presence (PoP): PoPs are vulnerable to attacks on their routers, attacks via Internet/Intranet connections, and attacks on cellular network access. exploitation of router protocol vulnerabilities such as BGP, OSPF, and RIP, eavesdropping, man-in-the-middle attacks, and denial of service on Wi-Fi and cellular networks. Additionally, there are vulnerabilities associated with the exploitation of protocols like PPP, Ethernet, and SNMP [20], [114].

3.5. Subsystem Vulnerabilities

The vulnerabilities of satellite subsystems are as follows:

1) Solar Flares & Radiation: Satellite subsystems, including EPS, ADCS, COMMS, TCS, PCS, and C&DHS, are vulnerable to solar flares and radiation. These phenomena can lead to various issues, such as damage to solar cells, decreased power output, and errors in data processing and command execution. [42], [61].

2) Space Debris: Components of the EPS, ADCS, COMMS, TCS, PCS, and C&DHS can be damaged by space debris, such as micrometeoroids. This can result in decreased power output, loss of pointing accuracy, communication disruption, and loss of control over motion and position [61].

3) Equipment Malfunction: Malfunctions in the equipment of the EPS, ADCS, COMMS, TCS, PCS, and C&DHS can lead to a variety of issues, including loss of power, loss of pointing accuracy, communication disruption, inability to maintain thermal control, and loss of control over motion and position [73], [92].

4) Radiation: Components of the EPS, ADCS, COMMS, TCS, PCS, and C&DHS are vulnerable to radiation, which can cause damage leading to decreased functionality or failure of these systems [61].

5) Cyberattacks: The ADCS, COMMS, and C&DHS are vulnerable to cyberattacks, which could disrupt operations, compromise data integrity, or cause loss of control [8].

6) Inadequate Design: Inadequate design in the TCS, PCS, and C&DHS could lead to an inability to maintain thermal control, loss of control over motion and position, and issues in command processing and data handling [45].

7) Human Error: Human errors in the operation and programming of the TCS and C&DHS could lead to vulnerabilities in thermal control and command and data handling.

8) Fuel Leakage: In the PCS, fuel leakage could lead to loss of control over the satellite’s motion and position, as well as pose safety hazards.

9) Payload: Satellites may have various payload components, each with its vulnerabilities. Specifically, communication systems (COM) can experience signal disruptions; software-defined radios (SDR) are vulnerable due to their software-centric design, potentially exposing them to firmware exploits; cameras, being tangible hardware, might degrade or be impacted by environmental factors, reducing image fidelity. Furthermore, inter-satellite links (ISL) are a potential weak point; if one satellite is compromised, it can threaten the entire communication network.

4. Adversaries & Capabilities

In this paper, we discuss the different types of adversaries with varying motivations and means at their disposal that may attempt to attack a satellite system. Based on their capabilities, potential harm, and available resources, adversaries are classified into six tiers: (1) *Individual hackers & activists* with limited capabilities who are often motivated by ideology or the potential for financial gain; (2) *Competitors* can be individuals or organizations seeking to gain an advantage or financial gain by theft or sabotage; (3) *Terrorists* may try to achieve their goals by attacking a satellite or its GS; (4) *Insider operator* may be motivated by financial gain or power and have various objectives, including corrupting data, stealing technology, taking control of the system, or selling confidential information to competitors or other threat actors; (5) *Organized criminals* are individuals or groups that are well-organized and well-funded. Their primary motives include financial gain. Organized criminals may collaborate with other actors, including insider operators, to achieve their goals; and (6) *State actors* State actors are government-sponsored entities with vast resources and capabilities and thus are often well-funded and well-trained; their motivations range from acquiring a strategic edge to gaining a military advantage.

We examined the skills (i.e., capabilities) required for executing various types of attacks. The identified capabilities are organized in the taxonomy presented in Figure 2. Following, we provide a brief description of the adversaries capabilities groups, while Table 2 list all the identified capabilities.




Figure 2: Adversaries’ capabilities.

Radio frequency (RF) - Signaling Capabilities. Satellite communications use a frequency range of 0.1-50 GHz to transmit and receive signals. For CubeSat communication, the most commonly used bands are VHF and UHF frequencies [21] due to their simple ground equipment, low loss of radio wave propagation, and the limited direct shielding effect of ground objects on radio waves [134]. However, small satellites can also use other frequency bands like UHF, S, X, and Ka. Recently, there has been a shift towards using S and X bands [21].

Laser Communication. Laser communication is a method of transmitting data using laser beams instead of radio frequency signals [89]. Laser communication offers several advantages over traditional RF methods, including lower link loss and an abundant unregulated spectrum [57]. However, it has its limitations, such as the requirement for an unobstructed line of sight and precise laser alignment. Despite these challenges, laser communication is increasingly important in various space applications and is often being used among the LEO satellites. Therefore, any potential adversary would need access to an optical satellite to launch an attack on the optical ISL communication.

Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP). An EMP is essentially a high-power electromagnetic pulse [76]. EMPs can be caused by natural or artificial means and manifest in different forms, such as electromagnetics and magnetic fields, electric currents, or nuclear explosions [84]. Those pulses can have great impact on power lines, telecommunication systems, electronic devices [33], and SATCOMM systems [123].

Physical Attack. Physical security risks can threaten the overall integrity of the satellite and its subsystems and consequently the proper functioning of the vehicle. While physical damage may not completely prevent a mission’s success, it can result in poorer performance, service disruptions, or a shorter lifespan. Physical risks are categorized in terms of whether they are induced by kinetic (direct physical contact with the satellite) or non-kinetic means (can physically damage space infrastructure and its components without direct contact).

Launch Satellite. Numerous companies, such as SpaceX, Amazon, OneWeb, and Telesat, send satellites into space.¹⁶ In addition, several smaller companies are expected to launch satellites soon.¹⁷ An adversary can create and deploy a satellite designed to attack other satellites.

16. <https://interactive.satellitetoday.com/via/july-2021/the-10-hottest-satellite-companies-in-2021/>

17. <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-55807150>

Position Access. In some cases, attackers require access to a specific network or facility, such as a constellation of satellites like those operated by SpaceX or Viasat or a ground segment facility like the GS. Once they gain access, they have a new arsenal of satellites on which to carry out their attack.

Insider Connection. An adversary may need to connect with an insider operator or supplier to gain access to sensitive information or systems within a satellite or to modify part of the supply chain.

Table 3 provides a comparison of the threat actor tiers based on the threat actors’ feasibility of acquiring different capabilities needed to implement an attack. In each cell, we indicate the likelihood that the capability exists, ranging from certain to unlikely.

5. A Brief History of Satellite Attacks

Since 1957, there have been over 100 significant satellite attacks [104]. In this section, we present an overview of these attacks, categorizing them based on their strategy (see Figure 3), and then we provide a more in-depth description of two recent complex attacks. Two of the attacks mentioned are used to demonstrate the use of our proposed taxonomy later in the paper (see Section 7) for our proposed taxonomy.




Figure 3: Satellite attack strategies.

5.1. Attack Strategies

5.1.1. Communication Threats. Satellite-based communication (SATCOM) faces significant communication threats [119], which we break down into five main categories. *Jamming* disrupts signals, affecting communication and navigation [28], [48]. *Eavesdropping* intercepts communications for intelligence or disruption [16], [48], [86]. *Spoofing* sends false signals, misleading systems [16], [62], [81], [131]. *Replay attack* re-transmits signals to cause confusion or errors [83], [104]. *Sensor injection/hijacking* manipulates sensor data to deceive or disrupt [30], [64], [104], [118].

5.1.2. Anti Satellite (ASAT) Weapons. Mainly focus on kinetic physical ASAT as discussed in Section 4 [17], [43]. *EMP weapon* [42]. *Ultrawideband weapon* disrupts operations with broad-frequency radiation [42].

5.1.3. CNE. Computer Network Exploitation is employed to permeate targeted computer networks, including those associated with satellite systems, to extract valuable intelligence information. [16], [44], [104], [119], [138]. *Social Engineering* This attack leverages psychological manipulation, such as social engineering and phishing techniques, to deceive individuals into revealing sensitive information or undertaking actions that jeopardize satellite system security [48], [59], [67], [100]. *Backdoor* satellite systems can be vulnerable to backdoors, which can take various forms, such as weaknesses in ground stations and communication networks, cyberattacks on satellite communications, and embedding malicious software or hardware during development [6], [14], [32], [104]. *DDoS* the ground segment and communication in satellite systems face a significant threat from Distributed Denial of Service attacks. These attacks could disrupt the crucial interaction between ground infrastructure and satellites [34], [135].

5.1.4. Inside Attack. When an individual gains control over a satellite system or its components, it creates a vulnerability to internal attacks. *Data Corruption* This is a cyberattack in which an attacker deliberately alters or destroys data in a computer system or network [18], [104]. *Hardware Backdoor* in the context of satellite, those attacks refer to inserting a malicious component during manufacturing or maintenance, providing a hidden entry point for attackers to gain unauthorized access to and control of satellite systems [32], [104]. *Privilege Escalation* adversaries gain unauthorized access to sensitive data or take control of specific function measures [22], [44], [104]. *DoS* disrupt the normal functioning of a satellite, either physically, such as by damaging hardware or by interfering with communication systems [87], [88].

5.1.5. Malware. This attack involves using malware to infiltrate the satellite’s design and disrupt or turn off its critical functions. *Generic Malware* this type of malware is often used in large-scale attacks where the goal is to infect as many computers as possible to gain access to sensitive information or to use the infected computers for other nefarious purposes, such as sending spam or launching (DDoS) attacks [2]. *Bespoke Malware* malicious software that is custom-made for a specific target [48].

5.1.6. Control of Satellite. Control of Satellite or *payload hijacking* is a cyberattack that targets satellite systems to gain unauthorized access and control. This involves exploiting vulnerabilities to gain unauthorized control, necessitating strong security and monitoring over the satellite. Incidents include satellite damage in 1998, operational interference in 2008, and a Trojan horse at the Johnson Space Centre affecting the ISS [37], [48].

5.2. Two Recent Attacks

In this subsection, we provide a comprehensive examination of two recent high-profile attacks.

5.2.1. Viasat Cyberattack. The Viasat cyberattack exploited KA-SAT ground segment vulnerabilities, disrupting satellite communications, predominantly affecting Ukrainian infrastructure, with suspected Russian origins.

TABLE 2: Adversaries' capabilities.

