Hardware Trojan

Yu   Bi

ELE594 – Special Topic on Hardware Security & Trust
University of Rhode Island

IP Trust & Security

- **IP Trust**
  - Detect *malicious* circuits inserted by IP designers
    - **Goal to Verify Trust**: Protect IP buyers, e.g., SoC integrators
  - Focus of this lecture

- **IP Security**
  - Information leakage, side-channel leakage, backdoors, functional bugs and flaws, illegal IP use/overuse, etc.
    - **Goal to Verify Security**: Protect application

IP Trust

- IPs from untrusted vendors need to be verified for trust before use in a system design
- **Problem statement:** How can one establish that the IP does exactly as the specification, nothing less, nothing more?

- **IP Cores**:
  - Soft IP, firm IP and hard IP

- **Challenges**:
  - No known golden model for the IP
    - Spec could be assumed as golden
  - Soft IP is just a code so that we cannot read its implementation

Pre-synthesis

- **Formal verification**
  - Property checking
  - Model checking
  - Equivalence checking

- **Coverage analysis**
  - Code coverage
  - Functional coverage

Formal Verification

▶ **Formal verification**

    ▶ Ensuring IP core is exactly same as its specification

    ▶ Three types of verification methods

        ▶ **Property checking**: Every *requirement* is defined as assertion in testbench and is checked

        ▶ **Equivalence checking**: Check the equivalence of RTL code, gate-level netlist and GDSII file

        ▶ **Model checking**

            ▶ System is described in a formal model (C, HDL)

            ▶ The desired behavior is expressed as a set of properties

            ▶ The specification is checked against the model

Code Coverage

- **Code coverage**
  - **Line coverage**

    Show which **lines** of the RTL have been executed

  - **Statement Coverage**

    Spans multiple lines, more precise

  - **FSM Coverage**

    Show which state can be reached

  - **Toggle**

    Each Signal in gate-level netlist

- **Function coverage**
  - **Assertion**

    Successful or Failure

Metric

- **If one of the assertions fails, the IP is assumed untrusted.**

- **If coverage is not 100%, *uncovered* parts of the code (RTL, netlist) are assumed suspicious.**

IC Trust

- **Objective**:
  - Ensure that the *fabricated chip/system* will carry out only our desired function and <u>nothing more</u>.

- **Challenges**:
  - **Tiny**: several gates to millions of gates
  - **Quiet**: hard-to-activate (rare event) or triggered itself (time-bomb)
  - **Hard to model**: human intelligence
  - Conventional test and validation approaches fail to reliably detect hardware Trojans.
    - Focus on manufacture defects and does not target detection of additiona functionality in a design

Classification of Trojan Detection

Trojan Detection Approaches

- Non-destructive
  - Run-time Monitoring
  - Test-time
    - Logic Test
    - Side-channel Analysis
      - Delay
      - Quiescent Current
      - Transient Current
      - Radiation
      - Multiple-parameter
- Destructive

- **Destructive Approach**: Expensive and time consuming
  - Reverse engineering to extract layer-by-layer images by using delayering and Scanning Electron Microscope
  - Identify transistors, gates and routing elements by using a template-matching approach – **needs golden IC/layout**

Classification of Trojan Detection

- **Non-destructive Approach**
  - **Run-time monitoring**: Monitor abnormal behavior during run-time
    - Exploit pre-existing redundancy in the circuit
    - Compare results and select a trusted part to avoid an infected part of the circuit.
  - **Test-time Authentication**: Detect Trojans throughout test duration.
    - Logic-testing-based approaches
    - Side-channel analysis-based approaches

Hardware Trojan Benchmarks

- A set of **trust benchmarks** for researchers in academia, industry, and government is needed to
  - Provide a baseline for examining diverse methods developed
  - Establishing a sound basis for the hardness of each benchmark instance
  - Help increase reproducibility of results by others who intend to employ certain methodologies in their design flow
- See NSF supported **Trust-Hub** website (www.trust-hub.org)
  - Complete taxonomy of Trojans
  - More than 120 trust benchmarks available which were designed at different abstraction levels, triggered in several ways, and have different effect mechanisms
  - More than 300 publications used these benchmarks

Logic Testing

- **Logic-testing approach** focuses on test-vector generation for
  - Activating a Trojan circuit
  - Observing its malicious effect on the payload at the primary outputs
  - Both functional and structural test vectors are applicable.
- **Pros & Cons:**
  - **Pros**:
    - Straight-forward and easy to differentiate
  - **Cons**:
    - The difficulty in exciting or observing low controllability or low observability nodes.
    - Intentionally inserted Trojans are triggered under rare conditions. (e.g., sequential Trojans)
    - It cannot trigger Trojans that are activated externally and can only observe functional Trojans.

