

Internet of Things Challenge 2

Andrea Pesciotti 10715428

Teachers:

Redondi Alessandro Enrico Cesare Fabio Palmese Boiano Antonio

1 Packet Sniffing

1.1 CQ1

Q: How many different Confirmable PUT requests obtained an unsuccessful response from the local CoAP server?

1.1.1 Filter Confirmable PUT requests from localhost

The following Wireshark display filter was used to extract all PUT requests with Confirmable type, coming from the local server (127.0.0.1):

```
coap.code == 3 && coap.type == 0 && ip.addr == 127.0.0.1
```

This filter returned a total of **26** packets.

1.1.2 Identify requests with and without Uri-Path

CoAP requests without a Uri-Path are typically invalid and result in a 4.04 Not Found response.

To isolate those requests, a refined filter was used:

Valid requests (with Uri-Path):

```
coap.code == 3 && coap.type == 0 && ip.addr == 127.0.0.1 && coap.
opt.uri_path
```

This filter returned: 22 packets

No. Time Source	Destination	Protocol	Lengtl Info
66 0.404168588 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	67 CON, MID:62422, PUT, TKN:12 a7 e7 28 fd 99 0c a5, /hello_post
5970 120.454709683 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	62 CON, MID:30549, PUT, TKN:58 52 18 be bb fb 0e 63, /basic
6292 132.431648144 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	68 CON, MID:42606, PUT, TKN:10 3c ee 30 eb b6 62 b6, /living_room
6725 156.432747756 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	73 CON, MID:7773, PUT, TKN:9b e6 70 9d 82 05 8e fc, /dining_room/door
8287 256.571556768 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	66 CON, MID:29978, PUT, TKN:78 58 9c d0 0c c1 f6 73, /main_door
8368 261.575677345 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	80 CON, MID:20520, PUT, TKN:9f 43 d8 0a 1f a8 24 49, /living_room/temperature
9320 304.672633300 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	62 CON, MID:53777, PUT, TKN:45 ca c1 5b ab f2 da 2c, /basic
9370 308.632831307 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	61 CON, MID:31613, PUT, TKN:3d 9b af ce 46 41 52 c9, /test
9808 341.669570149 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	68 CON, MID:20749, PUT, TKN:86 f0 81 3e af cf af b0, /dining_room
10792 407.830936149 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	68 CON, MID:27412, PUT, TKN:dd 02 50 2c e1 ce 9c 96, /hello_world
11000 421.795263082 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	67 CON, MID:40890, PUT, TKN:34 1b d3 9f e0 bf 88 dd, /hello_post
11443 450.623824739 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	62 CON, MID:41830, PUT, TKN:a9 19 3d 83 1f 5f 04 b8, /basic
13156 568.991003066 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	68 CON, MID:52719, PUT, TKN:90 ba 9c 68 c9 11 02 22, /living_room
13637 606.809045638 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	68 CON, MID:6551, PUT, TKN:24 cd 69 82 b5 50 8e 40, /hello_world
13826 620.566098890 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:6589, PUT, TKN:ab e6 91 f7 0f a1 95 16, /living_room/temperature
13840 621.546475735 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:30759, PUT, TKN:29 07 14 8f b1 68 ab f8, /living_room/temperature
13846 621.960299021 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:8393, PUT, TKN:a2 98 b9 3e 59 cd 04 a3, /living_room/temperature
13850 622.546404269 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:14342, PUT, TKN:3f 2a 9e 16 d0 f4 93 14, /living_room/temperature
13883 623.071715334 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:7805, PUT, TKN:39 2d 04 3b ec 68 bd f4, /living_room/temperature
13893 623.426307581 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:21174, PUT, TKN:d0 16 db 46 b3 51 0c a4, /living_room/temperature
13895 623.785089795 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	84 CON, MID:25946, PUT, TKN:ea 64 2b 05 bf fc 55 80, /living_room/temperature
14048 636.016454864 127.0.0.1	127.0.0.1	CoAP	62 CON, MID:2135, PUT, TKN:4a e5 b4 8a 0b 77 de 72, /basic

Figure 1: Filtered Confirmable PUT requests with valid Uri-Path

Result: Therefore, the number of Confirmable PUT requests that obtained a successful response from the local CoAP server is:

1.2 CQ2

Q: How many CoAP resources in the coap.me public server received the same number of unique Confirmable and Non Confirmable GET requests?

