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# **Abstract—** **Smart card are a secure way of transferring data, but security has not been properly handled in numerous applications, such as in public transportation systems. In this project, a methodology to reverse engineer and detect security flaws has been practiced. Specifically, the protocol of a smart card was analyzed. By applying the methodology with a tool, it was possible to access private information to capture tag-reader communications, and even emulate both tags and readers.**

# Introduction

Smart cards are tiny plastic cards with a microprocessor chip inside that can store and process data. These cards are used for electronic payments, access control and authentication. The microprocessor chip on the smart card is used to handle tasks such as encryption, creating of digital signatures and for securing the data. The smart card communicates with the card readers by contact or contactless interfaces by which the transfer of data is possible. Also, they provide a second level of authentication and protection, so they are used for security purposes for the protection of data. These smart cards are used in sectors like healthcare, transportation, banking etc. as they can securely store and transfer data such as medical records, tickets used in transportation, credit card numbers etc.

Diagram

Description automatically generated

1. Example of a figure caption. (*figure caption*)

Although smart cards are a secure method of data transport, they are susceptible to many dangers. Smart card security may be threatened by several factors, including logical and physical attacks like malware, and tampering and cloning. Smart card technology may also be vulnerable due to problems with the creation, use, or administration of the cards.

Many countermeasures, like as encryption, authentication protocols, access control systems, and physical security measures, can be used to minimise these dangers and vulnerabilities. Furthermore, it is possible to create and use smart card operating systems and apps to lower the danger of assaults.

Reverse engineering examines the transmission between the smart card and the reader or host device at the protocol level. This can be accomplished using passive or active techniques like eavesdropping, message interception, modification, or injection. The smart card application protocol data unit (APDU), the common means for exchanging data between smart cards and readers, can be revealed using these techniques in terms of its structure, content, and semantics. These techniques, though, are dependent on the implementations, standards, and protocol specifications, and they can be stopped by security mechanisms like authentication, encryption, and integrity checking.

The protocol level of smart card technology is how the smart card and the reader exchange data using the application protocol data unit (APDU) format. There are different types of contacted and contactless intelligent card protocols, such as T=0, T=1, Type A, Type B, etc. These protocols define the physical interface, transmission mode, error detection, and anti-collision methods. Standard protocols ensure interoperability and security, while proprietary protocols may have some advantages or disadvantages.

# Smart cards, Standards and their protocols

## NFC

NFC or Near Field Communication is a wireless communication technology that enables the transfer of data using a proximity of up to 10 cm. It is a very simple technology where transactions are initialized automatically by touching a reader or NFC device [1]. This is bidirectional coupling technology which is based on standard ISO 14443. The standard ISO 18092 is responsible for the peer-to-peer mode of the physical and data-link layer of NFC.

## ISO/IEC 14443 Protocol

With RFID systems, there are numerous standards still being used. The ISO/IEC 14443 [2] specification is one of the most widely used standards for proximity cards, which have a transmission range of roughly 15 cm. A tag is referred to in 14443 as a PICC (proximity integrated circuit card), while a device is referred to as a PCD (proximity coupling device). Under the ISO/IEC 14443 standard, there are two types: Type A and Type B, both of which communicate by radio at a frequency of 13.56 MHz (RFID HIGH FREQUENCY). The primary distinctions between these two types relate to protocol initiation procedures, coding schemes, and modulation schemes. The transmission methodology is the same for both types of RFID cards. Since the protocol stack is entirely transparent, the ISO/IEC 14443 standard does not provide any security procedures. The ISO/IEC 14443 standard defines a Waiting Time Ex- tension (WTX) command. This command can be used by a PICC to request more time to prepare the response. In view of relay attacks, the command can be exploited to obtain more time to relay the data.

