DESIGN SECURITY WITH WAVEFORMS

Jie Feng Altera Corporation 101 Innovation Dr San Jose, CA 95134 (408) 544-6753 jfeng@altera.com

ABSTRACT

Military communications applications such as the Joint tactical Radio System (JTRS) are increasingly turning to FPGAs for large portions of their system design. The reasons for this are many, but include the benefits of increased density, functionality, and performance of FPGAs, as well as higher flexibility, lower development costs and risks over ASICs. However, as FPGAs become a more integral part of the leading edge architectural design, replacing ASICs and ASSPs, security of the FPGA design and configuration bitstream is of utmost importance. This paper describes two techniques – configuration bitstream encryption and handshaking tokens – for securing designers' intellectual property (IP) within SRAM-based FPGAs.

1. INTRODUCTION

Military applications are becoming increasingly complex. Major programs such as the Future Combat Systems (FCS) and Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) are pushing technological capabilities on all fronts to their limits. The electronics in these systems are relying on programmable logic and FPGAs to provide extreme flexibility at a reasonable cost while not giving up the requisite computational power. For example, secure communication systems are used to connect a variety of airborne, space ground and sea-based military communication networks. They are used in the transmission, processing, recording, monitoring and dissemination functions of a variety such networks, including secure data links. All this functionality requires processing power and reconfigurability.

As FPGAs advance in density, functionality and performance, they are increasingly used in critical military system functions that were traditionally filled by ASICs or ASSPs. However, SRAM-based FPGAs are volatile and require a configuration bitstream to be sent from a flash memory or configuration device to the FPGA at power up. Since this bitstream could be intercepted during transmission, design security in high-performance FPGAs is a concern. Joel A. Seely Altera Corporation 101 Innovation Dr San Jose, CA 95134 (408) 544-8122 jseely@altera.com

2. TECHNIQUES FOR ENSURING BITSTREAM SECURITY

Two techniques – configuration bitstream encryption and handshaking tokens – can be used for securing intellectual property (IP) within SRAM-based FPGAs. The bitstream encryption is enabled using 128-bit advanced encryption standard (AES) and a non-volatile key. The 128-bit AES key makes it much more secure than data encryption standard (DES - 56-bit key size) and triple DES (112-bit effective key size). The non-volatile key is stored on the FPGA and retains its information when power is off, eliminating the need for unreliable battery backup in harsh military environments. Handshaking tokens is a method whereby the FPGA communicates with a CPLD which includes a non-volatile stored encrypted token. The FPGA design must read this token and have the matching key, otherwise the design will shut down.

AES comes in three different key sizes: 128-bit, 192-bit, and 256-bit. The longer the key size, the more secure, but also the more processing-intensive and costly. For many applications, 128-bit AES key size is probably the most suitable for both security and efficiency. To understand the level of security, studies have shown that if one could build a machine that could discover a DES key in seconds, then it would take that same machine approximately 149 trillion years to discover a 128-bit AES key.

Security key storage, which can be in either a volatile or non-volatile location, is an important part of overall security. When the key is stored in volatile memory, an external backup battery is required when there is no power to the device. While this solution is quite secure (because the key will likely be lost if someone tries to attack the solution by decapping the device), reliability, especially in military environments, is a major concern. Battery life depends on temperature and moisture levels of the surrounding area. If the battery dies, the key will be lost, and the device becomes unusable and must be sent back to the factory for repair. Also, adding a battery increases overall system cost and requires additional manufacturing steps. The battery needs to be soldered onto the board after the reflow process. The volatile key needs to be programmed into the FPGA after both the FPGA and the battery are on board.



Figure 1: Altera DSP Builder Design Flow

When the key is stored in a non-volatile location, no external battery is required. This method is more reliable, practical and flexible. The key can be stored into the FPGA during regular manufacturing flow, with the FPGA either on-board or off-board. Various security techniques need to be employed to make the key difficult to find.

Because only the encrypted configuration file is physically located in the system with the key stored securely inside the FPGA, even if the configuration bitstream is captured, it cannot be decrypted. Read-back of a decrypted configuration file is not allowed by the FPGA vendors. Further, the encrypted configuration file cannot be interpreted and used to configure another FPGA without the appropriate key, making it very difficult to copy such a design.