	Name	Description
Radio frequency (RF) - Signaling Capabilities		
AC1	Transmit VHF and low UHF signals	In the past, the VHF band, ranging from 136-138 MHz, was heavily used, but now most activity is restricted to 137-138 MHz. Meteorological satellites mainly use this band to transmit data and low-resolution images and for low data rate mobile satellite downlinks. The UHF band, with frequencies from 399.9-403 MHz, is used for navigation, positioning, time and frequency standards, mobile communication, and meteorological satellites. Satellites transmitting on 150 MHz use the companion band around 400 MHz. The 432-438 MHz range includes a popular amateur satellite band and a few Earth resources satellites.
AC2	Transmit L-band signals	The L-band refers to a section of radio spectrum that covers frequencies ranging from 1 to 2 GHz. This band has numerous applications in satellite technology. For example, it is used to transmit signals for crucial systems like the GPS and to enable satellite mobile phone communication like Iridium. In addition, Inmarsat leverages the L-band to establish communication across sea, land, and air. WorldSpace satellite radio also broadcasts within the L-band [5], [7], [116].
AC3	Transmit S-band signals	The S-band refers to frequencies ranging from 2-4 GHz in the radio spectrum. It has various applications in satellite technology, such as weather radar, surface ship radar, and some communications satellites. NASA utilizes the S-band to communicate with the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. In May 2009, the European Commission awarded Inmarsat and Solaris Mobile a 2x15 MHz portion of each S-band [7].
AC4	Transmit X-band signals	The X-band refers to a specific range of frequencies in the radio spectrum, those falling between 8-12 GHz. This frequency range is mainly used by military personnel for radar applications, such as continuous-wave, pulsed, single-polarization, dual-polarization, synthetic aperture radar, and phased arrays. Civil, military, and government organizations also use the X-band radar frequency sub-bands for various purposes, including weather monitoring, air traffic control, maritime vessel traffic control, defense tracking, and vehicle speed detection for law enforcement [7].
AC5	Transmit Ka-band signals	The Ka-band refers to frequencies ranging from 26-40 GHz in the radio spectrum. It has multiple applications, including satellite communications, with uplink capability in the 27.5 GHz and 31 GHz bands. It is also used for close-range targeting radars on military aircraft, providing high-resolution capabilities [7].
AC6	Adjust signal response	To accurately determine the location of a transmitter based on signal arrival times, it is crucial to be able to coordinate responses during interrogations and adjust transmission rates as needed.
AC7	Signal absorption and processing (AC7)	An adversary can use receivers, processors, and parsers to pick up, listen to, and decode signals.
Laser Communication		
AC8	Emit laser	Eavesdropping or jamming can be performed by using a laser [133], and in those cases, the following components are needed, in addition to the laser generator itself: a powerful electrical power supply, optical components, a control system, and a cooling system. These components work together to create and manage the laser beam, aiming it at the intended target.
Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)		
AC9	Generate EMP	To create an EMP, several components are required, including a high-energy source, power supply, pulse generator, antenna, enclosure, and trigger mechanism. These components work together to produce a powerful electromagnetic field that can disrupt or cause damage to electronic devices. An adversary can use an EMP weapon on the ground or in space, via a spacecraft [42], [43].
Physical Attack		
AC10	Emit high-powered laser	A high-powered laser beam can quickly disable or destroy a target by accurately aiming the shaft for a specific amount of time. Some countries have already developed this capability, and ongoing efforts are underway to mount such weapons on orbiting satellites for faster deployment [55]. These attacks are difficult to trace and can be launched from any location on the planet.
AC11	Emit high-powered microwave	An attack using a high-powered microwave involves directing a significant amount of energy toward a specific target. The consequences of such an attack can vary from the satellite's destruction to the temporary disablement of its subsystems [70].
AC12	Satellite control	By taking control of a satellite or spacecraft or creating their own, adversaries could attack other satellites by causing collisions or damaging their sensors. They could equip the spacecraft with weapons to increase their impact.
AC13	Missile	Direct-ascent Anti-satellite weapons (ASAT) involves missiles that are launched from the ground or air, and ascend in order to reach a target in orbit.
AC14	Nuclear weapon	Since the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests (PTBT) in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater, no further nuclear weapon tests have been conducted in the upper atmosphere [109]. Nevertheless, several nations possess the capability to do so today. A high-altitude nuclear explosion (HANE) has three main consequences for space infrastructure [23]. The first one is kinetic, which causes destructive effects within the explosion's radius. The last two consequences are related to electromagnetic pulses that HANE weapons produce, which can cause temporary or irreversible damage to satellites and ground stations [43].
Launch Satellite		
AC15	Launch on their own	Most launch companies do not permit individuals to launch their customized satellites into space, so an adversary interested in deploying a customized satellite with weapons would likely have to have the ability to launch the satellite him/herself.
AC16	Connection to launching company	For a similar reason as (AC15), the adversary may need a connection to a launching company in order to launch their weaponized customized satellite into space.
Position Access.		
AC17	Access to satellite network/constellation	Adversaries can access satellite networks/constellations by compromising GSs, exploiting communication vulnerabilities, or employing social engineering tactics. Alternatively, adversaries can gain access by paying for satellite services.
AC18	Access to the ground station	Adversaries can access ground stations through physical infiltration, remote attacks exploiting network vulnerabilities, or social engineering or own a GS or pay to utilize a cloud service's GS.
Insider Connection.		
AC19	Insider operator	An adversary can use an insider operator to access sensitive information, systems, or satellite components. Insiders may possess knowledge of the satellite's vulnerabilities, security procedures, and operational protocols, making them valuable assets for attackers. With insider assistance, attackers can bypass security controls, inject malicious code, or manipulate satellite operations to achieve their objectives, such as disrupting communications, stealing sensitive information, or sabotaging the satellite. Additionally, insiders may provide physical access to the satellite or its components, allowing the attacker to perform a physical attack. Connecting with an insider operator can significantly enhance an adversary's chances of success in a satellite attack.
AC20	Insider supplier	Through insider suppliers, an adversary can obtain malicious hardware or software components to compromise the satellite's security. Insiders with access to the supply chain can introduce counterfeit or modified components that bypass security measures or allow unauthorized access to the satellite's systems or data. By compromising the supply chain, an attacker can simultaneously compromise multiple satellites and magnify their attack's impact.

The attackers targeted user modems and modem control servers, possibly entering through an unpatched Fortinet VPN appliance and escalated privileges to manipulate modem management. The attack potentially spread malicious firmware, named "AcidRain," erasing modem data and impacting not just Ukraine but also Germany and other

European countries, possibly due to geographic selection errors or territorial overlaps [19].

5.2.2. ICARUS. DDoS attacks pose a significant threat to low-orbit satellite networks (LSNs), exploiting their decentralized structures to flood targets with excessive traffic and cause service disruptions. The ICARUS attack,

TABLE 3: Adversary Capabilities.

	Adversary Capabilities																			
	RF							Laser	EMP	Physical					Launch		Position		Insider	
	AC1	AC2	AC3	AC4	AC5	AC6	AC7	AC8	AC9	AC10	AC11	AC12	AC13	AC14	AC15	AC16	AC17	AC18	AC19	AC20
Tier 1 (Individual hackers & activists)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	•	•	•	•
Tier 2 (Competitors)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Tier 3 (Terrorists)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Tier 4 (Insider operator)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Tier 5 (Organized criminals)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Tier 6 (State actors)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

a specific form of DDoS, cunningly blends with legitimate traffic, making detection challenging. Attackers executing ICARUS can disrupt LSN communications by taking advantage of satellite movements, compromising devices linked to satellite terminals, and overloading certain network links. This particular DDoS attack underlines the urgent need for stringent security measures to safeguard satellite-based networks [50], [136].

6. Extending MITRE

In this paper, we standardize the knowledge gathered on threats to cybersecurity in the field of outer space generally and LEO satellites particularly. To do so, we follow ATT&CK (Adversarial Tactics, Techniques, and Common Knowledge) model presented by MITRE [115] to classify attack tactics, techniques, sub-techniques, and procedures.

- **Tactics** “*why*” a technique or sub-technique is used to achieve the adversary’s technical goals.
- **Technique** “*how*” the adversary achieves their tactical goals.
- **Sub-technique** a specific description of the adversarial behavior used to achieve a goal [10]. The difference between techniques and sub-techniques lies in their relationship, where each sub-technique falls under a technique. The fields and information for techniques will be similar to those for sub-techniques in ATT&CK.
- **Procedures** “*what*” specific implementation the adversary uses with a technique or sub-technique. In this paper, a procedure refers to implementing a technique in academic or industrial studies.

The matrices in Figure 4 represent the various tactics in the satellite field (columns) and the techniques used to achieve their tactical goals (the entities). This matrix representation helped us systematically categorize known attacks and build a taxonomy based on them, while retaining the attack phases as a sequence chart.

6.1. Reconnaissance

In the reconnaissance tactic, the adversary collects information and identifies and selects targets. More specifically, the adversary collects information that can be used in later phases of the attack lifecycle to target and select attack techniques. There are multiple techniques used to achieve this tactical goal.

Public Space Scanners: The availability of online resources such as LEOLABS¹⁸ and N2YO¹⁹ allows an

adversary to track and monitor the movements of LEO satellites in real-time. These resources provide various information that the adversary can gather when performing reconnaissance, such as the launch site, launch date, start and end azimuth, max elevation, and more, as well as a 10-day prediction for the payload location.

Gather Satellite Design Information: With the growing use of COST components [90], the adversary can collect specific information about the target satellite. For example, Theia²⁰ and CubeSatShop²¹ provide a simulator and full subsystems for LEO satellites, and an adversary can obtain all information needed online [56], [98].

Gather Space Communications Information: An adversary can obtain information regarding the payload’s communication channels to determine specific commands and protocols. Such information includes command patterns, locations, beacon frequencies, and polarization.

Eavesdropping: As described in Section 5, an adversary can gather valuable information by capturing RF communication.

Gather Supply Chain Information: An adversary can gather information about a mission’s supply chain [40] that can be used for future attacks, including information about hardware and software components, known vulnerabilities, and business relationships. The information obtained can be used to manipulate hardware and software components, identify vulnerabilities, or identify organizations involved in the mission’s supply chain.

Resource Development: Adversaries strive to develop and obtain resources that can be used their operations.

Acquire Infrastructure: An adversary can acquire infrastructure used to connect to and communicate with satellites. Such infrastructure includes GS equipment such as antenna positioners, ground antennas, ground data processors, ground radio modems, and signal generators. An adversary can also buy or rent commercial GS services²¹ to save time, money, and effort. Adversaries can even acquire satellites to maneuver near target spacecraft and launch facilities to launch rockets into space.

Compromise Infrastructure: Threat actors can compromise third-party infrastructure to use in future campaigns. This may include physical devices such as antennas, amplifiers, and converters, as well as software used by satellite communicators. For example, threat actors can compromise mission-operated GSs or third-party GSs that have already been configured for communication with the victim satellite. They may also compromise a third-party satellite that can maneuver in proximity to a target satel-

18. <https://leolabs.space/seeleo/>

19. <https://www.n2yo.com/>

20. <https://www.theia.eusoc.upm.es/esat/>

21. <https://www.cubesatshop.com/>




Figure 4: MITRE taxonomy for LEO satellites.

lite, which allows them to avoid signal attenuation and interferes with complicated attack attribution. Once the satellite is compromised, the threat actor may be able to target the satellite and perform various attacks depending on the access enabled via the physical connection.

Obtain Cyber Capabilities: Threat actors can obtain cyber capabilities by buying or stealing malware, software, exploits, and information related to vulnerabilities rather than developing them in-house. Doing so can support their operations in different phases of an attack. For example, an adversary may obtain exploits/payloads from online sources or purchase them from exploit vendors. They may also get encryption keys for commanding the target satellite or its subsystems/payloads, allowing them to control the satellite without going through legitimate channels. These keys can be obtained by performing reconnaissance on the GS or retrieved from the satellite.

Obtain Non-Cyber Capabilities: Refer to physical capabilities (e.g., high-powered lasers, high-powered microwaves, and missile) or EMP and launch satellite capabilities [126] as presented in Section 4. Threat actors may acquire these capabilities by developing or utilizing space launch service providers.