## ISO 18092

It standardizes peer-to-peer communication mode for random binary data exchanges. The peer-to-peer mode has a very big role in creating a secondary high-speed connection like Bluetooth or WiFi for the transfer of a large amount of data using NFC [3]. Devices can read or write data of any supported tag types in a standard data format because of this standard. Exchange of data over custom binary protocol is also enabled between devices. Card emulation allows the phone to act as a tag (contactless card) for other readers or POS terminals.

## Secure Electronic Transaction Protocol (SET)

In the world of electronic commerce, SET Secure Electronic Transaction is regarded as the key contributor to the payment system. It is an extremely thorough security mechanism that makes use of cryptography to ensure data secrecy. It guarantees both identity identification and payment integrity. The SET protocol's primary and fundamental requirement is that electronic transactions be carried out securely. SET employs two primary types of cryptography—public-key cryptography and secret-key cryptography—as well as techniques for encryption and decoding. A business can generate a public or private key pair and broadcast the public key using public key cryptography. This enables any client to send a secure message to the business. Financial institutions adopt DES (Data Encryption Standard), secret key cryptography, instead of RSA, public key cryptography, to encode PIN numbers [4].

## ISO/IEC 7816 Protocol

The characteristics of a card that has been bent or flexed are described by ISO7816-1 [5]. This is done to ensure that plastic cards with embedded chips are made in a way that ensures immaculate performance over the duration of a card's estimated life. The connections between the surface connectors and the embedded silicon die's I/O pins must resist mechanical stress and stagnate. Procedures for bending and flexing are standardized in ISO 7816. Although vendor-specific application layer protocols are occasionally used, the ISO/IEC 7816-4 application protocol is most frequently chosen. For card producers, this portion of ISO7816 is crucial. They select the components and set up the procedure for integrating the integrated circuit into the card. Some smart cards produced before 1990 adhered to a different standard for the contact location and cannot be utilized with modern smart card readers that are ISO 7816-2 compliant. Most of these cards were used in Europe. It should be noted that there is no space for embossing in the thickness dimension. More specifically, the card slot may have an additional notch for the embossed portion of the card. In effect, it functions as a polarization key and can be used to help the card be inserted correctly. The magnetic field sensor, which relies on the magnetic stripe and opens a mechanical gate on devices like ATMs where some vandal-proofing measures are applied, has this extra feature.

## ISO 8583

A standard for systems that exchange electronic transactions using payment cards. It defines the message format and the communication flow to enable the exchange of transaction requests and responses between different systems [6]. As per reports, most commonly Mastercard, Visa and Verve networks base their authorization communications in this standard. This standard is not directly used by systems or networks. This standard defines many data fields which are retained in the same systems and later used by each network to adapt the standard with custom usage. The main objective of this ISO protocol is to transfer information for payments via a network using TCP/IP sockets.

## ISO 7810

This standard defines the physical characteristics of identification cards. It specifies physical dimensions, resistance to bending, chemicals, temperature, humidity, and toxicity. There are four card sizes and that are ID-1 which is mostly banking and ID cards, ID-2 which is for Romanian and other ID cards and visas as well, ID-3 this size is for passport booklets and fourth ID-000 is for sim cards. The standard also defines the metric and imperial measurements for the card [7][8].

## NFCIP-1 and NFCIP-2

At information transmission speeds of 106, 212, and 424 kbps, this protocol is described in standards ISO/IEC 18092 and ECMA-340. It specifies modulation, coding, and frame structure [9]. An initiator and a target form the object of communication in NFC. The main methods offered by NFCIP-1 are RFCA (Radio Field Collision Avoidance) and SDD (Single Device Detection) [10]. The SDD is an algorithm that helps the initiator select a particular target from a group of targets in the RF field. Collision issues might arise with the current RFID technology. A scenario when more than two initiators or targets communicate data simultaneously and it is difficult to tell whether data is real is referred to as a collision. The NFC standard uses the RFCA algorithm to tackle the collision problem. RFCA is a method that uses carrier frequency to find additional RF fields and avoid collisions. The first step of RFCA is to validate the existence of other RF fields. The NFC does not produce its own RF field if other RF fields are already present. The SDD, which locates targets within the range, and the RFCA, which forbids the use of two RF fields, allow the NFC to be protected from the attacks like MITM (Man-In-The-Middle).