Functional Testing

- Functional patterns could potentially detect a "functional" Trojan.
  - Exhaustive test would be effective, but certainly not applicable for large circuits
  - E.g. 64 input adder → 2^{65} input combination (including carry in)
  - $2^{65} > 10^{18}$ – This is impractical
  - 100MHz is used → 10^{10} s → 317 years
  - Only a few and more effective patterns are used → Trojan can escape.
  - The fault coverage is low for manufacturing test

- In practice, structural tests are used.

Functional Testing

Feasible Trojan space inordinately large!

Deterministic test generation infeasible

A statistical approach is, more effective

- **MERO: A _Statistical_ Approach**
  - Find the rare events in the circuit
  - Generate vectors to trigger each rare node **_N times_**
  - Provides high confidence in detecting unknown Trojans!

a
b
c

Trojan Trigger Condition
a=0, b=1, c=1

Functional Testing

- **MERO**:
  - Generates a set of test vectors that can trigger each rare node to its rare value multiple times (N times)
  - It improves the probability of triggering a Trojan activated by a rare combination of a selection of the nodes


Fig. 15.6 Trigger coverage and Trojan coverage and test length for two ISCAS-85 benchmark circuits for different values of "N," using the MERO approach [8]

- **Challenge:** Triggering each net N times in a large circuit is challenging

# Side Channel Analysis - Power

- Hardware Trojans inserted in a chip can change the power consumption characteristics.
- **Partial activation** of Trojan can be extremely valuable for power analysis.
- The more number of cells in Trojan is activated the more the Trojan will draw current from power grid.

Side Channel Trojan Detection

Side-Channel Approach for Trojan Detection relies on observing Trojan effect in physical side-channel parameter, such as switching current, leakage current, path delay, electromagnetic (EM) emission

- Due to process variations, it is extremely challenging to detect the Trojan by considering F_{max} or I_{DDT} individually.

Transistor in a die

$V_{T,total} = V_{T,inter} + V_{T,intra}$

Intra-Die Variations
$\sim N(0, \sigma_{VT,intra})$

$\sigma_{VT,inter}$

Die

Inter-Die Variations
$\sim N(\mu_{VT,inter}, \sigma_{VT,inter})$

$\sigma_{VT,inter}$

$\mu_{VT,inter}$

Side Channel Signals

- All the side-channel analyses are based on observing the effect of an inserted Trojan on a physical parameter such as
  - **IDDQ**: Extra gates will consume leakage power.
  - **IDDT**: Extra switching activities will consume more dynamic power.
  - **Path Delay**: Additional gates and capacitance will increase path delay.
  - **EM**: Electromagnetic radiation due to switching activity

- **Pros & Cons**
  - **Pros**: It is effective for Trojan which does not cause observable malfunction in the circuits.
  - **Cons**: Large process variations in modern nanometer technologies and measurement noise can mask the effect of the Trojan circuits, especially for small Trojan.

Sensitivity Metric

- **Improving Detection Sensitivity**

Trojan Size $\downarrow$ ➡ Sensitivity $\downarrow$

Circuit Size $\uparrow$ ➡ Sensitivity $\downarrow$

$$Sensitivity = \frac{I_{tampered} - I_{original}}{I_{original}} \times 100\%$$

Comparisons

	Logic Testing	**Side-Channel Analysis**
Pros	• Robust under process noise • Effective for ultra-small Trojans	• Effective for large Trojans • Easy to generate test vectors
Cons	• Difficult to generate test vectors • Large Trojan detection challenging	• Vulnerable to process noise • Ultra-small Trojan Det. challenging

- A combination of logic testing & side-channel analysis could provide the good coverage!
- Online validation approaches can potentially provide a second layer of defense!

Side-channel Approach

- *Multiple-parameter Trojan Detection*
 - Due to process variations, Trojan detection by F_{max} or I_{DDT} alone is challenging!