6.2. Initial Access

When using the initial access tactic, an adversary attempts to create an attack vector by obtaining access to the targeted system/environment. To achieve this tactical goal, an adversary may exploit all available means of entry into the system from external sources and public networks; multiple potential pathways exist to gain a foothold in a space system.

Physical Access: Sabotaging the supply chain can allow an adversary to modify the satellite’s hardware, software, or C&HDS or insert malware in the satellite’s onboard computer or other subsystems to gain physical access or provide access to another adversary.

Satellite Proximity: An adversary can gain satellite proximity by controlling another spacecraft, for example, by purchasing a spacecraft or gaining control of another spacecraft. Then, the adversary can perform various attacks that require satellite proximity.

Ground Station An adversary can use malware or a

backdoor to access the GS; this can be accomplished via an insider operator or by employing social engineering. This access can give the attacker control of the satellite, making it one of an adversary’s top priorities.

Network: If an adversary possesses the right equipment, they can access a satellite network/constellation. For example, an adversary can pay a fee to receive the services of companies like SpaceX, StarLink, or Viasat. While some networks, like military networks, will be harder to access, attackers can find a backdoor from the web network or hack the computer belonging to someone with access to the network.

Signal: Adversaries can target satellites by using signals (e.g., radio or laser signals). Most satellite attacks performed have focused on the signals themselves, including eavesdropping, jamming, and replay attacks, and other methods discussed in Section C.1 [124], [128].

Rogue Equipment: An adversary can infiltrate a satellite using rogue equipment without going through an authorized GS or communication site.

6.3. Persistence

Threat actors aim to maintain access and control of a satellite; this can be accomplished by executing code and maintaining access and control of a satellite.

Backdoor: Threat actors can exploit or create backdoors in the hardware or software of satellites to ensure that their attack persists. Detecting hardware backdoors is particularly challenging for ground controllers once the satellite is in orbit. Code can be injected to create a backdoor by altering the software supply chain or modifying the configuration of software-defined radio (if present). Threat actors can establish persistent access to the satellite by exploiting or creating backdoors, potentially increasing the harm caused by the attacker.

Memory Compromise: Threat actors can manipulate the memory to install harmful code or commands on a satellite. They may target specific memory locations that allow programs to execute automatically during system reboot, safe mode entry/exit, or other events; this ensures that the adversary’s code remains on the system even after a reset, enabling them to continue their attack.

Ground System Presence: Threat actors can compromise

the GSs used to communicate with target satellites, enabling them to gain continuous access to the satellite or perform other malicious activities. GSs are already set up for satellite communication, making it easy for attackers to plan, initiate, and execute their attacks. By exploiting this infrastructure, threat actors can take control of a satellite and launch additional attacks.

Replace Cryptographic Keys: Adversaries may attempt to change the cryptographic keys on a satellite. This would prevent mission operators from accessing the satellite and could allow the attacker to communicate with it instead; since the operators would no longer have control of the satellite, it could become unstable. For example, threat actors can exploit weaknesses in the key management strategy by using over-the-air rekeying procedures to insert their cryptographic keys. By completely replacing the encryption key on the satellite, the attacker can take over the communication channel and potentially carry out additional attacks.

Valid Credentials: Threat actors may try to obtain valid credentials in order to gain access to a satellite or its related command and control (C2) systems; doing so would allow them to apply additional tactics in an attack. These credentials may include system service accounts, user accounts, maintenance accounts, cryptographic keys, and other authentication mechanisms. By obtaining valid credentials, threat actors can maintain access to the satellite and potentially launch further attacks.

6.4. Execution

An adversary can try to execute malicious code. In this case, the techniques involve running adversary-controlled code (locally or remotely). This is often combined with other tactics, such as network exploration or data theft, to achieve various objectives.

Replay: As described in Section 5, an adversary might execute malicious code by using a replay technique.

Exploit Hardware/Firmware Corruption: Different time-triggered protocols (TTP) can be used, depending on the type of hardware and/or firmware targeted. Antivirus, antimalware, and intrusion detection software can usually prevent threat actors from using vulnerabilities to infect a system with malicious code. Despite this, not all security gaps can be filled by these tools since these tools do not reside on software applications or drivers but rather on the hardware itself [90].

Disable/Bypass Encryption: The payload's encryption mechanism can be bypassed or disabled by an adversary.

Malicious Code: Threat actors may employ various tactics to execute malicious code on victim satellites. For example, they may compromise a satellite's supply chain or development environment, exploit known commands, or leverage software vulnerabilities. Once the malicious code has been uploaded, the threat actor can trigger its execution through a specific command or accidental activation by a legitimate user. The code can target the satellite's hosted payload, subsystems, or underlying operating system, potentially causing disruptions or damage.

6.5. Defense Evasion

Generally, an adversary tries to avoid being detected.

Disable Fault Management: In an attack campaign,

threat actors may disable fault management within the payload.

Prevent Downlink: Threat actors may target the downlink connections of satellites to prevent the victim satellite from sending telemetry to the ground controllers. This can be done by inhibiting GS functionality, jamming the downlink signal, or manipulating or shutting down the satellite's onboard processes. By disabling the downlink, threat actors may be able to prevent ground controllers from monitoring the health and stability of the satellite and taking corrective action if necessary.

Modify Onboard Values: Threat actors may target various onboard values put in place to prevent malicious or poorly crafted commands from being processed. This can be done by modifying the vehicle command counter, rejected command counter, telemetry downlink modes, cryptographic modes, system clock, GPS ephemeris, watchdog timer, or AI/ML training data. By modifying these values, adversaries may be able to hide their attacks, prevent ground controllers from taking corrective action, and take control of the satellite.

Masquerading: Adversaries can access a victim satellite by masquerading as an authorized entity. This can be done by manipulating command headers, spoofing locations, or leveraging insider access. By masquerading as an authorized entity, threat actors may be able to execute malicious commands or gain access to sensitive data.

Exploit Reduced Protections During Safe Mode: Attackers can exploit reduced protections in safe mode to send malicious commands that would not otherwise be processed. A satellite is put in safe mode to mitigate failures or other problems. In safe mode, many security features are disabled, making it easier for threat actors to access the satellite and execute malicious commands.

Camouflage, Concealment, and Decoys (CCD) Threat actors may use various physical methods to conceal, camouflage, or decoy their satellites. These methods can include hiding their satellites among space debris, taking advantage of space weather events to carry out electromagnetic interference (EMI) attacks, and deploying decoys that can disrupt detection and interception systems. By using these methods, threat actors can make it challenging for defenders to detect and track their satellites, which can enable adversaries to launch attacks without being detected.

Valid Credentials: described in subsection 6.3.

6.6. Lateral Movement:

Threat actors try to navigate through various segments of a satellite's space echo system or subsystems.

Constellation Hopping via Crosslink: Threat actors may attempt to command a neighboring satellite through crosslink connections. Satellites in close proximity to one another can often exchange commands. By exploiting this access, adversaries can compromise the security of another satellite [77].

From Rx to Payload: There are two main routes for communication from the receiving interface (Rx) to the satellite payload. The first route involves payload users who interact directly with the payload through the provided service using a small antenna. The second route involves payload service attackers who exploit the targeted

satellite service, utilizing a small antenna to communicate with the payload or the satellite GS [128].

From Rx to Bus: An external attacker can utilize a custom GS or a custom satellite to establish communication with the target satellite. This enables the attacker to send arbitrary traffic to any interface that receives external communication and receive responses accordingly. Therefore, the satellite classification system enables external attackers to access all external Rx interfaces [128].

From Payload to Bus: The bus-payload link is pivotal for managing and toggling power to payload components via API-like interfaces. To safeguard this link, it's vital to secure the TCs from the C&DHS and fortify interface vulnerabilities. Critical TC interfaces should be restricted to bus operations, and risky TC interfaces should either be eliminated or tightly controlled. Protecting this link's availability is key to preventing DoS among payload elements [128].

From Bus (C&HDS) to Satellite Control From the bus, an adversary gains some control of the C&HDS. Control of the satellite is possible if the adversary gains complete control of the C&HDS.

6.7. Impact

The impact tactic consists of an adversary's techniques to disrupt, compromise, destroy, and manipulate the integrity and availability of satellite components and systems or data.

Tampering with Network Communication While satellites are mainly used for communication, adversaries can exploit their signals to tamper with their communication. This has been done by multiple groups, as discussed in Section 5.1.1.

Eavesdropping: Since payloads are commonly used to monitor user telemetry [79], an adversary may exploit the signal to steal sensitive information about the user; in Section 5.1.1, We described how an adversary can intercept and listen to communications or data transmissions between satellites and other communication devices.

Data Corruption: As described in Section 5.1.4, an adversary might deliberately alter or destroy satellite system or network data.

Gain Control: An adversary might get control of the payload or GS.

Denial of Service: As described in Section 5.1.4, an adversary can disrupt a satellite's normal functioning physically, such as damaging hardware or interfering with communication systems. An adversary interested in disrupting critical services might adopt this technique.

Sabotage/Destruction: An adversary could try to destroy or sabotage one or more satellite subsystems.

Attack Endpoints on the Ground: A threat actor may target the attack on the user endpoint [112].

7. Demonstration - Using the Taxonomy to Model Attacks

To demonstrate how our proposed taxonomy (described in Section 6) models attacks based on the ATT&CK philosophy. In this section, we present two case studies in detail, as well as six recorded attacks mapped to our proposed taxonomy (see Table 4).

7.1. Case Study - Viasat Cyberattack

Additionally to what was discussed in Section 5.2, the Viasat cyberattack occurred on February 22, 2022, during Russia's war against Ukraine. While the attack was mainly targeted at the Ukraine military [19], it caused collateral damage on civilian targets such as the German wind turbine [129] and thousands of Internet users in Europe [3], [26].




Figure 5: Case study - Viasat cyberattack.

Reconnaissance: The adversaries used two techniques to achieve their reconnaissance goal. By gathering supply chain information, the adversary identified a component with a VPN vulnerability. The adversary managed to obtain additional information by gathering space communications information online.

Resource Development: In order to achieve the resource development tactic, the adversaries compromised infrastructure; in this attack, the Viasat GS was compromised to gain access to the satellite.

Initial Access: Several initial access techniques were used. The adversaries initiated their attack by targeting the network infrastructure, specifically exploiting a vulnerability in the VPN of their FortiGate modem, which had a known security weakness identified in 2019. After infiltrating the network, the adversaries successfully gained some control over the GS, allowing them to exploit the RF Ka-band [121] on wireless communication. They used the compromised access to send TC signals to the satellite, which triggered their attack.

Execution: To achieve the execution tactic, the adversaries leveraged the existing vulnerability in the FortiGate modem's VPN firmware to corrupt the firmware. This was accomplished by using "acidRain" [52] malware.

Lateral Movement: The attackers used TC to hop between constellations in order to propagate their attack. While In the Viasat report they did not explain how the attack spread within the satellite, it could have spread from the Rx to the payload or bus. If they need to reach the payload, they can move directly from the payload to the bus without having to return to the bus.

Impact: The adversaries executed a comprehensive plan targeting the communication infrastructure. First, they initiated a destructive operation by deleting critical data from the modem's flash memory. They also launched attacks on the ground-based endpoint modems, impacting both the satellite and its users, and performed a coordinated DoS attack in Ukraine that affected several neighboring European Union countries, causing significant disruption to their communication systems.