The NFCIP 2 protocol operates at the ECMA 352 standard and specifies how to select a communication method between the three states described in ECMA 340 to ISO/IECS 14443 and ISO/IEC15693 [9].

## ECMA 385 & ECMA 386
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The Secure Channel Service (SCH) and the Shared Secret Service (SSE) are two services that are supported by ECMA 385 and ECMA 386 [11]. The Open System Interconnection Reference Model (OSI Reference Model) served as a design guide for ECMA 385's organizational structure. The ECMA 385 standard structural model is shown in Fig 1[12]. It separated NFC-SEC User, NFC-SEC, and NFC into three levels. The NFC-SEC standard prevents data modulation and eavesdropping by unidentified third parties. Now, if an NFC user1's phone wishes to contact another NFC user, it must engage the NFC-SEC-SAP (Service Accessing Point) request service. The request from the user will be noted in the NFC-SEC-SDU (Service Data Unit).

The NFC-SEC-PDU (Protocol Data Unit) is created by combining the NFC-SEC-SDU and the NFC-SEC-PCI (Protocol Control Information). With User1's NFC-SEC- SAP, which sits at the intersection of the NFC-SEC layer and the NFC layer, the NFC-SEC- PDU may establish a "NFC connection" with the NFC-SEC User2's NFC-SEC-SAP. They will be motivated to coordinate a common secret value for further communication by this conduct. It is known as the Secure CHannel service (SCH) in the ECMA 386 standard. In the ECMA 386 standard, the Shared SEcret service (SSE) was defined. To create their secret keys, they will employ the Diffie-Hellman Elliptic Curve technique. They would begin to transmit after creating the SCH and SSE during the connecting phase.

The ECMA 385 standard and the ECMA 386 standard both specify these two services. Nevertheless, the Card Emulated Mode and Reader/Writer Mode do not support these two secure transaction protocols. Only the peer-to-peer mode may be employed with these two services.

# Vulnerabilities in smart cards

The market is showing an increasing interest in contactless cards due to their ability to facilitate quick and effortless operations. These cards can be waved near a reader in many cases without needing to be removed from a wallet or pocket. Furthermore, contactless communication nature ensures that the card is not subjected to the usual wear and tear effect that affects contact smart cards. As a result, contactless cards are becoming more prevalent and being employed in various applications, including but not limited to access control for secure facilities and environments, electronic identification documents, payment cards, and electronic tickets.

The wireless communication used in contactless cards makes them susceptible to security vulnerabilities. Specifically, the messages exchanged between the card and reader may be intercepted or the card content could be surreptitiously skimmed by establishing contactless communication with its chip. If the card is compromised, its content could be used to create a cloned card. To prevent such attacks, contactless card communications are usually encrypted, and access control mechanisms are implemented to restrict access to the chip content and functionalities. For instance, a code such as a Personal Identification Number (PIN) may be requested by the system with which the card is interacting, and the cardholder must provide it for access to be granted.

## Denial of Service Attacks

A DoS attack on NFC devices or readers can render them unavailable to intended users. One DoS attack scenario involves using a jamming device to disrupt communications between two NFC devices. This interference can destroy transmitted data and cause DoS. Continuous detection of jamming attacks can be used as a solution to this scenario. NFC devices can check the radio frequency field while transmitting and stop data transmission when a jamming attack is detected.

Another type of Denial of Service (DoS) attack that aims to destroy the trust relationship between customers and service providers. The attack involves a malicious actor creating a tag that causes an NFC mobile phone to crash after scanning. The attacker then places the malicious tag on top of the service provider tag. When a customer visits the service provider and scans the tag using their NFC mobile phone, the phone crashes. Since the malicious tag looks like a normal tag, it cannot be linked to the phone crash incident. This attack can destroy the trust relationship between customers and the service provider.

Another scenario of denial-of-service attack is simply touching the device with an empty tag causes it to generate an error message, which can easily occupy the device and make it unavailable. However, the use of an NFC switch can help to prevent this attack scenario. Although the drawback of this solution is that the user must manually turn the NFC functionality on and off each time they need to scan.

## Relay Attacks

A contactless card can be vulnerable to a relay attack, which involves tricking a reader into believing that it is near the card when it is not. To carry out this type of attack, two devices are required: a proxy and a mole. The proxy needs to be situated near the reader, while the mole must be positioned near the target card. Both devices must be equipped with an interface that complies with contactless card standards to communicate with the reader and the card, respectively. A communication channel must be established between the two devices. The mole acts as an intermediary between the reader and the card, transmitting instructions from the former to the latter, and reciprocating by relaying the card's responses back to the reader. By presenting the proxy to the reader, the attacker can pretend to be the cardholder of the target card, thus gaining access to the privileges and rights granted by that card.

In a relay attack, the reader communicates directly with the legitimate contactless card, thereby circumventing some of the security measures used to protect such cards. For example, if encrypted communication is used, the secure channel setup and management are handled directly by the original parties, and the attacker does not have to play any role in this process. Similarly, if challenge-response mechanisms are employed to ensure the authenticity of the card, the attacker can bypass this security measure. Access control mechanisms can be an effective defense against relay attacks. If the attacker handling the proxy is unaware of the card code (such as a PIN) required by the system, they will be unable to complete the transaction. However, the effectiveness of access control mechanisms depends on their design and implementation, which are not always foolproof. In fact, some vulnerabilities may still exist that could be exploited by attackers.

## Non-Invasive And Algorithm Implementation Attack

Non-invasive attacks pose no physical harm to the contactless card and are not specific to a particular card. Once an attacker has developed an attack for a specific processor and software version, they can quickly replicate it on other cards of the same type. The equipment used in these attacks can often be disguised as a normal smartcard reader. Non-invasive attacks are particularly concerning in some applications for two reasons. First, the card owner may not realize that their secret keys have been stolen, so the compromised keys are unlikely to be revoked before they are exploited. Furthermore, non-invasive attacks have the advantage of scalability since the equipment required for executing such attacks can be replicated and upgraded inexpensively.

* *Timing Analysis Attacks:*

Timing attacks leverage the duration taken by a system to execute operations and can potentially expose confidential keys. To illustrate, a perpetrator could exploit precise timing measurements to identify constant Diffie-Hellman exponents, factorize RSA keys, and compromise other cryptographic systems. If a system is vulnerable, the attack can be relatively simple and may only require knowledge of ciphertext.

Different inputs may cause cryptosystems to take slightly different amounts of time to process. This can be due to performance optimizations, conditional statements, processor instructions, and other factors.

Attackers can use timing measurements to find the entire secret key of vulnerable systems. This can be particularly dangerous because the owner of the system may not even realize that their key has been compromised. The performance attributes are commonly contingent on both the input data (i.e., plaintext or ciphertext) and the encryption key.

* *Side Channel Attacks:*

Side channel attacks (SCAs) are different from regular cryptographic attacks because they exploit side channels like power consumption, voltage fluctuations, temperature, or sound to extract secret information from a system. Placing an antenna, magnetic probe, or other sensor close to the device or system allows access to these side channels. There are two primary types of SCAs: simple power analysis (SPA), which uses direct observations of power or electromagnetic measurements to extract secret information, and differential power analysis (DPA).

Diagram

Description automatically generated

1. Example of a figure caption. (*figure caption*)

To start with, it is crucial to evaluate the possibility of exploiting power analysis attacks on the card key. Power analysis attacks are a type of side-channel attack that can be used to extract sensitive information, such as secret keys or plaintext data, by analyzing the power consumption of a device during cryptographic operations.

In power analysis attacks, an attacker typically performs repetitive cryptographic computations using a fixed secret key and varying plaintexts. This enables them to collect a significant number of side-channel signals, such as power consumption measurements, that can be analyzed to reveal the secret key or other sensitive information.

In the case of a transit card, when a session key is generated, the cryptosystem operates with the targeted card key and a random number as input plaintext. This means that an attacker who can intercept the communication between the card and the reader can potentially obtain the session key by performing power analysis attacks on the card key.

Moreover, as the attacker sends the recharge command to the card, the cryptosystem carries out cryptographic operations, which further increases the opportunities for an attacker to obtain side-channel signals. By analyzing these signals, an attacker can mount side-channel analysis attacks and potentially extract the card key or other sensitive information.

Therefore, it is essential to consider the potential threat of power analysis attacks when designing and implementing security measures for transit cards and other similar systems that use cryptographic operations to protect sensitive information. By taking appropriate measures to mitigate the risk of power analysis attacks, such as using countermeasures like masking or randomizing the power consumption during cryptographic operations, the security of these systems can be significantly improved.

## Out of Bound Read/Write Attacks

The out-of-bounds write vulnerability is a type of software vulnerability where the software writes data beyond the intended buffer limits, either before the beginning or past the end of the buffer. This can lead to various consequences, such as data corruption, program crashes, or even code execution. Out-of-bounds write vulnerabilities are frequently exploited by attackers to execute arbitrary code or crash a program. Sometimes, the overwriting of critical program data structures, such as heap control blocks, can occur, which can result in a denial-of-service attack.

This type of software vulnerability arises when the software writes data outside of the intended buffer space, leading to data corruption. Attackers can take advantage of out-of-bounds writes to modify program execution flow, besides overwriting function pointers and return addresses on the stack. It's crucial to note that this vulnerability can have severe consequences, as it can enable attackers to gain unauthorized access to systems, steal sensitive data, or disrupt the normal functioning of programs. As such, it's essential for software developers to take the necessary steps to prevent, detect and mitigate out-of-bounds write vulnerabilities in their code.

* *Buffer Overflow Attack*

An attacker can exploit a buffer overflow vulnerability to gain access to an organization's IT systems by injecting additional code into a program, which sends new instructions to the system. In some cases, attackers may deliberately input data that cannot be stored by the buffer, thus allowing them to overwrite memory locations that store executable code with malicious code. This can give the attacker full control over the program and potentially the entire system.

Diagram

Description automatically generated

1. Example of a figure caption. (*figure caption*)

Buffer overflows have been a known vulnerability for some time now, but the fact that they are present in the firmware of Near Field Communication (NFC) readers is particularly concerning. When a buffer overflow attack occurs, the attacker aims to manipulate the function of a privileged program to take control of it. If the program has enough privileges, the attacker can then take control of the entire host system. It's worth noting that this type of attack is usually targeted at root programs, but not always. After successfully compromising the system, the attacker may immediately execute code that grants them root access, such as "exec(sh)", but there are other methods they may use as well. As such, the presence of buffer overflows in NFC readers presents a significant security risk that must be addressed.

Buffer overflow vulnerabilities can be particularly damaging in web applications, as attackers can use them to corrupt the execution stack and execute arbitrary code. These vulnerabilities can exist in both application servers and web servers, especially in web applications that use libraries like graphics libraries. Custom web application codes can also be vulnerable to buffer overflows. While these codes may receive less scrutiny from security teams, they can be more challenging for hackers to discover and exploit. Therefore, it's crucial to ensure that proper security measures are in place to detect and mitigate buffer overflow vulnerabilities in web applications.