- Consider the intrinsic relationship between I_{DDT} and F_{max}

Trojan attacks on S38417 circuit

Power Analysis

- **Current difference measured from power pad 17 (Trojan-free vs Trojan-inserted)**

- **There is no change in layout of the circuit. Trojan was inserted in an unused space in the circuit layout.**

Current Evaluation

- Current consumption of Trojan-free and Trojan-inserted circuits

$$Q_{trojan\text{-}free}(t) = \int I_{trojan\_free}(t) \cdot dt$$

$$Q_{trojan\text{-}inserted}(t) = \int I_{trojan\_inserted}(t) \cdot dt = \int (I_{trojan\_free}(t) + I_{trojan}(t)) \cdot dt$$

Power Analysis

Pattern Generation
- How to increase switching activity in Trojans?
- How to reduce background noise?
- Switching locality
- Random Patterns
  - No observation is necessary , Similar to test-per-clock

Measurement Device Accuracy
- Measurement noise

Process Variations
- Calibration

On-Chip Measurement
- Vulnerable to attack

Authentication Time
- Trojans can be inserted randomly

Side Channel Analysis - Delay

- Hard to detect using power analysis are:
  - Distributed Trojans
  - Hard-to-activate Trojans
- **Path delay**: A change in physical dimension of the wires and transistors can also change path delay.
- We are developing new methods that can detect additional delays on each path of the circuit.

Delay-based Methods

- Shadow-register provides a possible solution for measuring internal path delay.

- From this architecture, it can be seen that the basic unit contains one shadow register, one comparator and one result register.

- **Limitations**:
  - PV
  - Overhead
  - S-clock
  - Output

Clock Sweeping

- Clock sweeping involves applying a pattern at different clock frequencies, from a lower speed to higher speeds.
- Some paths sensitized by the pattern which are longer than the current period start to fail when the clock speed increases.
- The obtained start-to-fail clock frequency can indicate the delays of the paths sensitized by the patterns

(a)

Path Delay

$--\!\!\!>$ Trojan

f_0 : Circuit function frequency

f_5 : Maximum allowable frequency

$$\Delta t = \frac{1}{f_i} - \frac{1}{f_{i+1}},$$

$i = 0,1,2,3,4$

(b)

Delay Analysis

- **Major advantage over power analysis: No activation is required.**
  - **Detection and Isolation**
    - How significant is the delay inserted by Trojan?
    - It depends on Trojan size and type
    - Location: on short paths or long paths
  - **Pattern Generation**
    - Delay test patterns
    - Path Coverage
  - **Process Variations (V_{th}, L, T_{ox})**
    - Impact circuit delay characteristics significantly
    - Differentiate between Trojan and PV
  - **Trojan can have impact on multiple paths (an advantage over PV)**

Trojan Detection

Trojan				Power Analysis	Delay Analysis	Fully Activation
Trojan Classification	Physical Characteristics	Type	Functional	D	P	P
			Parametric	P	D	P
		Size	Small		D	P
			Large	D	P	P
		Distribution	Tight	D	D	P
			Loose	P	D	P
		Structure	Modify Layout	P	D	
	Activation Characteristics	Always-on			D	
		Condition-based	Logic-based	D	P	P
			Sensor-based	D		
	Action Characteristics	Modify Function		D	P	
		Modify Spec.	Defects	P	D	P
			Reliability	P	P	P

P: Detection is possible   D: High level of confidence

Design for Hardware Security

- Since detecting Trojan is extremely challenging, design for hardware trust approaches are proposed to

  - **Improve hardware Trojan detection methods**
    - Improve sensitive to power and delay
    - Rare event removal

  - **Prevent hardware Trojan insertion**
   - Design obfuscation

Rare Event Removal

- Intelligent attackers will choose low-frequency events to trigger the inserted Trojans.

- Improving controllability or observability can make rare events scarce, thereby facilitating detecting Trojans inside the design.
  - Design for Trojan test: inserting probing points
 - Inserting dummy scan flip-flops

Increasing Trojan Activation

- Inserting dummy FFs on path with very low activation probability

Increasing Trojan Activation

- Dummy scan flip-flops are inserted to control hard-to-excite nodes.

- Usage:
  - **Full activation**: increase controllability
  - **Power-based**: generate switching activities
  - **Delay-based**: activate more paths to improve coverage

Design Obfuscation

- The objective is deterring attackers from inserting Trojans inside the design.

- Design obfuscation means that a design will be transformed to another one which is functionally equivalent to the original, but in which it is much harder for attackers to obtain complete understanding of the internal logic, making reverse engineering much more difficult to perform.

- It obfuscates the state transition function to add an obfuscated mode on top of the original functionality (called normal mode).

Design Obfuscation

- Specified pattern is able to guide the circuit into its normal mode.

- The transition arc K3 is the only way the design can enter normal operation mode from the obfuscated mode.

Built-in Self Authentication

- Filling all unused spaces with a circuit that can easily test itself