7.2. Case Study - ICARUS

As mentioned in Section 5.2, there have been no documented real-life attacks similar to ICARUS, so we use this for demonstration purposes. The ICARUS attack is a highly advanced DDoS attack that explicitly targets satellite networks. It can be challenging to detect as it disguises itself as legitimate traffic. The attacker controls the attack paths and can disrupt communication by exploiting satellite positions and vulnerable devices. In LSNs, there are only limited routing options available, which increases the vulnerability of the network. As a result, specific links can become congested and cause disruption [50].




Figure 6: Case study - ICARUS.

Reconnaissance: In order to successfully execute the attack, the adversary must know about the satellite’s location and movement. In this case, the adversary gathers information on the satellite and its communication patterns to predict and activate their bots effectively. The adversary also gathers information on the constellation of the target LSN; such information about the satellite’s functioning is crucial, enabling threat actors to exploit its vulnerabilities and carry out the attack.

Resource Development: With the resource development tactic, the adversary aims to infiltrate the satellite network by acquiring the necessary infrastructure. This involves gaining control of a GS or compromising an individual with privileged access to the satellite’s network. By obtaining such control or access, the adversary can navigate their way through the satellite network and carry out their malicious activities.

Initial Access: To execute the attack successfully, the threat actors requires access to the LSN. They can achieve this by utilizing bots deployed on hardware devices connected to the LSN. By leveraging these bots, the adversaries can enter the network and proceed with their intended malicious activities.

Execution: To successfully execute the attack, the adversary deploys bots on targets with to the LSN. By using these bots, the adversary is able to manipulate and control the targeted network and execute the attack.

Defense Evasion: The attacker can make their LSN traffic look legitimate by using valid credentials from a bot-infected user. By leveraging these valid credentials, the adversary can mask their activities and make it appear that the network traffic originates from genuine user interactions. This deceptive tactic helps the adversary avoid detection.

Lateral Movement: To achieve their goals, they employ a technique known as constellation hopping via a crosslink. This involves strategically directing data packets to move from one satellite to another within the constellation.

Impact: The adversary performs a DoS attack on the target by intentionally flooding the LSN network, resulting in network congestion. This act of overwhelming the network causes delays and prevents the target from accessing

its desired resources promptly. This tampering with network communication can also lead to significant disruptions, causing delays for all users in the LSN network. The overall impact is degraded user experience and diminished communication capabilities across the network.

8. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we have conducted an extensive analysis of the security vulnerabilities and threats that confront low earth orbit (LEO) satellites. Our examination delved into the various facets of the space ecosystem, encompassing the ground, space, communication, and user segments. We elucidated their architectures, functions, and inherent vulnerabilities, providing a comprehensive overview.

To better grasp the potential adversaries in this domain, we categorized them into six tiers based on their capabilities, potential harm, and available resources. Additionally, we presented an overview of historical satellite attacks, including jamming, spoofing, and malware incidents. Recent complex attacks on networks such as Viasat and ICARUS were also detailed, underscoring the evolving nature of the threats.

One of the main contributions of this paper is the introduction of a novel taxonomy that extends MITRE ATT&CK. This taxonomy is designed to classify adversarial techniques aimed at LEO satellites throughout the entire attack lifecycle, ranging from reconnaissance to impact. It encompasses various tactics, including reconnaissance, resource development, initial access, execution, persistence, defense evasion, lateral movement, and impact, each associated with specific techniques. We illustrated the application of this taxonomy through case studies, modeling the Viasat and ICARUS attacks.

Our proposed threat model and taxonomy represent significant advancements in satellite security research. They serve as a foundation for the development of robust defenses against emerging threats to space assets, as well as for the design of security architectures, intrusion detection systems, risk assessments, and satellite attack simulations.

We believe that the introduced taxonomy is a cornerstone for guiding these and other future endeavors to enhance satellite cybersecurity. By enhancing our understanding of the threat landscape, we can better protect vital space assets and ensure the continued integrity and functionality of LEO satellites.

The survey reveals that satellite systems are susceptible to different vulnerabilities such as signal interference, COTS, supply chain tampering, and network intrusions. These vulnerabilities exist between all the segments, making it crucial to implement comprehensive security measures, including encryption, access controls, testing, monitoring, and standards tailored to the space industry. Although securing satellites poses challenges like upgrade limitations, computing constraints, and supply chain visibility, there is positive progress in this area through growing awareness, information-sharing initiatives, focused R&D, and commercial providers prioritizing security. A layered defense that integrates redundancy and rapid recovery is essential to protect these critical space assets against evolving threats.

References

- [1] Skygrabber software drones hacked, 12 2009. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [2] Space attacks open database project, 2020. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [3] Ka-sat network cyber attack overview, 3 2022. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [4] Cve, 8 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [5] L-band for weather satellite data receiving system, 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [6] Protect satellites, secure your networks, chief space ops says, 1 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [7] Satellite frequency bands, 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [8] Satellite hacking demystified, 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [9] Second generation dvb interactive satellite system (dvb-rcs2); part 2: Lower layers for satellite standard, 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [10] Strom A. Att&ck sub-techniques preview, 08 2019.
- [11] Yuma Abe, Hiroyuki Tsuji, Amane Miura, and Shuichi Adachi. Frequency resource management based on model predictive control for satellite communications system. *IEICE Transactions on Fundamentals of Electronics, Communications and Computer Sciences*, 101(12):2434–2445, 2018.
- [12] Adnane Addaim, Abdelhaq Kherras, and El Bachir Zantou. Design of low-cost telecommunications cubesat-class spacecraft. *Aerospace Technologies Advancements*, page 293, 2010.
- [13] Carmen Reglero Andres, Nicholas Ansell, Eloy Salcedo, and Jason Arora. Virtualizing satellite communication operations with aws, 9 2022. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [14] Mathieu Bailly. Cybersecurity for smallsats - 5 key concepts explained, 2 2021. Last updated: October 19, 2023, Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [15] Richard Baker, Peter MacHarrie, Hieu Phung, Jonathan Hansford, Jakku Reddy, Stephen Causey, John Sobanski, Steven Walsh, Ronald Niemann, and Daniel Beall. Amazon web services (aws) cloud platform for satellite data processing. 2019.
- [16] Georg Baselt, Martin Strohmeier, James Pavur, Vincent Lenders, and Ivan Martinovic. Security and privacy issues of satellite communication in the avlatlon domain. In *2022 14th International Conference on Cyber Conflict: Keep Moving!(CyCon)*, volume 700, pages 285–307. IEEE, 2022.
- [17] Aaron Bateman. Mutually assured surveillance at risk: Anti-satellite weapons and cold war arms control. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 45(1):119–142, 2022.
- [18] Green Book. Security threats against space missions. *CCSDS Secretariat: Washington, DC, USA*, 2006.
- [19] Nicolò Boschetti, Nathaniel G Gordon, and Gregory Falco. Space cybersecurity lessons learned from the viasat cyberattack. In *ASCEND 2022*, page 4380. 2022.
- [20] CERT Coordination Center. Cert advisory ca-2002-03 multiple vulnerabilities in many implementations of the simple network management protocol (snmp), 12 february, 2002.
- [21] NASA Ames Research Center. State-of-the-art of small spacecraft technology, 07 2022.
- [22] Nicholas Cohen, Wayne A Wheeler, Roberta Ewart, and Joseph Betsler. Spacecraft embedded cyber defense-prototypes & experimentation. In *AIAA SPACE 2016*, page 5231. 2016.
- [23] Stirling A Colgate. The phenomenology of the mass motion of a high altitude nuclear explosion. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 70(13):3161–3173, 1965.
- [24] Andrei Costin, Syed Khandker, Hannu Turtiainen, and Timo Hämäläinen. Cybersecurity of cospas-sarsat and epirb: threat and attacker models, exploits, future research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08361*, 2023.
- [25] Giacomo Curzi, Dario Modenini, and Paolo Tortora. Large constellations of small satellites: A survey of near future challenges and missions. *Aerospace*, 7(9):133, 2020.
- [26] cyber peace institute. Case study viasat, 06 2022.
- [27] CyberScoop. Cisa researchers: Russia’s fancy bear infiltrated us satellite network, 12 2022. Accessed: October 8, 2023.
- [28] Robert F Dacey. *Critical Infrastructure Protection: Commercial Satellite Security Should Be More Fully Addressed*. Diane Publishing, 2002.
- [29] Tasneem Darwish, Gunes Karabulut Kurt, Halim Yanikomeroglu, Michel Bellemare, and Guillaume Lamontagne. Leo satellites in 5g and beyond networks: A review from a standardization perspective. *IEEE Access*, 10:35040–35060, 2022.
- [30] Bob Davis. Captain midnight unmasked by fcc, enters guilty plea. *Wall Street Journal*, page 1, 1986.
- [31] Anton de Waal Alberts. The degree of the lack of regulation of space debris within the current space law regime and suggestions for a prospective legal framework and technological interventions. *Space Security and Legal Aspects of Active Debris Removal*, pages 93–106, 2019.
- [32] Luca del Monte. Towards a cybersecurity policy for a sustainable, secure and safe space environment. In *Proceedings of the 64th International Astronautical Congress (IAC)*, 2013.
- [33] DHS. Electromagnetic pulse (emp) / geomagnetic disturbance (gmd), 08 2022.
- [34] AO Di, Shi Ruisheng, Lina Lan, and Lu Yueming. On the large-scale traffic ddos threat of space backbone network. In *2019 IEEE 5th Intl Conference on Big Data Security on Cloud (BigDataSecurity), IEEE Intl Conference on High Performance and Smart Computing (HPSC) and IEEE Intl Conference on Intelligent Data and Security (IDS)*, pages 192–194. IEEE, 2019.
- [35] Boya Di, Lingyang Song, Yonghui Li, and H Vincent Poor. Ultra-dense leo: Integration of satellite access networks into 5g and beyond. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 26(2):62–69, 2019.
- [36] Bryan R Early and Erik Gartzke. Spying from space: Reconnaissance satellites and interstate disputes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 65(9):1551–1575, 2021.
- [37] US-China Economic and Security Review Commission. *report to congress of the US-China economic and security review commission*. US-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 2019.
- [38] George Eger. Orion’s command and data handling architecture. In *AIAA Space 2008 Conference & Exposition*, page 7743, 2008.
- [39] Gregory Falco. Job one for space force: Space asset cybersecurity. *Belfer Center, Harvard Kennedy School, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School*, 79, 2018.
- [40] Gregory Falco. The vacuum of space cyber security. In *2018 AIAA SPACE and Astronautics Forum and Exposition*, page 5275, 2018.
- [41] Gregory Falco. Cybersecurity principles for space systems. *Journal of Aerospace Information Systems*, 16(2):61–70, 2019.
- [42] Gregory Falco. When satellites attack: Satellite-to-satellite cyber attack, defense and resilience. In *ASCEND 2020*, page 4014. 2020.
- [43] Gregory Falco and Nicolò Boschetti. A security risk taxonomy for commercial space missions. In *ASCEND 2021*, page 4241. 2021.
- [44] Gregory Falco, Arun Viswanathan, and Andrew Santangelo. Cubesat security attack tree analysis. In *2021 IEEE 8th International Conference on Space Mission Challenges for Information Technology (SMC-IT)*, pages 68–76. IEEE, 2021.
- [45] Muhammad Fayyaz and Tanya Vladimirova. Fault-tolerant distributed approach to satellite on-board computer design. In *2014 IEEE Aerospace Conference*, pages 1–12. IEEE, 2014.
- [46] United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs. Online index of objects launched into outer space. 2008.
- [47] A Franchi, A Howell, and J Sengupta. Broadband mobile via satellite inmarsat bgan. 2000.

