Assessing CPA Resistance of AES with Different Fault Tolerance Mechanisms

Hoda Pahlevanzadeh, Jaya Dofe, and Qiaoyan Yu University of New Hampshire Durham, NH, USA 03824 Email: <u>Qiaoyan.Yu@unh.edu</u>

Outline

- Security threats on hardware
 - Fault attack
 - Side-channel attack (SCA)
 - Combined attack
- Impact of existing countermeasures for fault attack on cryptosystem against SCA
- Factors affect the efficiency of SCA

Security Challenges in IC



IC Vulnerability to an Attack



[1]



[1] S. Skorobogatov, ECRYPT II, 2011.

IC Vulnerability to Natural and Intentional Faults



P. K. Singh, D. Patil, IJIIT, 2013

Unified Framework for Reliability and Security of IC



IC Security Vulnerability to Protection Circuits





Fault Analysis Attack



G. Canivet, et al., Journal of Cryptology, 2011.



AES Cipher



Impact of existing countermeasures for fault attack on cryptosystem security



Different fault detection methods

Fault detection methods on different modules

Fault Detection Methods



CPA Attack on AES



CPA Attack on AES



CPA Attack on AES





[1] E. Brier et al., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2004.

Convert the

Experimental Setup



Capture

ChipWhisperer [™] Capt	ure V2 - Untitled*		×
ile Project Tools	Windows Help		
Master: 👀	Scope: 018 Target: 019		
neral Settings			₽×
arameter	Value		
Scope Module			9
Target Module			5)
Trace Format			6
Auxilary Module			9
Acquisition Settings			
Number of Traces	100		5
Capture Segments	1		6
Open Monitor			
Key/Text Pattern	Basic		Ð
ey/Text Pattern			
Кеу	Fixed		S
Plaintext	Random		5
Fixed Encryption Key	2b 7e 15 16 28 ae d2 a6 ab f7 15 88 09 cf 4f 3c		9
Fixed Plaintext Key	00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 0A 0B 0C 0D 0E 0F		5
General Settings Scope	Settings Target Settings Trace Settings		
Capture Waveform (Ch	annel 1)		₽×
Xô Yô X	YI YI 😼 🔨 🗙		
	Power Trace View		
0	100 200 300		400
-			
0.4 -			
0.2			
-			
Gta	^-լիզիգիգիգիգիգիգիգի	p	
-			
-0.2 -	A restrict to the test of the second seco		
-			
-0.4 -			
			_
0	100 200 300		400 -
	Samples		

Analyzer

Attack		₽×		
Parameter	Value			
Attack				
CPA Algorithm	Progressive	5		
▲ Hardware Model				
Crypto Algorithr	n AES-128 (8-bit)	5		
Leakage Model	HD: AES Last-Round State	2		
Attacked Bytes				
All Off				
All On				
Bute 0		100		
Byte 1		5		
Byte 2				
Byte 3		5		
Byte 4		5		
Byte 5		5		
Byte 6	V	6		
Byte 7		6		
Byte 8		6		
Byte 9	\checkmark	6		
Byte 10	V	6		
Byte 11		6		
Byte 12		6		
Byte 13		1		
Byte 14		6		
Byte 15		5		
Point Setup				
Starting Point	0	5		
Ending Point	396	5		
Trace Setup				
Starting Trace	0	5		
Traces per Attack	6999	5		
Attack Runs	1	6		
Reporting Interval	700	÷ [•		