1.2.1 Packet Extraction in Wireshark

The provided .pcapng trace was opened in Wireshark, and two filters were applied separately to isolate the relevant packets:

• Confirmable GETs:

```
coap.code == 1 && coap.type == 0 && ip.dst == 134.102.218.18
```

• Non-confirmable GETs:

```
coap.code == 1 && coap.type == 1 && ip.dst == 134.102.218.18
```

Each filtered set was exported as a CSV file.

Only the Uri-Path and Token columns were considered, which are essential to identify the resource and distinguish unique requests.

1.2.2 Python Analysis

The exported CSV files (CQ2_CON.csv and CQ2_NON.csv) were processed using the following Python script.

Each request was considered unique based on its Token, and the goal was to count the number of unique tokens per resource in both datasets.

```
2 from collections import defaultdict
4 CON_FILE = 'CQ2_CON.csv'
5 NON_FILE = 'CQ2_NON.csv'
7 def count_unique_tokens(file_path):
      resource_tokens = defaultdict(set)
      with open(file_path, 'r', encoding='utf-8') as f:
9
          reader = csv.reader(f)
          next(reader)
11
          for row in reader:
12
               try:
13
                   uri = row[6].strip()
14
                   token = row[7].strip()
                   if uri and token:
16
                       resource_tokens[uri].add(token)
17
               except:
                   continue
      return resource_tokens
20
22 con_data = count_unique_tokens(CON_FILE)
23 non_data = count_unique_tokens(NON_FILE)
```

```
24
25 matching_resources = []
26 for resource in con_data.keys() & non_data.keys():
27    if len(con_data[resource]) == len(non_data[resource]) > 0:
28    matching_resources.append(resource)
```

The code returned the following matching resources:

- /large
- /secret
- /validate

Result: The number of resources that received the same number of unique Confirmable and Non-confirmable GET requests is:

1.3 CQ3

Q: How many different MQTT clients subscribe to the public broker HiveMQ using multi-level wildcards?

1.3.1 Identifying the IP Address of the HiveMQ Broker

The hostname of the broker is broker.hivemq.com, but to filter packets by IP, I first needed to resolve the IP address. To do this, I applied the following display filter in Wireshark:

dns

This filter shows all DNS packets. Among the results, I located the query for broker.hivemq.com and observed its A record response. In this case, the IP address returned was:

18.192.151.104

1.3.2 Filtering MQTT Subscriptions with Multi-Level Wildcards

To identify relevant packets, I filtered MQTT SUBSCRIBE messages that used multi-level wildcards ('#') in their topic and were directed to the HiveMQ broker:

```
mqtt.msgtype == 8 && mqtt.topic contains "#" && ip.dst ==
18.192.151.104
```

Where:

- mqtt.msgtype == 8 selects MQTT SUBSCRIBE messages.
- mqtt.topic contains "#" restricts to subscriptions using multi-level wild-cards.
- ip.dst == 18.192.151.104 limits the results to subscriptions sent to the HiveMQ server.

This filter returned 6 packets.

1.3.3 Identifying Unique Clients

At first glance, it may seem that there are 6 different clients. However, based on a useful insight, MQTT clients can:

- Share the same IP address (e.g., behind NAT).
- Be uniquely identified by the TCP session they establish with the broker.

Wireshark assigns a unique tcp.stream index to each TCP connection. Therefore, to find the actual number of different clients, I added a custom column in Wireshark with the field:

1 tcp.stream

Then, I re-applied the previous filter and observed the tcp.stream values. Out of the 6 packets, 3 of them shared the same stream index. That means these packets were part of the same TCP session, and hence from the same MQTT client.