- [48] Jason Fritz. Satellite hacking: A guide for the perplexed. *Culture Mandala*, 10(1):5906, 2013.
- [49] Joseph Gedeon. For the first time, u.s. government lets hackers break into satellite in space, 8 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [50] Giacomo Giuliani, Tommaso Ciussani, Adrian Perrig, Ankit Singla, and E Zurich. Icarus: Attacking low earth orbit satellite networks. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, pages 317–331, 2021.
- [51] Steven J Goodman, Timothy J Schmit, Jaime Daniels, and Robert J Redmon. *The GOES-R series: a new generation of geostationary environmental satellites*. Elsevier, 2019.
- [52] Juan Andres Guerrero-Saade and Max van Amerongen. Acidrain—a modem wiper rains down on europe. *Sentinel Labs*, 31, 2022.
- [53] Arthur Norman Guest. Telemetry, tracking, and command (tt&c). In *Handbook of Satellite Applications*, pages 1313–1324. Springer, 2017.
- [54] Peter Hadinger. Inmarsat global xpress the design, implementation, and activation of a global ka-band network. In *33rd AIAA International Communications Satellite Systems Conference and Exhibition*, page 4303, 2015.
- [55] Todd Harrison, Kaitlyn Johnson, Joe Moye, Makena Young, et al. *Space threat assessment 2020*. Center for Strategic & International Studies., 2020.
- [56] Aboul Ella Hassanien, Ashraf Darwish, and Sara Abdelghafar. Machine learning in telemetry data mining of space mission: basics, challenging and future directions. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 53:3201–3230, 2020.
- [57] Hamid Hemmati. *Near-earth laser communications*, volume 1. CRC press, 2020.
- [58] Amy Hewitson. Satellite ground stations - everything you ever wanted to know and more..., 10 2020. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [59] Kelly Jackson Higgins. Russian 'fancy bear' hackers hit mac os x with new trojan, 9 2016. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [60] Thomas Hiriart, Jean-Francois Castet, Jarret M Laffeur, and Joseph H Saleh. Comparative reliability of geo, leo, and meo satellites. In *Proceedings of the international astronautical congress, IAC-09 D*, volume 1, 2009.
- [61] Markus Hösel, Roar R Søndergaard, Mikkel Jørgensen, and Frederik C Krebs. Failure modes and fast repair procedures in high voltage organic solar cell installations. *Advanced Energy Materials*, 4(7):1301625, 2014.
- [62] T Humphreys. Ut austin researchers spoof superyacht at sea. URL: <https://cockrell.utexas.edu/news/archive/7649-superyacht-gps-spoofing>, 2013.
- [63] Stojče Dimov Ilčev and Stojče Dimov Ilčev. Users segment. *Global Mobile Satellite Communications Theory: For Maritime, Land and Aeronautical Applications*, pages 511–580, 2017.
- [64] Leyden J. Hamas hacks israeli tv sat channel to broadcast pics of gaza wounded, 05 2014.
- [65] Rainbow J. Thuraya invests in astrocast's leo constellation, 04 2023.
- [66] Chuberre N Jaffar M. Ntn & satellite in rel-17 & 18, 07 2022.
- [67] Benjamin Jensen, Brandon Valeriano, and Ryan Maness. Fancy bears and digital trolls: Cyber strategy with a russian twist. In *Military Strategy in the 21st Century*, pages 58–80. Routledge, 2020.
- [68] Harrison Johnson, Wood Young, Goessler, et al. *Space threat assessment 2022*. Center for Strategic & International Studies., 2022.
- [69] Harry Jones. The recent large reduction in space launch cost. 48th International Conference on Environmental Systems, 2018.
- [70] US Kai, LH Peter, R Jana, et al. Handbook of space security: policies, applications and programs, 2020.
- [71] Kimmo Karvinen, Tuomas Tikka, and Jaan Praks. Using hobby prototyping boards and commercial-off-the-shelf (cots) components for developing low-cost, fast-delivery satellite subsystems. *Journal of Small Satellites*, 4(1):301–314, 2015.
- [72] Jhoon Kim, Ukkyo Jeong, Myoung-Hwan Ahn, Jae H Kim, Rokjin J Park, Hanlim Lee, Chul Han Song, Yong-Sang Choi, Kwon-Ho Lee, Jung-Moon Yoo, et al. New era of air quality monitoring from space: Geostationary environment monitoring spectrometer (gems). *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 101(1):E1–E22, 2020.
- [73] So Young Kim, Jean-Francois Castet, and Joseph H Saleh. Satellite electrical power subsystem: Statistical analysis of on-orbit anomalies and failures. In *2011 Aerospace Conference*, pages 1–12. IEEE, 2011.
- [74] Oltjon Kodheli, Alessandro Guidotti, and Alessandro Vanelli-Coralli. Integration of satellites in 5g through leo constellations. In *GLOBECOM 2017-2017 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [75] Oltjon Kodheli, Eva Lagunas, Nicola Maturo, Shree Krishna Sharma, Bhavani Shankar, Jesus Fabian Mendoza Montoya, Juan Carlos Merlano Duncan, Danilo Spano, Symeon Chatzinotas, Steven Kisseleff, et al. Satellite communications in the new space era: A survey and future challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 23(1):70–109, 2020.
- [76] Carlo Kopp. The electromagnetic bomb: a weapon of electrical mass destruction, 1996.
- [77] Frank Lee and Gregory Falco. The vulnerabilities less exploited: Cyberattacks on end-of-life satellites. Technical report, Easy-Chair, 2023.
- [78] Malte Lenhart, Marco Spanghero, and Panagiotis Papadimitratos. Relay/replay attacks on gnss signals. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Security and Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, pages 380–382, 2021.
- [79] Israel Leyva-Mayorga, Beatriz Soret, Maik Röper, Dirk Wübben, Bho Matthiesen, Armin Dekorsy, and Petar Popovski. Leo small-satellite constellations for 5g and beyond-5g communications. *Ieee Access*, 8:184955–184964, 2020.
- [80] Hengnian Li. *Geostationary satellites collocation*. Springer, 2014.
- [81] Henrik Lied. Gps freaking out? maybe you're too close to putin. *NRK beta*, September, 18, 2017.
- [82] Xingqin Lin, Stefan Rommer, Sebastian Euler, Emre A Yavuz, and Robert S Karlsson. 5g from space: An overview of 3gpp non-terrestrial networks. *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, 5(4):147–153, 2021.
- [83] Mengjiang Liu, Zhixin Deng, and Li Jun. Research of satellite receiver anti-replay attack techniques. In *China Satellite Navigation Conference (CSNC) 2015 Proceedings: Volume 1*, pages 503–516. Springer, 2015.
- [84] Conrad L Longmire. On the electromagnetic pulse produced by nuclear explosions. *IEEE Transactions on Electromagnetic Compatibility*, (1):3–13, 1978.
- [85] Heiderich M. Total surveillance made easy with voip phones, 2 2008.
- [86] Urban M. Enthusiast watches nato spy pictures, 06 2002.
- [87] Ting Ma, Yee Hui Lee, and Maode Ma. Protecting satellite networks from disassociation dos attacks. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Communication Systems*, pages 662–666. IEEE, 2010.
- [88] Ting Ma, Yee Hui Lee, and Maode Ma. Protecting satellite systems from disassociation dos attacks. *Wireless personal communications*, 69:623–638, 2013.
- [89] Arun K Majumdar and Jennifer C Ricklin. *Free-space laser communications: principles and advances*, volume 2. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [90] Mark Manulis, Christopher P Bridges, Richard Harrison, Venkatesh Sekar, and Andy Davis. Cyber security in new space: analysis of threats, key enabling technologies and challenges. *International Journal of Information Security*, 20:287–311, 2021.

