

Attacking and Defending Watermarks

■ Attacks

- ❑ Ghost Signatures
- ❑ Tampering
- ❑ Forging

■ Defenses

- ❑ Watermark Obfuscation
- ❑ Multiple Small Watermarks
- ❑ Parity in Watermarks

Ghost Signatures

- Intention: To announce a watermark when there is none
 - So that you may announce it contains your watermark as well
- Methods
 - Starting from solution characteristics, try to figure out the input pattern from current solution
 - Try different signatures, hope for a collision
 - Unlikely
 - Addition of a new signature
 - Easy to disprove

Tampering

- Alter, damage, or remove the watermark
 - Prohibitively large amount of effort required
 - Move backwards through design phase
 - Keep going back until before the watermark was added, then remove or replace it at will
 - Depend heavily on reverse engineering previous design steps
-

Forging

- Objective: to subvert proprietor's watermark by inappropriately watermarking other solutions with proprietor's watermark
- Need to Steal the Private Key of an IP Author
- Usually prevented by encryption
- Trying to argue the watermark is present in everyone's IPs. Good luck attacking encryption.

Defense Against Attacks on Watermark

- Watermark Obfuscation
 - Against tampering
 - Make watermark harder to detect
- Multiple Small Watermarks
 - Against tampering
 - Make watermark harder to alter
- Parity in Watermarks
 - Against tampering
 - Detect and repair tampering
 - Often use XOR for parity check (whether sum is odd or even)

Evaluation of Watermarking Techniques

- Proof of Authorship
 - As low as possible
- Err on overestimation when exact value is hard to calculate
- Basically calculate how unlikely it is for the accused to have made the same pattern by pure chance.

$$P_c \equiv P(X \leq b) = \sum_{i=0}^b \left[(C! / (C-i)! * i!) * (p)^{C-i} * (1-p)^i \right]$$

‘p’ - probability of satisfying one random constraint by coincidence.
‘C’ - number of imposed constraints.
‘b’ - number of constraints unsatisfied.
‘x’ - random variable, represents how many of the ‘c’ constraints were not satisfied.

Boolean Satisfiability Problem (SAT)

■ Set of Variables

- $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$
- $u_i = 1 \text{ or } 0, i \in [1, n]$

■ Clauses

- Means logic OR; for example $\{u_1, u_2\}$ means $u_1 \vee u_2$

■ Satisfiability

- Is there an assignment of U that satisfy all clauses?

■ Example

$$U = \{u_1, u_2\}; C = \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{\overline{u_1}\}, \{\overline{u_1}, \overline{u_2}\}\}$$

$$U = \{u_1, u_2\}; C = \{\{\overline{u_1}, u_2\}, \{u_1\}, \{\overline{u_1}, \overline{u_2}\}\}$$

Method to Add Constraint

- Assuming function of the IP is described by example problem to the right
- Task: To modify this SAT problem so that
 - Any solution to modified problem satisfies old problem
 - Both modified problem and solution contain information uniquely identifying author

$$U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{14}\}$$

$$C = \{\{\bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_2 u_9\}, \{\bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_3 \bar{u}_4\}, \{\bar{u}_1 u_2 \bar{u}_5\} \\ \{u_1 \bar{u}_2 u_{10}\}, \{\bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_3 u_8\}, \{\bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_3 u_7\} \\ \{u_1 \bar{u}_5 u_7\}, \{\bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_6 \bar{u}_{12}\}, \{\bar{u}_1 u_{10} u_{12}\} \\ \{\bar{u}_1 u_6 u_9\}, \{\bar{u}_2 \bar{u}_3 \bar{u}_{10}\}, \{u_2 \bar{u}_5 \bar{u}_{14}\} \\ \{\bar{u}_2 u_7 u_8\}, \{u_2 \bar{u}_8 u_9\}, \{u_3 u_4 u_8\} \\ \{u_3 u_5 \bar{u}_7\}, \{\bar{u}_3 u_8 u_{13}\}, \{u_3 \bar{u}_9 \bar{u}_{11}\} \\ \{u_3 u_{10} \bar{u}_{12}\}, \{\bar{u}_4 \bar{u}_7 \bar{u}_8\}, \{\bar{u}_5 \bar{u}_8 \bar{u}_{12}\} \\ \{u_4 \bar{u}_7 u_{13}\}, \{\bar{u}_5 \bar{u}_9 \bar{u}_{11}\}, \{\bar{u}_5 u_7 u_9\} \\ \{u_6 u_{10} u_{11}\}, \{u_6 \bar{u}_8 \bar{u}_{12}\}, \{u_7 u_9 \bar{u}_{12}\} \\ \{u_7 u_9 \bar{u}_{13}\}, \{u_9 u_{11} \bar{u}_{14}\}, \{u_{10} u_{11} \bar{u}_{12}\}\}.$$