Figure 2: Requests with Stream Index filter

Result: The number of different MQTT clients that subscribed to the HiveMQ broker using multi-level wildcards is:



1.4 CQ4

Q: How many different MQTT clients specify a last Will Message to be directed to a topic having as first level "university"?

1.4.1 Filtering CONNECT Messages with Last Will

In MQTT, the Last Will Message is defined by the client during the initial connection to the broker using the CONNECT command.

I applied the following Wireshark display filter:

```
mqtt.msgtype == 1 && mqtt.willmsg && mqtt.willtopic
```

This filter selects all CONNECT packets that:

- Are of message type 1 (i.e., CONNECT).
- Define a Last Will Message payload.
- Specify a Last Will Topic.

1.4.2 Filtering by Topic Prefix

To narrow the results to only those clients whose Will Topic starts with university, the filter is defined as follows:

```
mqtt.msgtype == 1 && mqtt.willmsg && mqtt.willtopic && mqtt.
willtopic contains "university"
```

After applying this filter, I checked that the Will Topic indeed starts with university, and not just containing it as a substring

The only identified Will Topic is:

• university/department12/room1/temperature

Result: The number of different MQTT clients that specified a Last Will Message directed to a topic under the university root is:

1.5 CQ5

Q: How many MQTT subscribers receive a last will message derived from a subscription without a wildcard?

1.5.1 Identify Will Topics

From the CONNECT packets in Wireshark, I inspected the Will Topic field and extracted the following topics:

- university/department12/room1/temperature
- metaverse/room2/room2
- hospital/facility3/area3
- metaverse/room2/floor4

However, only the following Will Topic was actually published later on as a PUBLISH message:

• university/department12/room1/temperature

1.5.2 Filter Exact Subscriptions to the Published Will Topic

To identify MQTT clients subscribed to this topic without using wildcards, I used the following Wireshark display filter:

```
mqtt.msgtype == 8 &&
mqtt.topic == "university/department12/room1/temperature"
```

This filter returned 3 packets.



Figure 3: MQTT SUBSCRIBE packets to the Will Topic without wildcards

Result: The number of different MQTT clients that would receive a Will Message without using wildcards is:

1.6 CQ6

Q: How many MQTT publish messages directed to the public broker mosquitto are sent with the retain option and use QoS "At most once"?

1.6.1 Identify the Mosquitto Broker IP

I first filtered DNS traffic using the display filter dns to capture hostname resolutions. Within the results, the following DNS query and response were found:

- Query: Standard query A test.mosquitto.org
- Response: test.mosquitto.org A 5.196.78.28

This confirmed that the IP address of the public Mosquitto broker is:

```
5.196.78.28
```

1.6.2 Apply Wireshark Filter

To isolate the required packets, the following Wireshark display filter was used:

```
1 mqtt.msgtype == 3 && ip.dst == 5.196.78.28 && mqtt.qos == 0 && mqtt
.retain == 1
```

This filter extracts all MQTT PUBLISH messages that:

- are sent to 5.196.78.28 (Mosquitto),
- have QoS level 0 (mqtt.qos == 0),
- and are marked as retained (mqtt.retain == 1).

The number of matching packets corresponds to the final answer.

Result: The number of MQTT PUBLISH messages directed to the Mosquitto broker with the retain option and QoS "At most once" is:

1.7 CQ7

Q: How many MQTT-SN messages on port 1885 are sent by the clients to a broker in the local machine?

1.7.1 Filtering Strategy

- MQTT-SN operates over UDP rather than TCP.
- The default port for MQTT-SN is 1885.
- It is assumed that the local broker runs on IP address 127.0.0.1 (IPv4).

The Wireshark display filter used was:

```
udp.port == 1885
```

This filter selects all UDP packets on port 1885, regardless of direction. In the trace, this resulted in **0** packets matching the condition.

Result: The number of MQTT-SN messages sent by clients to a broker on the local machine is: