

Towards a Multi-Layer Defence Framework for Securing Near-Real-Time Operations in Open RAN

Hamed Alimohammadi*, Samara Mayhoub†, Sotiris Chatzimiltis*,
 Mohammad Shojafar*, and Muhammad Nasir Mumtaz Bhutta‡

*5G/6GIC, Institute for Communication Systems (ICS), University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

Email: {h.alimohammadi, sc02449, m.shojafar}@surrey.ac.uk

†Centre for Secure Information Technologies (CSIT), Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, UK

Email: s.mayhoub@qub.ac.uk

‡Computer Science and Information Technology Department, College of Engineering, Abu Dhabi University,
 United Arab Emirates

Email: muhammad.bhutta@adu.ac.ae

Abstract—Securing the near-real-time (near-RT) control operations in Open Radio Access Networks (Open RAN) is increasingly critical, yet remains insufficiently addressed, as new runtime threats target the control loop while the system is operational. In this paper, we propose a multi-layer defence framework designed to enhance the security of near-RT RAN Intelligent Controller (RIC) operations. We classify operational-time threats into three categories—message-level, data-level, and control logic-level—and design and implement a dedicated detection and mitigation component for each: a signature-based E2 message inspection module performing structural and semantic validation of signalling exchanges, a telemetry poisoning detector based on temporal anomaly scoring using an LSTM network, and a runtime xApp attestation mechanism based on execution-time hash challenge-response. The framework is evaluated on an O-RAN testbed comprising FlexRIC and a commercial RAN emulator, demonstrating effective detection rates, low latency overheads, and practical integration feasibility. Results indicate that the proposed safeguards can operate within near-RT time constraints while significantly improving protection against runtime attacks, introducing less than 80 ms overhead for a network with 500 User Equipment (UEs). Overall, this work lays the foundation for deployable, layered, and policy-driven runtime security architectures for the near-RT RIC control loop in Open RAN, and provides an extensible framework into which future mitigation policies and threat-specific modules can be integrated.

Index Terms—Open RAN; near-RT RIC; runtime security; E2 message inspection; KPM poisoning detection; xApp attestation.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE transition to Open Radio Access Networks (Open RAN) represents a paradigm shift in how mobile networks are designed, deployed, and managed. By disaggregating traditional vendor-specific components and introducing open interfaces, Open RAN enables the integration of multi-vendor solutions, fosters innovation through third-party applications, and promotes programmability through intelligent control loops. A central pillar of this architecture is RAN Intelligent Controller (RIC), which is logically split into two parts: non-real-time (non-RT) RIC, operating at timescales above one second and typically located in the Service Management and Orchestration (SMO) layer, and near-real-time (near-RT) RIC,

which functions at subsecond latencies (typically 10 ms to 1 s) to enable dynamic control of RAN behaviour. RIC executes control logic provided by third-party applications known as rApps and xApps, deployed on non-RT and near-RT RICs, respectively [1].

In the Open RAN architecture, the most commonly adopted functional split is the 3GPP New Radio (NR) Split 7.2. This split disaggregates a base station into a Central Unit (CU), a Distributed Unit (DU), and a Radio Unit (RU). Furthermore, the CU is itself divided into a Control Plane (CU-CP) and a User Plane (CU-UP) component. In the Open RAN context, these are referred to as O-CU, O-DU, and O-RU to emphasise openness and interoperability.

The openness and disaggregation introduced by Open RAN increase flexibility and vendor diversity, but also expand the attack surface compared to traditional vertically integrated RAN architectures. Particularly, as near-RT RIC has an immediate impact on RAN operations, its security and trustworthiness have become critical concerns. The near-RT RIC communicates with E2 nodes, O-CUs and O-DUs through the standardised E2 interface. xApps hosted on the near-RT RIC interact with these components to perform fine-grained, low-latency control and optimisation actions. Therefore, the near-RT RIC occupies a privileged position in the RAN control loop by receiving telemetry and signalling messages from E2 nodes, running inference or rule-based logic, mainly through its xApps, and issuing control actions that can reconfigure radio parameters, manage mobility, or optimise resource allocation. This dynamic and responsive behaviour, while offering substantial performance benefits, also creates new attack surfaces. While current Open RAN security efforts mostly address earlier stages of the lifecycle, such as secure onboarding and authorisation of xApps via frameworks like XRF [2], [3], and authentication of E2 interface connections through certificate-based mechanisms [4], these measures do not address threats that can bypass *proactive* safeguards and exploit vulnerabilities during operation—when the near-RT RIC is actively processing live inputs to generate decisions. Such runtime threats remain largely unaddressed in existing literature. Collectively, these gaps highlight the need for dedicated runtime *reactive*

safeguards that operate within the near-RT RIC control loop to ensure the trustworthiness of its decision-making process.

In this work, we approach the problem from the perspective of the near-RT RIC and focus on securing its *runtime control loop*. We categorise *externally influenced* runtime threats—those that do not stem from compromises within the near-RT RIC platform—into three dimensions: *message-level* threats involving malicious or manipulated E2 signalling, *data-level* threats where adversaries inject falsified telemetry such as spoofed KPM reports, and *control logic-level* threats arising from tampered or malicious xApps. While other components may contribute to overall system trustworthiness, these three categories collectively capture the primary externally influenced surfaces that directly affect real-time control decisions. The internal platform of the near-RT RIC can be secured using mechanisms defined in O-RAN Alliance specifications, such as [5]–[7]; therefore, we assume they are trusted and out of scope. Building on this categorisation, we propose a modular framework composed of deployable detection components paired with *policy-driven mitigation* units that operate within the near-RT RIC during live execution. The framework provides a structured methodology for mapping safeguards to each threat category, enabling systematic deployment of reactive defences and supporting extensibility toward emerging runtime threats. To validate its practicality, we demonstrate the framework’s feasibility through the implementation of one detection and mitigation mechanism for each threat category on an O-RAN testbed. This work therefore offers a practical step toward layered runtime assurance in near-RT RIC operations, through a threat-guided and policy-centric defence design.

This paper makes the following key contributions:

- *Threat-Driven Design and Categorisation Framework:* We categorise operational-time threats to the near-RT RIC into message-level, data-level, and control logic-level, and propose a generalised guideline for mapping detection and mitigation modules accordingly.
- *Modular Runtime Safeguards:* We present three deployable components targeting each threat category in the near-RT RIC control loop:
 - A signature-based *E2 message inspector* that flags malicious or unauthorised signalling patterns.
 - An ML-powered *telemetry poisoning detector* that identifies corrupted or deceptive KPM inputs.
 - A runtime *xApp attestation mechanism* that detects tampered or unauthorised xApps via hash verification.
- *Policy-Driven Mitigation Architecture:* Each detection module is paired with a configurable mitigation unit that applies actions based on operator-defined policies. This decoupled and extensible design allows operators to customise, refine, or disable mitigation strategies without modifying detection logic.
- *System Architecture and Deployment Feasibility:* We provide a detailed architecture showing where each component operates within the control loop, along with deployment considerations tailored to the constraints of near-RT execution.