## Man In The Middle Attack

An attacker can carry out a man-in-the-middle attack on Calypso systems by exploiting a weak protocol design. This allows the attacker to recharge a card at a point of service without the terminal's knowledge. The protocol involves the reader sending a signal called Signature Hi to the card to indicate that the transaction on the reader side is complete. The card then commits the transaction on its side and sends the signal Signature Low to the reader if the transaction is successful. The reader commits the data on its side when it receives Signature Low but cancels the transaction if it doesn't receive the signal. The attacker can prevent Signature Low from reaching the reader, causing the reader to cancel previous transactions while the card is charged, and the new ticket number is stored in the card's memory.
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Another type of man-in-the-middle attack involves exploiting the plain messages that are sent at the start of a communication. A smart card (ex-OPUS; a transit card) tickets remain valid for two hours from their first use, so an attacker can manipulate the messages related to the last three usages of the card. By changing the time/date information in these messages, the attacker can deceive the reader into believing that an invalid ticket is still valid or that a valid ticket has expired. This is a significant attack that can allow the attacker to use the same ticket for an extended period, regardless of its actual validity.

## Eavesdropping Attack

Although the communication range of NFC devices is limited to a few centimeters, eavesdropping attacks are still possible. The attacker's proximity to the target device depends on factors such as equipment used, location of the attacker, and communication mode. Passive mode is more difficult to eavesdrop on because the target device draws its power from the electromagnetic field generated by the active device. However, an attacker with sufficient knowledge and equipment, can still capture NFC communication.

There are three ways in which an attacker can launch an information leakage attack on an OPUS card.

The first method involves stealing the unique serial number of the card through Eavesdropping, skimming, or simply looking at the back of the card. This unique ID can be used to track and even identify the card holder by correlating it with other information associated with the card holder such as their purchase history, residential or work address, and daily commute schedule. Although there may be better ways to track or identify a person, this method is still a privacy-violating feature that can be carried out at a distance and in an automatic way without the user's knowledge. Attackers can use this information to create a customer profile for targeted advertising or track the card holder for any other reason.

The second Eavesdropping method involves estimating the time when the OPUS card was purchased by taking advantage of the fact that unique serial numbers are generated sequentially. By collecting many OPUS card IDs, it is possible to deduce the month and year of purchase with ease. With more precise methods, an attacker could reduce this time slot to a day or even less.

The third method involves sniffing or skimming information about the last three usages of the card, such as the bus line or metro station used, through communication with a legitimate reader or by using a Proxmark3 in the vicinity of the card. This information can be used to deduce the daily commute schedule of the card holder and their home or work neighborhood.

# Implementation

## Hardware Used

* NXP MIFARE Classic® 1k
* ISO/IEC 14443 - 3(NFC-A)
* Total memory: 1kb
* Blank, white, printable with a Card Printer
* Write endurance (typical cycles): 200,000.
* Data Retention: up to 10 years
* 4-byte UID
* CRYPTO1 cryptography supported.

## MIFARE Classic 1K Card

The MIFARE Classic 1K card can be configured as either read-only or read/write. A read-only MIFARE Classic 1K card contains information that cannot be changed or updated. This type of card is commonly used for applications such as ticketing or identification, where the information stored on the card is fixed and does not need to be updated. It contains 1 kilobyte of memory and is organized into 16 sectors, each containing 4 blocks of data. Each block can store up to 16 bytes of data and can be either read-only or read/write.

MIFARE Classic 1K contains variety of data as below,

* *User information:* This can include details about the cardholder, such as their name, address, and contact information.
* *Access control information:* This can include data about the areas or facilities that the cardholder is authorized to access, such as a door or turnstile.
* *Payment information:* This can include details about the cardholder's account balance or transaction history for a payment system.
* *Ticketing information:* This can include details about the cardholder's ticket or travel information, such as the destination or amount.
* *Security keys:* MIFARE Classic 1K cards use a proprietary encryption algorithm to secure the data stored on the card. The card can contain various security keys that are used to authenticate the card and protect the data from unauthorized access.