ChipWhispere	r™ Analyzer V2	- S-Box_Parity_1_11_2	.cwp*								J						
File Project Tools Windows Help																	
Attack			🗗 🗙 Results	; Table						₽×			Δr		176)r	
Parameter	Value			0 1 2	3 4	5 6 7	7 8 9	10 11 1	2 13 14	15					y Z (5 I	
Attack			PGE	0 39 0	0 54	0 0 0	0 8	12 0 0	0 16	0				1			
CPA Algorithr	m Progres	sive		E6 5B D4	C4 ED	AD 82 9D	C0 32	51 ED 36	6D 96	3B							
A Hardware Mo	odel	R (R-bit)		B6 1E 1E	1F Δ4	BE FE 6E	ΔF 99	35 71 94	2E 95	4 0.0541 F2							
Leakage N	Model HD: AE	S Last-Round State		0.0589 0.0452 0.0530	5 0.0475 0.0487	0.0522 0.0541 0.04	497 0.0502 0.0538	0.0474 0.0477 0.0	543 0.0559 0.0511	1 0.0517							
▲ Attacked Byt	tes		2	AD 57 21 0.0479 0.0449 0.049	15 96 0.0471 0.0480	5 96 DC F0 56 3B 6D BE 08 4B B0 0D 11						Subkov NO					
All O	ff		3	DB 8D 3B	+1/9 0.0449 0.0431 0.0471 0.0480 0.0511 0.0478 0.0492 0.0493 0.0524 0.0460 0.0537 0.0523 0.0478 0.0512 8D 3B 83 99 AA 65 E6 D1 78 26 B8 A3 E5 F2 35						SUDKEY NO.						
				0.0455 0.0432 0.0460 3D A3 79	BF DD	0.0491 0.0463 0.04 D7 99 1C	D5 EB	0.0465 0.0467 0.03 18 9C 44	9F 4A	7 0.0491 32							
All O)n		4	0.0454 0.0430 0.0459	0.0468 0.0462	0.0484 0.0454 0.04	458 0.0454 0.0480	0.0464 0.0465 0.0	510 0.0510 0.0464	4 0.0488	1			Suh	kev G	11000	
Byte 0			5	48 B1 93 0.0442 0.0430 0.0444	/3 13 4 0.0459 0.0453	07 9F 67 0.0466 0.0446 0.04	17 92 449 0.0449 0.0464	2A BE CE 0.0463 0.0456 0.04	EB AC 498 0.0483 0.0450	74 6 0.0473				Jub	NC y U	4633	
Byte 1			6	F9 94 C1	9B 49	76 3C 0C	59 C6	2B 1E 87	CF 76	FO							
Byte 2				0.0427 0.0428 0.044 /5 DC C5	E9 71	0.0465 0.0446 0.04 6B 6E AB	13 22	0.0456 0.0454 0.04 C6 1A C3	491 0.0470 0.0450 C0 1B	0 0.0465 B2							
		1 a 1				-		-						4.0			
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
PGE	0	39	0	0	54	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	16	0	
0	E6	58	D4	C4	ED	AD	82	9D	CO	32	51	ED	36	6D	96	38	
0	0.063	0.0472	0.059	0.0937	0.0494	0.0661	0.0675	0.0531	0.0579	0.054	2 0.051	0.0663	0.0626	0.0823	0.0544	0.0541	
	0.000	0.0472	0.000	0.0537	0.004044	0.0001	0.0010	0.0004	0.0010	0.000	2 0.034.	0.0000	0.0020	0.0025	V.0.244	0.00044	
Byte 15			5 14	0415 0.0415 0.04	0.0416 0.0429	0.0432 0.0426 0.04	428 0.0403 0.0428	0.0430 0.0434 0.04	448 0.0436 0.0430	6 0. 137							
Point Setup			15	B2 34 C7 0.0414 0.0414 0.0416	C5 58 5 0.0416 0.0429	CC F5 26 0.0429 0.0426 0.04	F5 82 127 0.0402 0.0428	25 8E 9B 0.0430 0.0433 0.04	FA E8 447 0.0432 0.0433	43 3 0.0435							
Starting Point	0		5 16	05 18 00	A6 6B	14 55 C9	29 C5	71 62 34	86 3A	9C							
Ending Point	396	_		0.0412 0.0413 0.0413 8C F1 FD	3 0.0415 0.0429	0.0423 0.0424 0.04 32 F1 F2	425 0.0400 0.0426 B7 73	0.0423 0.0432 0.04 58 29 FB	438 0.0431 0.0433 F4 B9	3 0.0428 D7		~ I		CC		c .	
Starting Trace	0	_	17	0.0412 0.0413 0.0412	2 0.0415 0.0429	0.0417 0.0418 0.04	422 0.0398 0.0419	0.0419 0.0431 0.04	436 0.0431 0.042	3 0.0420		orrel	ation	coeff	Iclent	factor	
Traces per Att	tack 6999		5 18	56 9E E1 0.0411 0.0410 0.0412	18 5F 2 0.0415 0.0429	22 45 A5 0.0415 0.0413 0.04	69 16 19 0.0397 0.0418	33 E1 59 0.0417 0.0431 0.04	92 AA 435 0.0430 0.0417	5C 7 0.0411							
Attack Runs	1		5	B9 CC 63	F9 8A	E4 84 A3	79 1C	91 99 6A	52 33	D8							
Reporting Inte	erval 700	-	• •	0.0410 0.0409 0.0411 44 04 1A	56 3E	0.0415 0.0413 0.04 B3 EB E5	49 BA	0.0416 0.0426 0.04 F1 9D 52	427 0.0430 0.0413 39 8C	3 0.0408							
Progressive CPA 20 0.0410 0.0408 0.0409 0.0414 0.0422 0.0414 0.0413 0.0418 0.0395 0.0415 0.0414 0.0424 0.0426 0.0425 0.0412 0.0408							2 0.0408										
Iteration Mod	le Breadth F-0 🕅	n-First	21	C1 E4 38 0.0409 0.0407 0.0409	3A 25 0.0413 0.0419	05 DC D0 0.0414 0.0412 0.04	9F 79 418 0.0394 0.0414	B1 DF C1 0.0413 0.0420 0.04	8F 6A 425 0.0424 0.0408	C5 8 0.0405							
Skip When PO			22	85 40 59	B3 68	OC 76 22	3A 9E	C9 5C FB	95 C3	E9							
				94 DA C4	9E BB	0.0412 0.0410 0.04 93 4F 5C	AB A1	95 AD 68	423 0.0423 0.040 D8 3F	5A							
23 0.407 0.0403 0.0403 0.0403 0.0409 0.0415 0.0411 0.0407 0.0417 0.0393 0.0409 0.0413 0.0422 0.0427 0.0401							7 0.0401										
			24	90 SC F1 0.0407 0.0401 0.0402	FA A2 0.0409 0.0414	BU 1D 7B	5A 8E 116 0.0392 0.0407	5F E6 76 0.0409 0.0406 0.04	7A 6E 419 0.0421 0.040	94 7 0 0400 -						10	
Gen Prepro	oces At	Postproces R	es Wav	eform Display Result	s Table PGE vs	Trace Plot Corre	elation vs Traces in A	ttack			1					TO	

Impact of FD on SCA Attack







Impact of Different Hardware Redundancy-Based FD Methods on SCA Attack



Impact of Different Power Models in CPA Attack



Impact of Different Power Models in CPA Attack



Two Approaches to Study the Impact of Different FDs



Conclusion

- As the combination of FA and SCA attacks is emerging as an advanced attack, effective countermeasure for the combined attack is needed.
- One countermeasure for a particular attack can influence the other attack positively or negatively.
- Our experimental results indicate that the effective factors on CPA efficiency include
 - \circ Type of redundancy
 - Module under protection
 - CPA attack power model

Thank you!

Any Questions?