- [91] Paul K Martin and Inspector General. Nasa cybersecurity: An examination of the agency's information security. *NASA, Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, US House of Representatives, House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology*, 29, 2012.
- [92] JS Mayo, H Mann, FJ Witt, DS Peck, HK Gummel, and WL Brown. The command system malfunction of the telstar satellite. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 42(4):1631–1657, 1963.
- [93] Shawn McGann and Douglas C Sicker. An analysis of security threats and tools in sip-based voip systems. In *Second VoIP security workshop*, 2005.
- [94] W Paul Menzel and James FW Purdom. Introducing goes-i: The first of a new generation of geostationary operational environmental satellites. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 75(5):757–782, 1994.
- [95] Lois Miraux. Environmental limits to the space sector's growth. *Science of The Total Environment*, 806:150862, 2022.
- [96] Ruben Morales-Ferre, Philipp Richter, Emanuela Falletti, Alberto de la Fuente, and Elena Simona Lohan. A survey on coping with intentional interference in satellite navigation for manned and unmanned aircraft. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 22(1):249–291, 2019.
- [97] Y Jade Morton, Frank van Diggelen, James J Spilker Jr, Bradford W Parkinson, Sherman Lo, and Grace Gao. *Position, navigation, and timing technologies in the 21st century: Integrated satellite navigation, sensor systems, and civil applications, volume 1*. John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
- [98] Hung H Nguyen and Peter S Nguyen. Communication subsystems for satellite design. In *Satellite Systems-Design, Modeling, Simulation and Analysis*. IntechOpen, 2020.
- [99] Brian Nussbaum and George Berg. Cybersecurity implications of commercial off the shelf (cots) equipment in space infrastructure. *Space infrastructures: From risk to resilience governance*, pages 91–99, 2020.
- [100] Jacqueline O'Leary, Josiah Kimble, Kelli Vanderlee, and Nalani Fraser. Insights into iranian cyber espionage: Apt33 targets aerospace and energy sectors and has ties to destructive malware. *Threat Research Blog*, 2017.
- [101] Bradford W Parkinson, Thomas Stansell, Ronald Beard, and Konstantine Gromov. A history of satellite navigation. *Navigation*, 42(1):109–164, 1995.
- [102] Anand Parthasarathy. Reaching for the sky—bridging distances. 2022.
- [103] James Pavur and Ivan Martinovic. Sok: Building a launchpad for impactful satellite cyber-security research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10872*, 2020.
- [104] James Pavur and Ivan Martinovic. Building a launchpad for satellite cyber-security research: lessons from 60 years of spaceflight. *Journal of Cybersecurity*, 8(1):tyac008, 2022.
- [105] Ana I Perez-Neira, Miguel Angel Vazquez, MR Bhavani Shankar, Sina Maleki, and Symeon Chatzinotas. Signal processing for high-throughput satellites: Challenges in new interference-limited scenarios. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 36(4):112–131, 2019.
- [106] Szűcs Péter. Detection of the uplink of the inmarsat satellite phone calls. *Nemzetbiztonsági Szemle*, 3(4):35–42, 2015.
- [107] Michael Prior-Jones. Satellite communications systems buyers' guide. *British Antarctic Survey*, 2008.
- [108] Frederick Rawlins, Richard Baker, and Ivan Martinovic. Death by a thousand cots: Disrupting satellite communications using low earth orbit constellations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.13514*, 2022.
- [109] Egon Schwelb. The nuclear test ban treaty and international law. *American Journal of International Law*, 58(3):642–670, 1964.
- [110] MENG Shaofei, SHU Jiansheng, YANG Qi, and XIA Wei. Analysis of detection capabilities of leo reconnaissance satellite constellation based on coverage performance. *Journal of Systems Engineering and Electronics*, 29(1):98–104, 2018.
- [111] Lake A Singh, William R Whittecar, Marc D DiPrinzio, Jonathan D Herman, Matthew P Ferringer, and Patrick M Reed. Low cost satellite constellations for nearly continuous global coverage. *Nature communications*, 11(1):200, 2020.
- [112] Joshua Smailes, Edd Salkield, Simon Birnbach, Martin Strohmeier, and Ivan Martinovic. Dishing out dos: How to disable and secure the starlink user terminal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.00582*, 2023.
- [113] John S. Sobolewski. Data transmission media. In Robert A. Meyers, editor, *Encyclopedia of Physical Science and Technology (Third Edition)*, pages 277–303. Academic Press, New York, third edition edition, 2003.
- [114] Jessica A Steinberger. A survey of satellite communications system vulnerabilities. 2008.
- [115] Blake E Strom, Andy Applebaum, Doug P Miller, Kathryn C Nickels, Adam G Pennington, and Cody B Thomas. Mitre att&ck: Design and philosophy. In *Technical report*. The MITRE Corporation, 2018.
- [116] Tazio Strozzi, Paolo Farina, Alessandro Corsini, Christian Ambrosi, Manfred Thüring, Johannes Zilger, Andreas Wiesmann, Urs Wegmüller, and Charles Werner. Survey and monitoring of landslide displacements by means of l-band satellite sar interferometry. *Landslides*, 2:193–201, 2005.
- [117] Kohnstamm T. <https://www.aboutamazon.com/news/innovation-at-amazon/what-is-amazon-project-kuiper>, October 2022.
- [118] Staff T. Hamas hacks into israeli tv and threatens: 'terror will never end', 03 2016.
- [119] Pietro Tedeschi, Savio Sciancalepore, and Roberto Di Pietro. Satellite-based communications security: A survey of threats, solutions, and research challenges. *Computer Networks*, page 109246, 2022.
- [120] Francesco Vatalaro, Giovanni Emanuele Corazza, Carlo Caini, and Carlo Ferrarelli. Analysis of leo, meo, and geo global mobile satellite systems in the presence of interference and fading. *IEEE Journal on selected areas in communications*, 13(2):291–300, 1995.
- [121] Inc. Viasat. Ka-sat network cyber attack overview, February 2022.
- [122] Anne Wainscott-Sargent. Satellite operators respond to cyber threats in a rapidly changing environment, 9 2022. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [123] Dingwei Wang, Yifu Li, Payman Dehghanian, and Shiyuan Wang. Power grid resilience to electromagnetic pulse (emp) disturbances: a literature review. In *2019 North American Power Symposium (NAPS)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2019.
- [124] Qiwei Wang, Thinh Nguyen, Khanh Pham, and Hyuck Kwon. Satellite jamming: A game theoretic analysis. In *MILCOM 2017-2017 IEEE Military Communications Conference (MILCOM)*, pages 141–146. IEEE, 2017.
- [125] Qiwei Wang, Thinh Nguyen, Khanh Pham, and Hyuck Kwon. Satellite jamming: A game theoretic analysis. In *MILCOM 2017 - 2017 IEEE Military Communications Conference (MILCOM)*, pages 141–146, 2017.
- [126] Tyler Way. Counterspace weapons 101. *Aero Space Security (CSIS)*, 2019.
- [127] Debra Werner. Azure orbital space unveils software tools for space applications, 11 2022. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [128] Johannes Willbold, Moritz Schloegel, Manuel Vögele, Maximilian Gerhardt, Thorsten Holz, and Ali Abbasi. Space odyssey: An experimental software security analysis of satellites. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2023.
- [129] Marian Willuhn. Satellite cyber attack paralyzes 11gw of german wind turbines. 2022.
- [130] Zhijun Wu, Qingbo Pan, Meng Yue, and Shaopu Ma. An approach of security protection for vsat network. In *2018 17th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications/12th IEEE International Conference On Big Data Science And Engineering (TrustCom/BigDataSE)*, pages 1511–1516. IEEE, 2018.

- [131] Zhijun Wu, Yun Zhang, Yiming Yang, Cheng Liang, and Rusen Liu. Spoofing and anti-spoofing technologies of global navigation satellite system: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 8:165444–165496, 2020.
- [132] Haoran Xie, Yafeng Zhan, Guanming Zeng, and Xiaohan Pan. Leo mega-constellations for 6g global coverage: Challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Access*, 9:164223–164244, 2021.
- [133] Olfa Ben Yahia, Eylem Erdogan, Gunes Karabulut Kurt, Ibrahim Altunbas, and Halim Yanikomeroglu. Optical satellite eavesdropping. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 71(9):10126–10131, 2022.
- [134] Rui You, Wenjun Gao, Chunbang Wu, and Hongbin Li. *Low-Frequency Antenna and Small Satellite Antenna*, pages 231–247. Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2021.
- [135] Peter Yuen. Cloudflare prevents largest ddos attack and potentially saved a lot of satellite data, 2 2023. Accessed: October 28, 2023.
- [136] Yan Zhang, Yong Wang, Yihua Hu, Zhi Lin, Yadi Zhai, Lei Wang, Qingsong Zhao, Kang Wen, and Linshuang Kang. Security performance analysis of leo satellite constellation networks under ddos attack. *Sensors*, 22(19):7286, 2022.
- [137] Li Zhen, Ali Kashif Bashir, Keping Yu, Yasser D Al-Otaibi, Chuan Heng Foh, and Pei Xiao. Energy-efficient random access for leo satellite-assisted 6g internet of remote things. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(7):5114–5128, 2020.
- [138] Ming Zhuo, Leyuan Liu, Shijie Zhou, and Zhiwen Tian. Survey on security issues of routing and anomaly detection for space information networks. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1):22261, 2021.

A. Threat Analysis

The security analysis that we performed in this paper is based on NIST Ontology for Modeling Enterprise Security. Figure 7 illustrates the set of entities and relationships, according to which the analysis was carried out.

Adversary Refers to an individual, group, or state that can be held accountable for an event or incident that has the capacity to compromise or endanger the security and safety of a satellite system. These threat actors possess diverse adversarial capabilities, which in turn enable them to employ various attack techniques.

Threat An adversary’s actions can introduce threats that have the potential to compromise crucial security properties such as integrity, confidentiality, or availability.

Adversarial Capabilities Capabilities pertain to the resources and abilities accessible to the threat actor. We differentiate between access, positional, knowledge, and material capabilities.

Tactics Describe an adversary’s tactical goal: the reason for the adversary’s actions

Techniques Techniques or approaches that can be employed by threat actors to actualize threats.

Sub-Techniques More specific descriptions of the adversarial behavior used to achieve the adversary’s tactical goal. A technique may encompass multiple sub-techniques [10] or may not have any sub-techniques at all.

Procedures Refers to the specific implementation employed by the adversary for a technique or sub-technique. They pertain to how a technique is realized in academic or industrial studies.

Vulnerability Refers to a characteristic of an asset or technology that is prone to an attack.

Impact The consequence for which an attack was executed.




Figure 7: Threat analysis.

Target assets Encompass the core systems, components, processes, data, and services that constitute a space system (i.e., a satellite) and require protection.

To examine the threat model and establish a classification system for attacks in the space domain, we perform the following steps. First, we conduct a comprehensive examination of the various segments within the satellite ecosystem. This review primarily focuses on analyzing the architecture of each segment and its connections to identify the specific assets within them that can be targeted. Additionally, we discuss the satellite subsystems and their significance as potential target assets (Sections 2, Appendix B). Second, we examine the vulnerabilities of the identified assets and explore how adversaries might exploit those weaknesses (Section 3). Next, we address the capabilities of adversaries and categorize them into six tiers based on their abilities, potential for harm, and available resources (Section 4). Then, we provide a concise overview of satellite attacks throughout history, summarizing the significant attacks (Section C). Finally, by mapping potential threat actors, their capabilities, target assets, and vulnerabilities, and the documented attacks in both industry and academia, we build a taxonomy for the space domain, which is structured as an extension of the MITRE framework (Section 6). We then apply the proposed taxonomy to model two major attacks (Section 7).

B. Satellite Subsystems

The satellite's components can be divided into two functional areas: the payload and the bus. The bus refers to the fundamental infrastructure and subsystems that support the satellite operation [56], [98]. Satellites typically incorporate the following essential subsystems: electrical power control, altitude determination and orbit control, communication, telemetry data, thermal control, propulsion Control and command and data handling. A brief overview of each of these subsystems is provided below.

The payload refers to the equipment or instruments onboard that serve a specific purpose. It is the part of the satellite focused on mission objectives rather than propulsion or power systems. Payloads vary based on the satellite's intended application, such as communication, Earth observation, weather monitoring, scientific research, or navigation. They can include communication transponders, imaging cameras, navigation receivers, or scientific sensors. Payloads are integrated with the satellite during manufacturing and perform data processing, signal transmission, and data capturing functions. They are crucial for achieving the mission's goals, determining the satellite's capabilities, and assessing its performance [98], [128]. A payload may have its own processor and can sometimes perform its tasks without communicating with the bus.

Most nanosatellites have power (EPS), attitude, orbit control (ADCS), command and data handling (C&DHS), and command and telemetry (TT&C in some satellites it part of the communication system) subsystems as presented in Figure 8.




Figure 8: Satellite subsystems.

B.1. Electrical Power Subsystem (EPS)

The EPS is a crucial part of a satellite, providing energy to the satellite and its subsystems [98]. It utilizes solar panels to convert light from the sun into electrical energy, which is stored in batteries through chemical processes. The batteries are the satellite's only energy source during the eclipse phase, i.e., when the satellite is not facing the sun. Charging circuits charge the batteries to a specified limit and monitor for maximum battery charge. Verification pulses are regularly applied to the battery during sunlight to ensure that it remains fully charged. If the battery is partially discharged, the charging process is repeated to ensure that it is fully charged for the next eclipse phase. A vulnerability in the EPS can lead to a loss

of power, which can cause the satellite to malfunction or become completely inoperable.

B.2. Attitude Determination and Control Subsystem (ADCS)

The ADCS subsystem [56] ensures that the satellite is oriented and stabilized in the desired direction throughout its mission. It achieves this by utilizing a range of sensors and modes that help determine the satellite's attitude and orientation. For example, the attitude sensors consist of stars, magnetometers, GPS, angular velocity meters, and angular momentum sensors, while the attitude actuators consist of magnetic torques. The ADCS operates in various modes, including standby mode, de-tumbling mode, and programmed tilting mode, each of which is designed for specific satellite operations. A vulnerability in the ADCS can cause the satellite to lose its pointing accuracy, affecting its ability to perform its intended mission.