## Crypto1 Protocol

CRYPTO1 is a proprietary encryption algorithm used in the MIFARE Classic 1K smart card. It is a stream cipher that operates on 48-bit keys and is used to protect the communication between the card and the reader.

The CRYPTO1 algorithm works by generating a pseudorandom bitstream that is XORed with the plaintext data to produce the ciphertext. The key used to generate the pseudorandom bitstream is derived from the key that is stored on the card and the unique serial number of the card. This makes it difficult for an attacker to intercept and decode the communication between the card and the reader, as they would need to know the key and serial number to decrypt the data.[16]

However, the CRYPTO1 algorithm has been found to have weaknesses that make it vulnerable to certain types of attacks. It has been shown that the key can be easily recovered through a process known as a "nested attack," which involves performing a series of authentication attempts and analyzing the responses from the card.[15] As a result, the security of the MIFARE Classic 1K card has been called into question, and it is generally not recommended for use in high-security applications.

There are several smart card technologies that are considered more secure than MIFARE Classic 1K, such as MIFARE Plus, DESFire, HID iCLASS SE, and FeliCa. These cards use stronger encryption algorithms, support mutual authentication, and offer additional security features to protect against attacks. The choice of card will depend on the specific application and security requirements of the system.

## Vulnerabilities in MIFARE Classic 1K

The MIFARE Classic 1K card has several known security vulnerabilities, which can be exploited by attackers to access or manipulate the data on the card. Here are some examples of these vulnerabilities and how they can be exploited:

* *Weak encryption:* The MIFARE Classic 1K card uses a proprietary encryption algorithm called Crypto-1, which has been shown to be vulnerable to certain types of attacks. For example, an attacker could use a specialized RFID reader to intercept the communication between the card and the reader and recover the encryption keys used to protect the data on the card.
* *Card cloning:* Because the MIFARE Classic 1K card has weak encryption, it is possible for an attacker to create a cloned card that contains the same data as the original card. This can be done using a specialized RFID reader/writer that can copy the data from the original card onto a blank card which needs to be a T5577 card.
* *Data manipulation:* An attacker who has access to a cloned or genuine MIFARE Classic 1K card can also manipulate the data stored on the card. For example, an attacker could change the access control information on the card to gain unauthorized access to a building or facility.
* *Brute-force attacks:* The MIFARE Classic 1K card has a limited number of keys that can be used to access the data on the card. An attacker could use a brute-force attack to try all possible combinations of keys until the correct one is found.

## Nested Attack using MFOC

Nested attack is a technique used by MFOC for key cracking of MIFARE classic cards. Using MFOC for a nested attack involves trying out a set of default keys that are hard-coded on the card for authentication. Should there be no luck with the default keys, MFOC moves on to the next phase where it can perform a dictionary attack.

MFOC utilizes a nested approach in a dictionary attack by testing multiple keys (usually drawn from a pre-computed key space or a custom dictionary file) until the correct key is found. Rather than attempting all keys simultaneously, MFOC conducts authentication attempts, with each subsequent attempt using the result of the prior attempt as input. This approach reduces the number of authentication efforts necessary to crack the keys, accelerating and streamlining the attack process.

To increase the likelihood of success and hasten the attack, MFOC utilizes incremental keys search and partial matching, in addition to other techniques. Once the correct key is found, MFOC can read or write data to the card, allowing unauthorized access to the information on the card.
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## Card Data Duplication Using RC522 & Arduino Uno R3

### We have used Arduino Uno R3 and RC522 modules to read and clone data from one card to another. The RC522 module is a common RFID reader module that is designed to work with Arduino microcontrollers. It communicates with the microcontroller via SPI (Serial Peripheral Interface) and is capable of reading data from Mifare Classic RFID cards.
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