- *Empirical Evaluation:* We demonstrate the detection accuracy and runtime overhead of each mechanism—both individually and jointly, highlighting their suitability for real-world Open RAN environments.
- *Toward Securing Near-RT RIC Operations:* By addressing multiple runtime threat vectors within the near-RT control loop, spanning message-level, data-level, and control logic-level threats, our work lays a foundation for layered, runtime-aware defence strategies in Open RAN and highlights future research directions in this space.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section II reviews related works in the area of near-RT RIC security. Section III presents the proposed system architecture, including threat categorisation and deployment strategy. Section IV details the integrated runtime defence components, including the signature-based E2 message inspector, KPM poisoning detection module, and runtime xApp attestation mechanism. Section V describes the implementation details and experimental results for each module, as well as a use case deployment. Section VI discusses limitations and future directions for enhancing the framework. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORKS

The security of Open RAN architectures—particularly the Near-RT RIC and its open interfaces—has become a growing area of research. While several studies investigate architectural vulnerabilities and propose protective measures, critical runtime threats remain underexplored.

Early works such as [4], [8]–[11] provide a broad analysis of the security challenges in Open RAN, highlighting threats introduced by its disaggregated architecture, open interfaces, and AI/ML-based control loops. These studies outline common attack vectors, including data and model poisoning, evasion attacks, protocol manipulation, and unauthorised access. In particular, [10] discusses adversarial input attacks that can degrade AI/ML model performance in xApps and rApps. Similarly, [4], [11] analyze attack surfaces in the E2 interface, covering threats like Denial-of-Service (DoS), Man-in-the-Middle (MitM), protocol exploitation, and data tampering. While these contributions are critical in defining the Open RAN threat landscape, they primarily focus on identifying vulnerabilities rather than implementing active runtime defences.

The integration of AI/ML into Near-RT RIC introduces new attack vectors, as discussed in [12], which focuses on malicious xApps leveraging their privileged access to manipulate the shared database, RIC Message Router, and E2 Manager. Although the study discusses several theoretical attack types, such as model extraction and inference attacks, it lacks experimental evaluation and does not consider other threat agents like compromised E2 nodes.

On the other hand, [13] presents concrete attack scenarios targeting the E2 interface, including repeated RIC subscription responses leading to DoS and spoofed RMR table attacks causing misrouting. It emphasises the insufficient access control mechanisms in the Near-RT RIC but focuses mainly on traffic-level anomaly detection. Semantic validation of E2 control messages and integrity checks for xApps remain unaddressed.

ZTRAN [14] proposes a modular zero-trust framework based on three xApps: authentication, intrusion detection, and secure slicing. While it demonstrates dynamic runtime mitigation via KPM monitoring and behavioural profiling, ZTRAN assumes the trustworthiness of its own xApps and does not address semantic or telemetry poisoning attacks.

Several studies have assessed platform-level vulnerabilities. The authors in [15] examine threats to open interfaces and xApp logic, suggesting IPsec encryption and Autoencoder-based defences against adversarial ML. However, their focus remains on training-time and anomaly detection, needing re-training ML models. Similarly, [16] introduces IDS and Secure Slicing xApps to detect UE-level anomalies and dynamically isolate malicious users. Yet, this approach still overlooks threats within the control logic of xApps themselves.

Protocol-level threats are addressed in [17], which uses finite state machines and fuzzing to validate E2AP messages. Although effective at catching syntactic violations, the method lacks runtime ML-based detection or auditing of xApps.

A more systemic analysis is provided in [18], which performs a penetration test of μ ONOS RIC and reveals authentication flaws, misconfigured REST APIs, and insufficient role-based access controls. Despite its practical insights, this work targets configuration-time vulnerabilities rather than runtime control enforcement.

Further experimental studies include [19], which evaluates E2 interface disruptions on xApps (e.g., KPI monitoring and network slicing) by introducing adversarial delay and loss. However, it does not explore attacks involving semantic poisoning or the injection of false telemetry values.

Directly related to our focus in KPM poisoning, [20], [21] examine ML model manipulation using FGSM and PGD adversarial methods in xApps trained on interference classification datasets, without considering real-time telemetry streams verification.

Recent standards efforts [22], [23] have formalised the structure of telemetry reporting and performance indicators (e.g., KPMs), further motivating the need for their semantic verification during runtime.

While the literature offers significant insights into Open RAN security, most approaches concentrate on pre-deployment validation, static configurations, or high-level user behaviour profiling. Few works tackle the semantic integrity of E2 messages, KPM poisoning, or runtime attestation of xApp behaviours. Our contribution addresses these overlooked aspects by proposing a comprehensive runtime safeguarding framework that not only enforces control logic correctness, detects malicious telemetry injection, and audits xApp integrity for policy compliance during live execution, but also provides a generalised threat categorisation and placement methodology. This structured approach equips operators with practical guidance on where and how to deploy detection and mitigation modules to achieve layered runtime security across the near-RT RIC.

III. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

This section presents the architecture of our proposed runtime security framework for the near-RT RIC in Open RAN.

The framework integrates lightweight, modular safeguards into the near-RT control loop to detect and mitigate runtime threats targeting E2 messages, telemetry data, and xApp execution.

In addition to implementing these safeguarding components, the framework provides a systematic guideline for mapping detection and mitigation mechanisms to specific threat categories. By defining a structured threat classification and placement strategy, it enables operators to determine optimal deployment locations for each detection module within the control loop, while mitigation units are consistently placed within the near-RT RIC platform.

Although the guideline focuses on the principal runtime threats addressed in this work, it is designed to be extensible, supporting future integration of additional safeguards as new threat vectors emerge. This approach enhances the adaptability and scalability of near-RT RIC security architectures with a clear methodology for deploying effective, layered runtime protections, beyond the solutions implemented in this work.

A. Threat Categorisation Framework and Implementation Mapping

Our runtime security framework targets operational-time threats to the near-RT RIC, which can exploit externally influenced inputs or components to manipulate real-time control decisions if left unmitigated. To systematically address these threats, we first define a general categorisation framework that classifies threats in near-RT control loop based on their nature and impact, and guides the placement of detection and mitigation modules within the near-RT control loop.

Table I presents this guideline, categorising threats into three levels, Message-Level, Data-Level, and Control Logic-Level, and recommending corresponding detection and mitigation placements. Building on this guideline, Table II summarises the specific threat types addressed in this study, providing representative attack examples, the implemented detection modules, and their placement within the near-RT RIC control loop. These implemented safeguards demonstrate practical instantiations of the general framework and validate its effectiveness against key runtime threat vectors.

B. Architectural Overview and Deployment Strategy

Figure 1 illustrates how the proposed runtime security components are integrated within the near-RT RIC architecture. Each component is positioned to intercept or validate a specific stage of the control loop, enabling early threat detection and mitigation with minimal disruption to existing RIC functions. A mitigation unit is associated with each detection component, all of which are placed at the near-RT RIC platform. The components integrate into the standard RIC workflow and do not require changes to the RIC messaging pipeline. The interaction between xApps and the near-RT RIC platform is performed through RIC platform APIs. Where necessary, additional internal service APIs can be introduced—for example, to support runtime xApp attestation—without modifying the external behaviour or deployment model of xApps.

The *E2 message inspection module* operates at the ingress point of the E2 interface. It monitors incoming messages and

TABLE I
GENERAL GUIDELINE FOR CATEGORISING RUNTIME THREATS IN NEAR-RT RIC AND RECOMMENDED DETECTION/MITIGATION PLACEMENT

Threat Category	Threat Root	Attack Target	Detection Module Placement	Mitigation Module Placement
Message-Level	Compromised E2 nodes or E2 interface	Near-RT RIC messaging ingress (e.g. protocol messages)	E2 terminal (message parsing/inspection stage)	Near-RT RIC platform
Data-Level	Compromised E2 nodes, E2 interface, or xApps injecting falsified data	Telemetry data and inference inputs used by xApps	Trusted xApp or function within near-RT RIC platform	Near-RT RIC platform
Control Logic-Level	Tampered xApp or malicious xApp logic	Near-RT RIC control decisions issued by xApps	Function within near-RT RIC platform (attestation engine)	Near-RT RIC platform

TABLE II
IMPLEMENTED DETECTION MODULES FOR EACH THREAT CATEGORY

Threat Category	Example Attack	Implemented Detection Module	Detection Placement	Mitigation Placement
Message-Level	Injection of syntactically valid but semantically malicious E2 messages to trigger misbehaviour	E2 Message Inspector Module (signature-based detection)	E2 terminal (ingress point)	Near-RT RIC platform
Data-Level	Poisoning of KPM telemetry reports to mislead AI/ML-based xApps	KPM Poisoning Detection xApp (LSTM-based anomaly detection)	Near-RT RIC platform (as standalone xApp)	Near-RT RIC platform
Control Logic-Level	Tampering with xApp binaries to issue unauthorised control actions	Runtime xApp Attestation Module (hash-based integrity verification)	Near-RT RIC platform (attestation engine)	Near-RT RIC platform

applies signature-based filtering to detect syntactically correct but semantically malicious patterns, and redirects malicious messages to the mitigation unit. By inspecting control and configuration messages in real time, it helps prevent adversarial E2 nodes or Man-in-the-Middle (MitM) attackers from injecting harmful signalling. This module is deployed internally within the near-RT RIC as a sidecar or plugin to the E2 terminal, enabling real-time inspection prior to message dispatch.

The *KPM poisoning detector* is implemented as a standalone xApp. It subscribes to telemetry streams such as KPM reports and uses anomaly detection to flag statistical deviations or behavioural inconsistencies that may indicate poisoning. This component works with a mitigation unit to protect AI/ML-driven xApps from making control decisions based on falsified input data. It is deployed via standard xApp lifecycle management procedures and uses E2SM-based subscriptions to access real-time telemetry in a non-intrusive manner.

The *runtime xApp attestation module* is distributed across two components: (i) an *attestation engine* embedded within the near-RT RIC, and (ii) an *attester function* integrated into each xApp that is subject to verification. The xApp computes its runtime hash and periodically reports it to the attestation engine, which validates it against a trusted registry. The associated mitigation unit takes an appropriate action once an integrity violation is detected. This split design enables decentralised attestation while retaining centralised verification within the platform.

Minimal inter-component coordination is required, enabling lightweight and parallel execution of the safeguards. Alerts and detection outputs from individual modules can optionally be routed to a central logging or policy engine in SMO to support broader security workflows and auditability. Furthermore, the modular nature of the framework supports incremental adoption, allowing operators to deploy only the components that align with their threat models and resource constraints.

Together, these components form a layered defence strategy

across the control loop, covering input validation, inference integrity, and xApp trustworthiness.

IV. INTEGRATED RUNTIME DEFENCE COMPONENTS

As outlined above, our framework comprises three detection modules, each paired with a corresponding mitigation unit deployed within the near-RT RIC platform. These components are designed to operate independently, enabling flexible deployment, low overhead, and seamless integration into existing workflows. A key feature of our approach is the use of **policy-driven mitigation**, which allows responses to detected threats to be dynamically tailored based on threat severity, source, and operator preferences. The mitigation logic is designed to be extensible, enabling operators to define, refine, or remove mitigation actions over time without modifying the detection modules. In this paper, we detail the specific policies and actions defined for each component in their respective subsections. By integrating targeted detection and adaptive response mechanisms at critical points in the control loop, our framework enforces runtime assurance across a broad attack surface. This section provides a detailed description of each component's architecture, its operational role within the framework, and how it contributes to the overall goal of securing the near-RT RIC against runtime threats.

A. Signature-Based E2 Message Inspection

The E2 interface plays a critical role in Open RAN systems, enabling communication between the near-RT RIC and underlying RAN components such as the O-CU and O-DU. Positioned at the ingress of the control loop, the E2 interface represents an attractive target for adversaries seeking to disrupt or manipulate real-time network behaviour. Ensuring its integrity is therefore essential to maintaining secure and trustworthy RAN operation.

A notable attack vector involves the injection of crafted patterns—commonly referred to as *signatures*—into syntactically valid E2 messages. These signatures are not necessarily




Fig. 1. Architecture of the proposed runtime security framework for the near-RT RIC.

harmful in terms of payload content but can serve different purposes. Some may act as benign indicators of known threats, used for testing or simulation, while others are designed to exploit weaknesses in downstream logic. Our focus is on the latter class: signatures that, although structurally compliant, can provoke unintended or unauthorised control actions when processed by vulnerable RIC components. These may be embedded within permissible fields such as OCTET STRING or PrintableString in protocols like E2AP, E2SM-KPM, E2SM-RC, or E2SM-CCC. While often overlooked by basic validation mechanisms, such signatures can be used to trigger control misbehaviours or bypass safeguards in poorly designed systems.

To counter this threat, we implement a signature-based detection module integrated at the ingress of the near-RT RIC. Figure 2 illustrates the architecture of this component, its associated mitigation unit, and potential threat roots. Operating ahead of the message processing pipeline at the E2 terminal, the module scans all inbound E2 messages for known malicious patterns. It is done before ASN.1 decoder, as the

inspector treats the payload as a string and the patterns are detectable at this stage. If a match is detected, the message is directed to the mitigation unit. This unit decides which action(s) to be taken based on its policy that determines the action(s) for each kind of signatures. The policy is determined by the operator. If a message contains more than one signature, the mitigation unit takes the union of the action sets associated with those signatures. It can choose one or more of the possible actions: (i) *dropping the message*, (ii) *blocking the source E2 node*, (iii) *reporting the attack to the administration body that can be a human or a function in SMO*. Benign messages are sent to the normal message handling path. This procedure prevents malicious messages from influencing xApps or other internal control logic.

The current implementation employs a naive pattern search algorithm, chosen for its efficiency given the short and structured nature of typical E2 messages. Our measurements show that most E2 messages are under a few hundred bytes, with the exception of E2 Setup Requests (approximately 25 KB), which occur only once per node connection and are excluded from frequent inspection. With a rule set of signatures corresponding to 100 known attacks, the naive search achieves sufficient performance. However, should the signature set expand or messages created in large sizes, scalable approaches such as the Aho-Corasick algorithm or trie-based matching could be considered.

This inspection mechanism complements broader runtime safeguards by providing a first line of defence at the near-RT RIC RAN-side entry point. It reinforces the trust boundary of the near-RT RIC by preemptively filtering suspicious inputs before they can affect system behaviour.

B. KPM Poisoning Detection

Key Performance Measurements (KPMs) are critical inputs to control functions in Open RAN, directly influencing decisions made by the near-RT RIC and its xApps. These reports guide operations such as traffic steering, mobility management, and energy efficiency optimisation. However, their central role also makes them a high-value target for adversaries. In a KPM poisoning attack, falsified measurement reports are injected into the control loop, misleading the system and potentially degrading performance or violating service-level objectives.

In our earlier work [24], we introduced and analysed this threat in detail, demonstrating that even partial telemetry poisoning can disrupt different use cases with varying severity. To address this, we proposed a detection method based on Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) neural networks, designed to capture temporal patterns in KPM telemetry and identify anomalous behaviour indicative of tampering.

In this paper, we integrate the LSTM-based anomaly detection system into our broader runtime security framework for the near-RT RIC. The detection model processes sequences of KPM records, where each record corresponds to a specific user and timestamp, and includes multiple KPMs. The LSTM model learns temporal patterns and raises alerts when deviations suggest injected or manipulated data.

In our previous work, the poisoning detector was proposed as a module integrated within the near-RT RIC core to con-




Fig. 2. E2 message inspection and associated mitigation.

ceptually demonstrate tight integration. However, for practical deployment in this work, some components of the framework, such as the E2 message inspector and mitigation units, remain platform-integrated due to their nature and privilege requirements, while we implemented the KPM poisoning detector as a standalone xApp. This design maintains modularity, enables deployment flexibility, and allows operators to selectively route xApps through the detector based on their latency tolerance. For example, ultra time-sensitive xApps can bypass the detector by directly subscribing to KPM reports to maintain strict timing constraints, while other xApps can benefit from filtered and verified telemetry inputs with minimal deployment complexity.

The poisoning detector xApp subscribes to E2 nodes, collects KPM reports, and stores them in a shared database. Other xApps consume these stored KPMs rather than retrieving them directly from E2 nodes, allowing them to operate on telemetry that has already been verified for integrity. This indirect access is suitable for the majority of xApps, as KPM reporting is typically configured at a one-second interval, which aligns

with the operational timescale of near-RT RIC control policies in current O-RAN deployments. Use cases requiring sub-second telemetry generally correspond to fast control loops implemented at the O-DU (e.g., MAC scheduling or HARQ adaptation) and therefore fall outside the scope of near-RT RIC decision-making. In such cases, xApps can bypass the poisoning detector when necessary, preserving performance for ultra time-sensitive operations while maintaining protection for higher-level control logic.

As mentioned before, our threat model assumes that the near-RT RIC itself is a trusted entity, and that poisoning occurs prior to the ingestion of telemetry. This includes two primary vectors: (i) MitM attacks on the E2 interface, where telemetry is intercepted and altered in transit, and (ii) compromised E2 nodes, where adversaries directly control the data source. While our prior work [24] focused on characterising the attack and evaluating detection under emulated conditions, this paper embeds the defence mechanism into a deployable xApp, forming a key component of the proposed runtime protection framework for Open RAN. This xApp is accompanied by a mitigation unit at the near-RT RIC platform. Once the xApp detects a poisoned data, it alerts the mitigation unit, which then decides on the action(s) should be taken based on the policy. The policy can be adjusted based on the operator's preferences. One example policy can be taking actions based on the deviation magnitude and the source E2 node. The mitigation magnitude is classified to three levels, small, moderate, and significant. Three actions have been provided: (i) *dropping the poisoned data* for all magnitude classes, (ii) *blocking the source E2 node* for significant magnitude class, and (iii) *reporting the issue to the administration body* for moderate and significant magnitude classes.

Figure 3 shows the architecture of the solution and the roots of the threat. In summary, the KPM poisoning detector plays a critical role in safeguarding the inference inputs of control xApps. By combining temporal sequence learning with flexible, policy-driven mitigation, it provides a robust and adaptive line of defence against telemetry-based attacks. As a standalone xApp integrated within our modular framework, it enables scalable, operator-configurable protection without disrupting the existing control loop operations.

C. Runtime xApp Attestation

The open and modular design of the near-RT RIC enables third-party developers to deploy diverse xApps that dynamically interact with RAN functions and system resources. While this promotes innovation and adaptability, it also introduces significant security risks. In particular, a compromised or malicious xApp may abuse its operational privileges, issue unauthorised control actions, or leak sensitive data. Static onboarding validation is insufficient for maintaining long-term trust, highlighting the need for a runtime attestation mechanism that can continuously verify the integrity of executing xApps.

Figure 4 shows our attestation module and its associated mitigation unit components and architecture. The attestation mechanism consists of two coordinated components: (i) an




Fig. 3. KPM poisoning detection and mitigation.

attestation engine deployed within the near-RT RIC, and (ii) a lightweight *attester function* embedded in each xApp to be verified. The RIC-side engine initiates periodic attestation sessions and validates the integrity proofs, while each xApp's attester is responsible for computing responses to these challenges. Prior to deployment, each xApp is provisioned with a trusted snapshot of its binary memory layout.

During runtime, the attestation engine issues a challenge comprising a fresh random seed. The xApp computes a hash over its active memory region using this seed and returns the result. The RIC engine then independently computes the expected hash using the same seed and the reference memory image. If the two hashes match, the xApp is deemed unmodified; a mismatch indicates potential code injection or unauthorised modification. An integrity violation alert is sent to the mitigation unit. Three possible mitigation actions are: (i) *revoking the xApp's control privileges*, (ii) *blocking the xApp*, and (iii) *reporting the incident to the administrative entity*. The policy is that action (iii) is always taken, as any detected violation must be recorded and addressed by network management—either via automated systems or human oversight. Actions (i) and (ii) may also be enforced based on the xApp type and its assigned privilege level. For instance, high-impact xApps responsible for mobility management, traffic steering, or security enforcement are more likely to be immediately

blocked or revoked upon a confirmed violation to prevent harm to network operation. In contrast, lower-priority or read-only xApps may continue to operate in a restricted mode while further investigation is carried out. This tiered response ensures that mitigation is proportionate to potential risk, while preserving service continuity where possible.

The attestation process is designed to be lightweight, scalable, and non-intrusive. It can be executed frequently with minimal performance overhead, as each xApp is attested independently and the mechanism does not interfere with near-RT control loop timing. The use of seed-based hashing prevents replay attacks and ensures response freshness. This design supports secure and continuous integrity monitoring in dynamic RAN environments.

Additionally, there exists a fundamental trade-off between the level of security provided by attestation and the associated performance cost. To balance this, the frequency of attestation can be configured based on the type and criticality of each xApp. For example, xApps with higher control privileges or greater impact on RAN behaviour—such as mobility or resource allocation controllers—may warrant more frequent integrity checks, whereas monitoring xApps may require less stringent validation. In this work, we delegate the responsibility of defining attestation intervals to the network operator, allowing customisation based on operational risk profiles and resource constraints.

By enabling continuous runtime validation of xApps, this mechanism enhances the trustworthiness of the near-RT RIC control loop and mitigates risks stemming from dynamic code tampering or unauthorised logic injection.

V. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The proposed runtime defence framework was implemented and evaluated using a testbed comprising FlexRIC as the near-RT RIC platform and a commercial emulator for RAN emulation. FlexRIC and xApps were deployed on a dedicated server acting as the near-RT RIC, while the emulator was deployed on a separate server to emulate E2 nodes and user equipment (UEs). In this setup, each E2 node established an E2 interface connection to FlexRIC. All detection and mitigation components were integrated within FlexRIC. Both servers had identical specifications: Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2667 v2 @ 3.30GHz, 192 GB RAM, running Ubuntu 24 (64-bit).

This setup enabled realistic emulation of E2 node behaviour and traffic, with FlexRIC executing the detection and mitigation components in a near-real-time environment while the emulator generated dynamic RAN scenarios and telemetry for evaluation.

In the following subsections, experimental scenarios and results are presented and discussed. First, the experiments for each of the three defence modules are described, followed by a use-case evaluation with all modules onboard. Each scenario was repeated over ten runs to ensure statistical reliability.

A. E2 Message Inspector

To evaluate the E2 message inspector, a scenario with four E2 nodes, twelve cells, and varying numbers of UEs per




Fig. 4. xApp attestation and integrity violation mitigation

cell was implemented on the RAN emulator. The emulator's signature injection feature injected signatures corresponding to 100 known attacks from the CVE database. The percentage of malicious nodes was set to 50%, resulting in two benign and two malicious E2 nodes. Additionally, the percentage of injected malicious E2 messages was set to 50%, as a 100% injection rate would prevent malicious E2 nodes from establishing E2 connections to FlexRIC by blocking all E2 setup requests.

On the FlexRIC side, the inspector module was deployed on the E2 terminal, with its mitigation module implemented as an internal functionality. A KPM monitoring xApp was used to trigger different types of E2 messages from E2 nodes to FlexRIC. This xApp subscribed to E2SM KPM, receiving reports every second from all E2 nodes, and operated for 100 seconds per run.

The mitigation policy was configured to drop detected malicious messages. Blocking malicious E2 nodes was not applied, as this would terminate message reception within a few seconds, preventing experiment completion. As malicious messages were redirected to the mitigation unit and removed from the near-RT control loop, mitigation execution time was not included in control loop timing evaluations. For the same reason, flag-up report creation time was excluded. The primary evaluation metric was inspection latency, as it is the only part

affecting the control loop time. The detection rate remained consistently at 100% due to the rule-based nature of the inspector.

Four types of E2 messages were observed. Table III presents their sizes under different user densities. Only RIC Indication messages, containing KPM reports, showed size variation with user numbers.

TABLE III
E2 MESSAGE SIZES FOR DIFFERENT USER DENSITIES

Message Type / Size	1 UE/cell	10 UEs/cell	20 UEs/cell
E2 Setup Request	≈25 KB	≈25 KB	≈25 KB
RIC Subscription Response	38 B	38 B	38 B
RIC Indication	≈100 B	≈150 B	≈200 B
RIC Subscription Delete Response	22 B	22 B	22 B

Table IV summarises average and maximum inspection latencies, evaluated with ten UEs per cell. As expected, E2 Setup Request messages, conveying full configuration information, incurred the highest latencies (average 17.22 ms; maximum 66.54 ms). RIC Indication messages, which influence operational time requirements, showed consistently low latencies (<1 ms). RIC Subscription Response and Delete Response messages exhibited the fastest inspection times (<0.05 ms). Occasional higher maximums were due to instantaneous processing loads and the random placement of malicious signatures within messages by the RAN emulator. Signatures located towards the end of messages took longer to detect due to the naive search approach.

TABLE IV
LATENCY OF E2 MESSAGES WITH INSPECTOR ENABLED

Message Type	Average (ms)	Maximum (ms)
E2 Setup Request	17.22	66.54
RIC Subscription Response	0.024	0.037
RIC Indication	0.13	0.68
RIC Subscription Delete Response	0.017	0.044




Fig. 5. RIC Indication message inspection latency

Overall, inspection latencies did not violate the one-second near-RT control loop constraint. Although some ultra time-sensitive use cases may require even sub-second latencies, the

<1 ms latency for RIC Indication messages ensures seamless integration without performance degradation.

B. KPM Poisoning Detection

The KPM poisoning detection module was evaluated as part of its integration into the broader runtime defence framework. As introduced in our earlier work [24], the detector uses an LSTM-based anomaly detection model to identify temporal deviations in telemetry sequences indicative of poisoning attacks. The detection model processes sequences of KPM records, each containing multiple KPMs for a specific user and timestamp. A sequence length of 10 was used, based on prior analysis showing it provides the best balance between detection accuracy and computational efficiency.

In this implementation, the poisoning detector was integrated into the KPM monitoring xApp within FlexRIC. This design choice, as discussed in Section IV-B, allows operators to integrate detection flexibly and selectively route xApps through the detector based on their latency tolerance.

The evaluation was conducted using the RAN emulator to run a scenario with three base stations, each including an O-CU and three O-DUs (one per cell). Fifty UEs were distributed randomly across the cells. The UEs were evenly split between two network slices, with 25 assigned to the Enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMBB) slice and 25 to the Ultra-Reliable Low Latency Communications (URLLC) slice. For each UE, six key performance measurements (KPMs) were recorded, determined by the emulation platform's capabilities. Alongside these KPMs, the timestamp and UE identifier were included as input features for the LSTM-based detection model. The specifics of these features are detailed in Table V.

The emulation was first run to collect the dataset and inject anomalies, with 80% of the data used to train the LSTM model. For live testing, the trained model was deployed within the detection module, and a MitM-based attack model was used to inject anomalies directly into KPM reports streamed from the RAN emulator.

Poisoning attacks were simulated by amplifying the mean and covariance of targeted UEs' KPM distributions during randomly chosen timeframes, using amplification factors (AF) of 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, as described in [24]. The KPM monitoring xApp subscribed to E2SM KPM reports arriving every 1 second and processed them in real time. Benign records were stored in the database, while malicious records were redirected to the mitigation unit, which dropped poisoned data. Other mitigation policies were not evaluated, as they do not impact the core detection performance metrics presented here.

As the detection performance of the underlying ML model has already been evaluated in our previous work, this paper reports the following evaluation metrics to assess its integration as an xApp and its operational impact:

- *Attack Detection Rate (ADR)*: Proportion of poisoned records correctly identified relative to the total poisoned data.
- *False Positive Rate (FPR)*: Proportion of benign records incorrectly flagged relative to the total benign data.

TABLE V
KPM POISONING DATASET FEATURES

#	Feature Name	Description
1	Timestamp	The date and time when the data was recorded.
2	UEid	The unique identifier for the user equipment.
3	UETHpUI	User equipment uplink throughput.
4	PrbUsedUI	Number of uplink physical resource blocks used.
5	UETHpDI	User equipment downlink throughput.
6	PrbUsedDI	Number of downlink physical resource blocks used.
7	TotNbrUI_per_sec	Total number of uplink data packets per second.
8	TotNbrDI_per_sec	Total number of downlink data packets per second.

- *Latency*: Average end-to-end processing time per KPM record, representing detection-imposed latency.

Table VI summarises the detection performance across all tested amplification factors. As shown, the detection rate remained consistently high across all attack magnitudes, with minimal false positives. The inference latency remained on 0.15 ms in all cases, aligning with near-real-time operational requirements for most monitoring and optimisation xApps. It means that if there are, for example, 1000 UEs, the verification time for a full KPM report will be about 150 ms that is still under 1 s time constraint of the near-RT control loop.

In summary, the results demonstrate that the implemented poisoning detector achieves reliable detection performance with low false positive rates and real-time scale latency, enabling practical deployment within the near-RT RIC environment.

TABLE VI
DETECTION PERFORMANCE METRICS ACROSS DIFFERENT POISONING AMPLIFICATION FACTORS (AF).

AF	ADR (%)	FPR (%)	Latency (ms)
1.2	98.29	0.01	0.15
1.3	97.99	0.01	0.15
1.4	99.40	0.02	0.15
1.5	99.00	0.01	0.15

C. Runtime xApp Attestation

The same KPM monitoring xApp used in the E2 message inspector experiments was employed to evaluate the xApp attestation module. The baseline memory footprint of this xApp was approximately 8.5 MB. To assess the impact of xApp size on attestation performance, additional code blocks were inserted to create a larger variant with a footprint of approximately 16 MB, without altering the xApp's core logic.

For the attestation process, SHA-256 was selected as the hash function due to its strong security guarantees and acceptable computational overhead, providing a sufficiently large output space to minimise collision risks without incurring excessive delays.

To emulate an attack scenario, a code injector was implemented in assembly to locate the xApp’s memory space in RAM, expand it, and inject arbitrary code. In all experiments, such manipulations were successfully detected by the attestation module. The mitigation policy was configured to block manipulated xApps upon detection; while alternative actions are available, they do not affect the performance metrics evaluated in this study.

The evaluation metric was attestation latency, defined as the elapsed time from when the attestation request was sent by the near-RT RIC to the xApp until completion of the validation process. To allow uninterrupted experiment runs, the attacker code was not executed during latency measurements, as any injection would result in immediate blocking of the xApp. It is worth noting that attestation latency is not part of the near-RT control loop execution time; however it can affect the performance by imposing additional computations. While attestation frequency is operator-defined, results show that latency is sufficiently low to permit attestations every few seconds without significant overhead. In these experiments, attestation was performed once every five seconds.

Figure 6 shows attestation latency across 20 rounds for both xApp sizes. The first round exhibited higher latencies—approximately 2.6 ms for the 8.5 MB xApp and 2.3 ms for the 16 MB xApp—due to cold-start effects from initial disk access to retrieve the trusted reference image. For subsequent rounds, latency stabilised with no significant variation, reflecting the characteristics of SHA-256 as a Merkle–Damgård construction hash function that processes data in fixed-size 512-bit (64-byte) blocks. As expected, attestation time was roughly proportional to xApp size, with hashing being the dominant contributor to latency.




Fig. 6. xApp attestation latency

To further analyse this relationship, Figure 7 presents per-megabyte elapsed time for rounds 2 to 20, excluding the cold-start round. While minor fluctuations occurred in early rounds, per-MB latency converged to approximately 0.67 ms/MByte for both xApp sizes, confirming the linear relationship between input size and hashing time.

In summary, the attestation module achieved consistently low, real-time scale latencies, ensuring seamless integration into the near-RT RIC platform without imposing performance bottlenecks.




Fig. 7. xApp attestation latency per MB of xApp size

D. Test Use Case: Putting It All Together

In this section, we evaluate the framework with all three implemented modules integrated. Building on our previous work [25], where we developed the Decision Tree (DT)-based ML model for detecting malicious handover behaviour, we implemented and deployed it as an O-RU-triggered signalling storm detection xApp for this study. This xApp collects KPM reports and uses the trained DT model to detect attacks involving frequent O-RU on/off switching that induces a large number of handovers. The xApp was tested in our O-RAN testbed comprising the RAN emulator and FlexRIC, under the same scenario as the KPM poisoning detection experiments.

To evaluate the impact of our safeguarding framework, we tested the signalling storm detection xApp both with and without the integrated safeguards. The xApp was configured to run 100 control loops, each processing KPM records corresponding to a one-second period for the UEs and cells involved in recent handover events, in order to detect malicious handovers and identify malicious cells. Unlike direct E2SM-KPM subscriptions, the xApp retrieved KPM records from the database, which contained telemetry data verified by the KPM poisoning detection xApp. The test scenario is same with KPM poisoning detection experiments, except we tested here with 50 and 500 UEs.

We monitored the timestamps at which the xApp made its decisions to quantify any additional latency introduced by the safeguards. It should be noted that the primary effect of the safeguards is on the time at which the use case xApp can access its required data. Since the control loop operates on a one-second cycle—of which a substantial portion remains idle—the processing delays imposed by the safeguards, which are significantly smaller than one second, do not extend the total execution time of each loop beyond the 1s constraint. Instead, they simply shift the xApp’s operation within its scheduled window, utilising part of its idle time without increasing its aggregated runtime duration over 100 loops.

Table VII presents the results collected over ten runs, each comprising 100 control loops. As the xApp attestation process operates outside the near-RT control loop and does not impact the operation of the signalling storm detection xApp, it was excluded from this analysis. However, we performed experiments with and without the attestation and did not find any meaningful impact on the performance. For the

other two modules, we measured their latencies separately, alongside recording the timestamps of data availability for the xApp under two scenarios: with and without the safeguarding framework implemented.

As shown in the table, the E2 message inspector introduces minimal latency, while the KPM poisoning detection module incurs less than 9 ms and 80 ms in all the scenarios, attributable to its ML-based detection approach. Finally, the time shift results indicate that the observed shifts are proportional to the latencies imposed by these modules. However, the minimum and maximum time shifts are not simple sums of the corresponding module latencies, as they occurred across different control loops and runs.

It can be concluded that the proposed defence framework can be integrated into the near-RT RIC environment with latency overheads of less than 9 ms and 80 ms for all the scenarios with 50 and 500 UEs, respectively. This demonstrates the framework's compatibility with Open RAN near-RT RIC operations while maintaining high efficiency in safeguarding against targeted threats.

TABLE VII
PROCESSING TIMES (MS) MEASURED UNDER TWO UE LOAD SCENARIOS.

Measured Time	50 UEs			500 UEs		
	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg
E2 Message Inspector	0.09	0.62	0.13	0.98	5.91	1.52
KPM Poisoning Detection	6.80	7.72	7.10	71.23	78.36	74.17
Data Availability Time Shift	6.98	8.12	7.31	73.61	79.47	76.74

VI. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This section critically reflects on the design trade-offs and current limitations of the proposed runtime security components, and outlines directions for future research to enhance their robustness and applicability. While each module addresses specific threat vectors in near-RT RIC environments, further development is needed to extend detection coverage, improve interpretability, and integrate with broader RAN security policies.

A. Signature-Based E2 Message Inspection

The E2 message inspection component relies on a rule-based signature matching approach, which is well-suited to identifying known malicious signalling patterns embedded in E2 messages. While this method ensures precision and incurs low computational overhead, it is inherently limited in its ability to detect novel or evolving attack strategies that do not match predefined patterns. This constraint is typical of signature-based detection systems and reflects a trade-off between accuracy and adaptability. One potential direction for future improvement is the incorporation of learning-based techniques, such as large language models (LLMs) or embedding-based similarity search, to extend detection capabilities to semantically similar or previously unseen message variants—while maintaining compliance with E2AP and E2SM encoding constraints.

As discussed in Section IV-A, the use of naive pattern matching is justified by the short length of typical E2 messages. However, future systems with larger rule sets or more complex injection patterns may benefit from scalable multi-pattern search algorithms such as Aho–Corasick.

B. KPM Poisoning Detection

The KPM poisoning detection mechanism is based on temporal anomaly detection using an LSTM neural network trained on sequences of historical KPI records. While this approach is effective in identifying subtle deviations and capturing temporal correlations, it inherits limitations common to learning-based detectors. An important one is the dependence on the quality and representativeness of the training data. If the training set does not reflect the full diversity of legitimate operational conditions, the model may suffer from false positives or overlook slow, stealthy poisoning patterns.

Another challenge lies in the interpretability of the LSTM model's decisions. The opaque nature of deep learning-based detection makes it difficult to provide human-understandable justifications for flagged anomalies, which may hinder operator trust and complicate incident response. Exploring explainable AI (XAI) techniques or hybrid approaches that combine statistical thresholds with learned models may help address this limitation.

Lastly, the LSTM model is deployed as a standalone xApp, which simplifies integration but introduces dependencies on telemetry availability, synchronisation, and real-time execution constraints. Additional work is needed to assess its robustness under varying load conditions, data loss, or latency jitter, particularly in resource-constrained RIC environments. Moreover, while the current implementation focuses on detecting a specific type of poisoning attack, the approach can be extended in future work to cover a broader range of poisoning strategies targeting different KPI fields or statistical properties.

C. Runtime xApp Attestation

While the proposed runtime attestation mechanism enhances xApp integrity verification during execution, several aspects merit further consideration. First, the framework assumes that the attestation logic embedded within the xApp has not itself been compromised. An attacker with control over the xApp may employ code hiding techniques, preserving the original trusted binary image to pass attestation challenges while executing malicious routines elsewhere at runtime. To mitigate this, behavioural analysis techniques—such as monitoring runtime responses or execution patterns—could be explored as a complementary safeguard. These approaches would make it more difficult for attackers to mimic legitimate xApp behaviour, although they introduce additional complexity, require profiling, and may suffer from false positives. Balancing detection accuracy with operational cost remains an open challenge.

Second, the current design does not incorporate hardware-based attestation mechanisms such as Trusted Platform Modules (TPMs) or Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs), which can offer stronger guarantees of execution integrity.

However, such mechanisms typically assume a fixed, trusted hardware platform—an assumption that does not align well with the Open RAN ecosystem. According to O-RAN Alliance specifications, near-RT RIC platforms and xApps are expected to operate on commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware, often in virtualised or containerised environments across diverse cloud infrastructures. This architectural flexibility limits the feasibility of relying on platform-specific hardware trust anchors.

D. Generalisability to Other RIC Platforms

While the proposed safeguarding framework has been implemented and evaluated using the FlexRIC platform, its design principles and components are intended to be broadly applicable to other near-RT RIC implementations, such as the O-RAN SC near-RT RIC. The E2 message inspection, KPM poisoning detection, and xApp integrity check modules operate at the levels that are standardised across RIC platforms. However, integrating the framework with other RICs may require adaptation of interfacing components to match platform-specific SDKs, deployment pipelines, and plugin architectures. Future work will include validating the framework on alternative near-RT RIC implementations to further demonstrate its portability and to identify any platform-specific integration challenges.

E. Scalability Considerations

While the current evaluation includes scenarios with up to 500 UEs, near-RT RIC deployments in dense network environments may involve UE counts exceeding 1000. Based on the observed near-linear scaling behaviour of processing latencies with respect to UE load, we anticipate that the safeguarding framework would continue to operate within acceptable time constraints for higher UE densities. The KPM poisoning detection module, which already utilises batch processing to handle multiple UE records efficiently, is expected to experience proportional latency increases as the number of records per batch grows. To further support scalability, optimisation strategies such as model compression, use of lightweight architectures, or hardware accelerators (e.g. GPU inference) can be explored. Future work will include empirical validation under dense load conditions to confirm these projections and identify any additional architectural enhancements required for large-scale RAN deployments.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed and evaluated a modular multi-layer reactive defence framework to secure near-RT RIC operations in Open RAN environments. By categorising runtime threats into message-level, data-level, and control logic-level dimensions, we designed and implemented targeted safeguarding modules comprising a signature-based E2 message inspector, an LSTM-based KPM poisoning detector, and a runtime xApp attestation mechanism. Our experimental evaluation on an O-RAN testbed demonstrated that the proposed framework can achieve high detection accuracy with minimal latency

overheads, remaining well within near-RT time constraints even under increased UE loads. This confirms its suitability for integration into practical Open RAN deployments. Furthermore, the generalisability of our approach, both across different near-RT RIC platforms and as a structured guideline for categorising threats and placing safeguards, provides a foundation for future extensions. Future work will extend detection capabilities to cover a broader range of poisoning attacks, explore learning-based E2 message inspection techniques, and behavioural attestation. Overall, this study provides a step towards layered, runtime-aware defence mechanisms to enhance the resilience and trustworthiness of Open RAN systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work has been supported in part by the ORAN-TWIN-X subproject under CHEDDAR: Communications Hub for Empowering Distributed Cloud Computing Applications and Research funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) under grant numbers EP/Y037421/1 and EP/X040518/1 and in part by Abu Dhabi University's Office of Sponsored Programs in the United Arab Emirates (Grant number: 19300917).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Polese, L. Bonati, S. D'oro, S. Basagni, and T. Melodia, "Understanding O-RAN: Architecture, interfaces, algorithms, security, and research challenges," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 1376–1411, 2023.
- [2] T. O. Atalay, S. Maitra, D. Stojadinovic, A. Stavrou, and H. Wang, "Securing 5g openran with a scalable authorization framework for xapps," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2023 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 2023, pp. 1–10.
- [3] —, "An openran security framework for scalable authentication, authorization, and discovery of xapps with isolated critical services," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 2873–2890, 2025.
- [4] H. Djuitcheu, K. Kakani, H. D. Schotten, D. Brunke, and D. Fraunholz, "Exploring the Implications and Methodologies of Securing the E2 Interface," feb 2024.
- [5] "O-RAN Security Requirements and Controls Specification," O-RAN Alliance, Technical Specification O-RAN.WG11.TS.SRCS.0-R004-v12.00, 2025, available at: <https://specifications.o-ran.org/specifications>.
- [6] "Study on Security for Application Lifecycle Management," O-RAN Alliance, Technical Report O-RAN.WG11.TR.AppLCM-Security-R004-v04.00, 2025, available at: <https://specifications.o-ran.org/specifications>.
- [7] "Study on Security for Near Real Time RIC and xApps," O-RAN Alliance, Technical Report O-RAN.WG11.Security-Near-RT-RIC-xApps-TR.0-R003-v05.00, 2025, available at: <https://specifications.o-ran.org/specifications>.
- [8] M. Liyanage *et al.*, "Open RAN security: Challenges and opportunities," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 214, p. 103621, 2023.
- [9] A. S. Abdalla and V. Marojevic, "End-to-End O-RAN Security Architecture, Threat Surface, Coverage, and the Case of the Open Fronthaul," *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 36–43, 2024.
- [10] N. M. Yungaicela-Naula, V. Sharma, and S. Scott-Hayward, "Misconfiguration in O-RAN: Analysis of the impact of AI/ML," *Computer Networks*, vol. 247, p. 110455, 2024.
- [11] P. K. Kakani, H. Djuitcheu, and H. D. Schotten, "Evaluation of xApps and Their Security in Next-Generation Open Radio Access Networks(ORAN)," 2024.
- [12] T. Dayaratne, V. Vo, S. Lai, S. Abuadba, B. Haydon, H. Suzuki, X. Yuan, and C. Rudolph, "Exploiting and Securing ML Solutions in Near-RT RIC: A Perspective of an xApp," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12299>

- [13] C.-F. Hung, Y.-R. Chen, C.-H. Tseng, and S.-M. Cheng, "Security threats to xapps access control and e2 interface in o-ran," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 5, pp. 1197–1203, 2024.
- [14] A. S. Abdalla, J. Moore, N. Adhikari, and V. Marojevic, "Ztran: Prototyping zero trust security xapps for open radio access network deployments," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 66–73, 2024.
- [15] J. Groen, S. D'Oro, U. Demir, L. Bonati, M. Polese, T. Melodia, and K. Chowdhury, "Implementing and evaluating security in o-ran: Interfaces, intelligence, and platforms," *IEEE Network*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 227–234, 2025.
- [16] M. Kouchaki, J. Moore, M. Zhang, and V. Marojevic, "Advancing o-ran security: Integrated intrusion detection and secure slicing xapps," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2024 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, 2024, pp. 1–2.
- [17] C.-F. Hung, C.-H. Tseng, and S.-M. Cheng, "Anomaly detection for mitigating xapp and e2 interface threats in o-ran near-rt ric," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 6, pp. 1682–1694, 2025.
- [18] K. Thimmaraju, A. Shaik, S. Flück, P. J. F. Mora, C. Werling, and J.-P. Seifert, "Security testing the o-ran near-real time ric & a1 interface," in *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Security and Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, ser. WiSec '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024, p. 277–287. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643833.3656118>
- [19] P. Bague, G. M. Yilma, E. Municio, G. Garcia-Aviles, A. Garcia-Saavedra, M. Liebsch, and X. Costa-Pérez, "Attacking o-ran interfaces: Threat modeling, analysis and practical experimentation," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 5, pp. 4559–4577, 2024.
- [20] N. N. Sapavath, B. Kim, K. Chowdhury, and V. K. Shah, "Experimental Study of Adversarial Attacks on ML-Based xApps in O-RAN," in *GLOBECOM 2023 - 2023 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2023, pp. 6352–6357.
- [21] A. Chiejina, B. Kim, K. Chowdhury, and V. K. Shah, "System-level Analysis of Adversarial Attacks and Defenses on Intelligence in O-RAN based Cellular Networks," ser. WiSec '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024, p. 237–247.
- [22] O-RAN Work Group 11, "O-RAN Work Group 11 (Security threat modeling and remediation analysis), 4.0.," Technical Specification, 2022.
- [23] —, "O-RAN Work Group 11 (Security Threat Modeling and Risk Assessment), 1.0.," Technical Specification, 2023.
- [24] H. Alimohammadi, S. Chatzimiltis, S. Mayhoub, M. Shojafar, S. A. Soleymani, A. Akbas, and C. H. Foh, "Kpi poisoning: An attack in open ran near real-time control loop," in *2024 IEEE Future Networks World Forum (FNWF)*, 2024, pp. 712–718.
- [25] S. Mayhoub, S. Chatzimiltis, H. Alimohammadi, Z. He, S. A. Abdulkareem, M. Shojafar, A. Akbas, and C. H. Foh, "A new sub-use case for signaling storm attack in open ran and an ml-based detection approach," in *2024 IEEE Conference on Standards for Communications and Networking (CSCN)*, 2024, pp. 308–313.