B.3. Communication Subsystem (COMMS)

The communication subsystem [98] of a satellite, which is sometimes referred to as the telemetry data subsystem (TT&C) [56], serves as the main channel for transmitting the satellite's status updates and images captured by its camera to the ground station. It also sends out an essential beacon to enable the satellite to be tracked by the ground station. This subsystem includes two transmitters, which are the beacon transmitter. This transmitter plays a critical role in all satellite communication systems, providing continuous wave signal updates about the satellite's status and identity. A vulnerability in the COMMS can affect the satellite's ability to communicate effectively, impacting its ability to perform its intended mission.

B.4. Telemetry, Tracking, and Command (TT&C)

The TT&C subsystem of a satellite is responsible for managing and controlling the satellite's functions and establishing links with the ground station. It is a separate entity from the communication subsystem, consisting of an antenna, command receiver, and tracking and telemetry transmitter. In addition, Telemetry data is collected from other satellite subsystems, such as the power and attitude determination and control subsystems. The TT&C on the ground station comprises a telemetry receiver, command transmitter, antenna, and tracking subsystem. Therefore, a vulnerability in the TT&C can affect the satellite's ability to collect and transmit data effectively, which can impact the mission's success.

B.5. Thermal Control Subsystem (TCS)

The TCS is responsible for managing the heat generated within the satellite by relocating or removing it to maintain an optimal temperature environment for the satellite. A vulnerability in the TCS can cause the satellite to overheat or become too cold, which can impact the satellite's performance and potentially lead to mission failure. Some potential vulnerabilities may cause the satellite to overheat or become too cold, negatively impacting its performance and potentially leading to mission failure.

B.6. Propulsion Control Subsystem (PCS)

The PCS consists of a single tank for storing propellant and four hydrazine thrusters that are situated underneath the tank. Its main functions include storing a sufficient amount of propellant needed for the mission, delivering fuel to the thrusters, and ensuring proper distribution, filtering, isolation, filling, draining, pressurizing, cleaning, and telemetry sensing of the power. A vulnerability in the PCS can result in losing control of the satellite, potentially leading it to drift off course or collide with other objects in space.

B.7. Command & Data Handling Subsystem (C&DHS)

The C&DHS subsystem has been called an onboard computer (OBC), a legacy of the past, because of the shift from analog circuits to the digital domain. The term OBC does not fully reflect the role of this subsystem, and now it is typically referred to as the C&DHS [98]. The C&DHS subsystem is the brain and nervous system of the spacecraft. The function of a C&DHS subsystem is to perform onboard processing and operations and internal communication [38]. Software management of spacecraft operations performed autonomously is generally considered an onboard operation. The software is also responsible for preparing the data to be downlinked and handling any commands received from satellite operators on the ground. In addition, the C&DHS facilitates and controls all internal communication (consisting of headquarters, telemetry, and tracking data) between the satellite subsystems.

There are two main satellite bus architectures [12].

B.8. Star Architecture

The star architecture, as depicted in Figure 9, requires the C&DHS to establish individual data connections with each subsystem. In this type of architecture, the C&DHS needs multiple peripheral interfaces corresponding to the number of subsystems on the satellite. Consequently, challenges may arise related to the wiring of these numerous connections.




Figure 9: star architecture.

B.9. Linear Bus Architecture

As shown in Figure 10, the bus architecture connects all satellite subsystems to a bus, which operates similarly to a local area network (LAN) within the satellite.

Typically, a master-slave protocol is employed in this architecture, and three simple master-slave bus protocols are commonly used in embedded systems: the CAN (Controller Area Network), SPI (Serial Peripheral Interface), and I²C (Inter-Integrated Circuit) protocols.




Figure 10: Satellite linear bus architecture.

C. A Brief History of Satellite Attacks

Since 1957, there have been over 100 significant satellite attacks [104]. In this section, we present an overview of these attacks, categorizing them based on their strategy (see Figure 11), and then we provide a more in-depth description of two recent complex attacks.




Figure 11: Attack strategies; strategies are in dark gray, while specific categories within strategies are in light gray.

C.1. Communication Threats

Satellite-based communication (SATCOM) faces significant communication threats [119], which we break down into five major categories (summarized in Figure 11).

Jamming. In the context of satellite attacks, jamming refers to the intentional disruption of satellite signals by emitting radio frequency interference. The interference can block, obstruct, or degrade the normal functioning of a satellite, making it difficult or impossible to receive or transmit data. Jamming can be performed by various means, including dedicated jamming devices, electronic warfare systems, and even improvised devices. When used in a satellite attack, jamming can have a wide range of impacts, causing a loss of communication or navigation or other critical functions. As reliance on satellite technology continues to grow, the threat of jamming attacks has become increasingly serious, making it a major concern of military [125], governmental, and

commercial entities [42], [90], [131]. For instance, in 1995, intentional jamming disrupted the transmissions of MED TV via the Eutelsat satellite, as it was perceived to serve as a Turkish communication platform [2]. Furthermore, in 1997, an Indonesian satellite emitted interference signals to disrupt Apstar-1A, primarily due to its utilization of a contentious orbital location [28], [48]. In 2000, during tank trials for the Greek army, GPS navigation signals employed by British and US military tanks were deliberately jammed to portray US and British tanks as less capable, thereby influencing the Greek military's choice of tanks [48].

Eavesdropping In the context of satellite attacks, eavesdropping refers to intercepting and listening to communication or data transmissions between satellites and other communication devices. Eavesdropping can be performed for various purposes, such as intelligence gathering, monitoring military or commercial satellite communications, or disrupting satellite operations. Various methods can be used to eavesdrop on satellites, including intercepting radio frequency signals or using specialized equipment to eavesdrop on satellite signals. Eavesdropping can be performed relatively inexpensively; for example, in one study [16], the authors demonstrated a low-budget eavesdropping attack performed with equipment costing less than 400\$. In 2002, there was a report of an amateur radio enthusiast from England eavesdropping on satellite signals originating from NATO surveillance flights [2], [86]. In 2009, insurgents captured unencrypted live video feed from US military unmanned aircraft using a commercial software tool called SkyGrabber [1], [48]. In 2015, Iridium satellite constellation communications were analyzed and decoded to reveal clear-text pager information.²²

Spoofing. In the context of satellite attacks, spoofing is performed to falsely transmit or alter signals to interfere with or manipulate satellite communication systems or deceive satellite navigation systems, such as GPS, by transmitting false signals that appear to be coming from the targeted satellite. As a result, the recipient of the spoofed signals may be led to believe that the satellite is in a different location or traveling at a different speed than it actually is. Spoofing attacks can be used for various purposes, including misleading military or commercial navigation systems, interfering with critical infrastructure, or compromising satellite-based communication networks [2]. This type of attack can seriously affect national security and compromise international relations [16], [131]. The proof-of-concept for a spoofing attack was successfully performed in June 2013, when the luxury yacht, the White Rose of Drachs, was misdirected with spoofed GPS signals, which altered the route of the yacht [62]. In 2017, multiple vessels' navigation systems reported false GPS signals resulting in incorrect ship locations. This was an attempt to trigger UAV geo-fencing and prevent drones from flying near airports [81]. In the same year, researchers from New Zealand were able to spoof GPS timing in an air-gapped network to bypass time-based one-time password (TOTP)

authentication.²³

Replay Attacks Replay attacks intercept, record, and later re-transmit valid satellite communication signals. Such attacks can interfere with or disrupt satellite communications by introducing a delay or repeating false signals. In replay attacks, the attacker captures valid satellite signals and then re-transmits them later, either in the same form or with modifications. This can result in confusion or errors in the communication system and lead to disruptions in satellite navigation, communication, or other functions. Like spoofing attacks, replay attacks often interfere with military or commercial satellite systems and can seriously harm national security and compromise international relations [83], [104].

Sensor Injection/Hijacking In this specific cyber attack, the perpetrator infiltrates a satellite's sensor system or network to tamper with or hinder data acquisition. In satellites, over-the-air methods are used to arm the satellite sensors, causing them to read false or manipulated information. The attacker's goal is to deceive the satellite's sensors or blind them. For example, In 1986, a person who called themselves Captain Midnight interrupted the uplink and displayed messages for 4-5 minutes on HBO's East Coast feed [30]. In 2006, China conducted an ASAT demonstration and also used a ground-based laser system to blind sensors on a US military satellite [104]. In 2014, the Hamas organization took control of an Israeli satellite feed to disseminate propaganda [64]. Additionally, in a 2016 incident, the broadcast of Israeli television was suddenly disrupted, with TV screens displaying images and messages of incitement from Hamas, which included warnings of impending acts of terrorism [118].

C.2. Anti-Satellite (ASAT) Weapons

ASAT technology is designed to compromise or neutralize space-based weapon systems, with a range of capabilities that can either temporarily disable or permanently destroy targeted spacecraft. We focus on kinetic physical ASAT such as those discussed in Section 4 as *AC12-14*, which physically impacts the spacecraft. By the end of the 1970s, both the US and the USSR were developing ASAT weapons capable of destroying observation satellites [17].

EMP Weapons An electromagnetic pulse (EMP) device can cause satellite failures through line-of-sight attacks, similar to natural electrostatic events or radiation. The instructions for making handheld EMPs are available online, and some researchers and military organizations have developed industrial-grade EMP technology. However, hitting the target with an EMP device requires considerable control and an additional power supply [42].

Ultrawideband Weapons Ultrawideband (UWB) weapons are performed using radio frequency radiation across a broad range of frequencies (typically from around

22. <https://av.tib.eu/media/38121>

23. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=isiuTNh5P34>

100 MHz to over 1 GHz) with minimal directivity. These weapons are not commonly used to cause permanent damage to spacecraft but rather to disrupt their operation. UWB radiation can enter a satellite through its receiving antenna and openings in its shielding. If a sufficient amount of power is applied, it can damage the satellite's internal communication hardware. However, UWB weapons can cause interference in systems, which may require manual intervention from operators to restore normal functioning or lead to problems that occur only during the satellite's exposure to radiation. Additionally, pinpointing the source of UWB spoofing or other radio frequency-based electronic attacks can be challenging, resulting in the loss of valuable customer data [42].

C.3. CNE

Computer Network Exploitation (CNE) is employed to permeate targeted computer networks, including those associated with satellite systems, to extract valuable intelligence information. This method enables external entities or nations to exploit specific computers and network infrastructures linked to satellites, aiming to gather sensitive or classified data that is usually safeguarded and concealed.

Social Engineering This attack leverages psychological manipulation, such as social engineering and phishing techniques, to deceive individuals into revealing sensitive information or undertaking actions that jeopardize satellite system security. Attackers may impersonate trustworthy figures, tricking targets into actions like downloading malware, which compromises system integrity. To mitigate these risks, satellite operators must recognize these deceptive tactics, and manufacturers should enforce stringent security measures to prevent unauthorized access [16], [44], [104], [119], [138]. In 2006, NASA officials fell victim to a cyber attack when they clicked on a link in an email, which compromised their Washington headquarters' workstations and allowed the attackers to access cutting-edge satellite research files [48]. In 2017, an Iranian group called APT33 sent phishing emails to aerospace companies that included a link to download a Trojan backdoor [100]. In 2016, a hacking group called APT28, sponsored by Russian intelligence, used a phishing email to trick users into downloading a malicious file containing executable code containing a Trojan that looked like a PDF [59], [67].

Backdoor Satellite systems can be vulnerable to backdoors, which can take various forms, such as weaknesses in ground stations and communication networks, cyberattacks on satellite communications, and embedding malicious software or hardware during development. These backdoors can be exploited after the satellite launch, threatening the system's integrity and security. Furthermore, backdoors in signal-processing hardware could potentially hide or distort crucial data, affecting the system's functionality. To prevent these risks, robust cybersecurity measures should be implemented at all stages of satellite system development and operation. [6], [14], [32], [104]. **DDOS** The ground segment and communication in satellite systems face a significant threat from Distributed

Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks. These attacks could disrupt the crucial interaction between ground infrastructure and satellites. To counter such threats, cybersecurity firms like Cloudflare have implemented mitigation techniques, such as proactive restriction of network requests, to prevent DDoS attempts. Additionally, adopting Software-Defined Network (SDN) technology in Space-Air-Ground Integrated Networks (SAGIN) is a structured approach towards centralizing management to mitigate DDoS attacks at the GS end in satellite networks. These measures underscore the evolving cybersecurity landscape, emphasizing the importance of protective measures to ensure the resilience and operational integrity of satellite systems amidst emerging threats [34], [135].

C.4. Inside Attack

When an individual gains control over a satellite system or its components, it creates a vulnerability to internal attacks. These harmful attacks might manifest as data manipulation, the insertion of hardware backdoors, unauthorized access elevation, or denial-of-service (DoS) attacks. Utilizing these tactics, an assailant could augment their control, forge pathways for recurrent system access, or deliberately compromise the integrity of the satellite's data.

Data Corruption This is a cyber attack in which an attacker deliberately alters or destroys data in a computer system or network. This type of attack can cause significant damage, as it can compromise data integrity and make it difficult or impossible to use. Data corruption attacks can be carried out in various ways, including using malware, causing physical damage to storage devices, and performing network attacks. Data corruption attacks can occur on LEO, SATCOM, and navigation satellites either on the ground segment or the satellite system. An example of such an attack is damaging stored imagery data to prevent its use in intelligence [18], [104].

Hardware Backdoor In the context of satellite attacks, hardware backdoor attacks refer to inserting a malicious component during manufacturing or maintenance, providing a hidden entry point for attackers to gain unauthorized access to and control of satellite systems. Attackers can issue commands, modify settings, or render the satellite useless, leading to severe consequences [32], [104].

Privilege Escalation Satellite systems are vulnerable to attacks from malicious actors who can exploit weaknesses to gain unauthorized access to sensitive data or take control of specific functions. Attackers may use compromised software, tampered hardware, or social engineering techniques to achieve their objectives. The ultimate goal is to penetrate restricted areas and gain unauthorized influence or control. To prevent such attacks, it is essential to implement strong security measures such as encryption and stringent authentication protocols. For example, an intruder might manipulate a software application associated with a satellite's payload to issue flight control commands. This attack requires initial access to the flight control subsystem and further privilege escalation, highlighting the need for comprehensive security practices to protect the integrity of satellite operations [22], [44], [104].

Denial of Service (DoS) In the satellite industry, Denial of Service (DoS) attacks refer to any attempt to disrupt

the normal functioning of a satellite, either physically, such as by damaging hardware or by interfering with communication systems. For instance, a hacker can force a satellite to enter "safe mode" by commanding the GS to attack the satellite to make it stop communicating with the GS [87], [88].

C.5. Malware

The risk of malware attacks on satellites is increasing, which poses a significant threat to their functions, including communication and navigation. An attacker gains unauthorized access to the satellite's systems and exploits software vulnerabilities, supply chains, social engineering, or weak passwords. This attack involves using malware to infiltrate the satellite's design and disrupt or turn off its critical functions.

Generic Malware Generic malware is a term used to describe malware that is not explicitly targeted at a particular individual or organization. This type of malware is often used in large-scale attacks where the goal is to infect as many computers as possible to gain access to sensitive information or to use the infected computers for other nefarious purposes, such as sending spam or launching distributed denial-of-service (DDoS) attacks. Generic malware can be difficult to detect and remove and have severe consequences for individuals and organizations. Satellites have been targeted by malware attacks recently, causing concern in the cyber world. In one such attack in 2005, malicious software successfully stole a large amount of data from computer systems. This malware then spread to other networks, sending an alarming 20 GB of compressed data to an overseas location. Another attack in 2007 involved a virus that aimed to steal gaming credentials and send them to a central hub. Although it seemed harmless, it exposed significant vulnerabilities in outdated systems like Windows XP. In 2014, researchers and system administrators discovered their machines had been hacked, indicating a deliberate intrusion to access sensitive information. These incidents are a stark reminder of the persistent threat satellites and their associated systems face, as shown in the attacks database [2].

Bespoke Malware Bespoke malware is malicious software that is custom-made for a specific target. It is typically created by hackers or cybercriminals to steal sensitive information, disrupt critical systems, or cause other types of damage [48].

C.6. Control of Satellite

Control of Satellite or Satellite/payload hijacking is a cyber attack that targets satellite systems to gain unauthorized access and control. In this case, the attacker exploits vulnerabilities in the satellite's communication protocols or ground station equipment to issue commands to the satellite, modify its orbit, turn off its functionality, etc., disrupting critical services or loss of life. In 1998, a satellite inadvertently faced the sun, resulting in substantial damage and rendering it inoperative, with speculative connections to a security breach at the Goddard Space Flight Centre [48]. Fast forward to 2008, the satellite experienced brief periods of interference on two separate occasions, in June and October, achieving attacker command control,

though no commands were executed. Reports suggest that commercially operated ground stations might have been a vulnerability, a claim that KSAT refutes [37], [48]. In the same year, a Trojan horse compromised the NASA Johnson Space Center's computers, exposing the International Space Station (ISS) to potential attackers and causing disruptions in several systems, exacerbated by outdated software onboard the ISS [48].

C.7. In-depth Analysis of Recent Sophisticated Cyber Attacks on Satellite Systems

This subsection provides a comprehensive examination of two recent and sophisticated cyber attacks targeting satellite systems, illustrating the multifaceted nature of these threats and the various strategies employed by adversaries to achieve their objectives.

C.7.1. Viasat Cyberattack . During the cyberattack on Viasat, the attackers were able to exploit vulnerabilities in the KA-SAT ground segment, which disrupted the satellite's communication network. The primary impact of this targeted assault was on the Ukrainian infrastructure, and it is believed that the attack originated from Russia. The attackers focused their efforts on two crucial parts of the ground segment - the modems used by individual users and the modem control servers. It is suspected that the initial point of intrusion occurred via the Internet, potentially through an unpatched VPN appliance manufactured by Fortinet. The attackers likely gained access to Skylogic's gateway earth stations or POP server via this VPN, enabling them to tunnel through the trusted management network and ultimately reach the Surfbeam 2 modem. The attackers used privilege escalation by manipulating modem management through another unpatched VPN. Moreover, it is suspected that the attackers were able to install an ELF binary named "AcidRain" through a valid firmware update, which resulted in the deletion of data from the modem's flash memory. The consequences of this attack went beyond Ukraine, affecting Germany and other European countries. This spillover effect may have occurred due to an error in selecting the geographic cells that received the malicious signal or the overlap of Ukrainian territory with other EU countries. [19].

C.7.2. ICARUS. DDoS attacks on low-orbit satellite networks (LSNs) are a growing concern due to the unique vulnerabilities of these decentralized systems. In a typical DDoS attack on LSNs, attackers flood a target with traffic from compromised hosts, overwhelming its resources and causing disruptions. Common types of DDoS attacks include ICMP Flood, TCP SYN Flood, UDP Flood, and HTTP Flood. One particularly concerning attack is the ICARUS attack, which is designed to blend in with legitimate traffic, making it hard to detect. Attackers can disrupt LSN communication by exploiting satellite movements, compromising devices connected to satellite terminals, and congesting specific network links. This is true for ICARUS and DDOS attacks in LSN. These attacks highlight the need for robust security measures to protect satellite-based networks [50], [136].

TABLE 4: Reported attacks mapped to MITRE taxonomy presented in Section 6.

Ref	Violation Type	Reconnaissance	Resource Development	Initial Access	Execution	Persistence	Defense Evasion	Lateral Movement	Impact
[19]	Availability	Gather space Comm Info	Compromise Infrastructure	Ground station, Network, wireless comm	Exploit Hardware/- Firmware Corruption, Malicious Code	-	-	Constellation Hopping via Crosslink, Rx to payload, Rx to bus, payload to bus	Sabotage, Attack endpoints, Denial of service
[50]	Availability	Public space scanners, Gather space Comm Info, Constellation	Acquire Infrastructure	Network	Malicious Code	-	Valid Credentials	Constellation Hopping via Crosslink	Tampering with network communication, Denial of service
[136]	Availability	Public space scanners, Gather space Comm Info, Constellation	Acquire Infrastructure	Network	Malicious Code	-	Valid Credentials	Constellation Hopping via Crosslink	Tampering with network communication, Denial of service
[27]	Integrity, Confidentiality	Gather space Comm Info, Constellation	Acquire Infrastructure, Obtain Cyber Capabilities	Network	social engineering, Malicious Code	Backdoor	Valid Credentials	-	Eavesdropping
[78]	Integrity	Gather space Comm Info	Acquire Infrastructure	Signal	Replay, Valid Credentials	-	-	-	Tampering with network communication, Attack endpoints on the ground
[112]	Availability	Constellation	Acquire Infrastructure	Ground station	Malicious Code	Valid Credentials	Prevent Downlink	-	Tampering with network communication, Denial of service

D. Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
ADCS	Attitude Determination and Control Subsystem
AGS	Aeronautical Aircraft Ground Stations
ASAT	Anti-Satellite Weapon
AWS	Amazon Web Services
C&DHS	Command and Data Handling Subsystem
CAN	Controller Area Network
CC&DS	Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems
CCSDS	Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems
CNE	Computer Network Exploitation
COMMS	Communication Subsystem
COTS	Commercial Off-The-Shelf
DoS	Denial of Service
DDoS	Distributed Denial of Service
EMP	Electromagnetic Pulse
EPS	Electrical Power Subsystem
EO	Earth Observation
GEO	Geostationary Earth Orbit
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite System
GS	Ground Station
HANE	High-Altitude Nuclear Explosion
ISCCP	International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project
ISL	Inter Satellite Link
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
LAN	Local Area Network
LEO	Low Earth Orbit
LSN	LEO Satellite Network
MGS	Land Mobile Ground Stations
MEO	Medium Earth Orbit
MITRE	Adversarial Tactics, Techniques, and Common Knowledge
MMOD	Micrometeoroids and Orbital Debris
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OBC	Onboard Computer
PCS	Propulsion Control Subsystem
PGS	Personal Ground Stations
PoP	Point of Presence
RF	Radio Frequency
RFI	Radio Frequency Interference
Rx	Receiving Interface
SATCOM	Satellite Communication
SDR	Software Defined Radio
SGS	Maritime Ship Ground Stations
SSP	Satellite Service Provider
TC	Telecommand
TM	Telemetry
TOTP	Time-based One Time Password
TTC	Telemetry, Tracking and Command
TCS	Thermal Control Subsystem
Tx	Transmission (telecommunications)
UHF	Ultra High Frequency
UWB	Ultrawideband
VHF	Very High Frequency
VSAT	Very Small Aperture Terminal

TABLE 5: Acronym table.