Reverse engineering any FPGA design through configuration bitstream is very difficult and timeconsuming, even without encryption. For high-density devices, the configuration file could contain millions of bits. Some FPGA vendors' configuration file formats are proprietary and confidential, providing another layer of security. With the addition of configuration bitstream encryption, it may be easier and quicker to build a competitive design from scratch than to reverse engineer such a design.

Tampering cannot be prevented if a volatile key is used because the key is erasable; once the key is erased, the device can be configured with any configuration file. For the non-volatile key solution, the device can be set to only accept configuration files encrypted with the stored key. A configuration failure signals possible tampering with the configuration file, whether in the external memory, during transmission between the external memory and the FPGA, or during remotely communicated system upgrades. This is another advantage of a non-volatile key.

3. HANDSHAKING TOKENS

Configuration bitstream encryption is only available in high-density, high-performance SRAM-based FPGAs. The following solution allows any FPGA designs to remain secure even if the configuration bitstream is captured. This is accomplished by disabling the functionality of a user design within the FPGA until handshaking tokens are passed to the FPGA from a secure external device. The secure external device generates continuous handshaking tokens to the FPGA to ensure that it continues operation. This concept is similar to the software license scheme shown in Figure 2.

Configuring the FPGA is similar to installing software onto a computer; the configuration bitstream is not protected. The external secure device is similar to the license file. The software will only operate when a valid license file is present. The user design within the FPGA will only operate when the handshaking tokens sent from the external secure device are valid. A simplified hardware implementation for this solution is shown in Figure 3. In this example, a CPLD is used as the secure external device because it is non-volatile and retains its configuration data during power down.



Figure 2: Comparison of Software License Scheme & FPGA Security Scheme



Figure 3: Simplified Hardware Implementation of the FPGA Design Security Solution

After the FPGA is configured, the functionality of the user design within the FPGA is disabled because the enable signal is not asserted, while the security block within the FPGA starts to function. The random number generator (RNG) generates and sends the initial counter value to the CPLD. The CPLD encrypts the counter value and sends the resulting handshaking token to the FPGA. If the handshaking token matches the data generated internally inside the FPGA, the enable signal is asserted, and the user design starts functioning. This process continues during the entire operation of the FPGA. A mismatch will cause the enable signal to go low and disable the functionality of the user design. Figure 4 shows an example of how the enable signal is used with a simple AND gate.



Figure 4: Design with Security Scheme

The FPGA user design only works when the handshaking tokens from the external secure device and the data generated inside the FPGA are identical. Even if the FPGA configuration bitstream is stolen, it is useless, similar to software without a license. Therefore, the FPGA user design is secure from copying. This solution does not provide additional protection against reverse engineering (though difficult) and tampering.

The security of the solution relies on the external secure device to be secure and the handshaking tokens to be unpredictable. A secure external device needs to be nonvolatile and retain its configuration during power down (e.g. CPLDs or security processors). The RNG in the solution is critical. It ensures that every time the device starts up, it uses a different initial value. This prevents anyone from storing the handshaking tokens in a storage device. To prevent someone from detecting the pattern in the handshaking tokens, a proven encryption algorithm such as AES should be used.

To ensure that the security scheme works properly, the system clock feeding the FPGA user design should be the same as the system clock feeding the security block. This prevents someone from disabling the security block when the enable signal is asserted. To further increase security, the comparator block can be duplicated several times to produce more enable signals to feed different portions of the user designs.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In an era of ever-increasing security concerns, SRAM-based FPGAs combined with bitstream encryption offer designers of military systems critical advantages. In addition to high density, high performance, low development risk and fast time-to-market benefits over other implementations, they also deliver a secure approach for protecting proprietary designs and IP. For FPGAs without this built-in security feature, an additional non-volatile device can be used to protect the FPGA design by supplying handshaking tokens.

5. REFERENCES

[1] Design Security using MAX II CPLDs, Altera http://www.altera.com/literature/wp/wp_m2dsgn.pdf

[2] Design Security in Stratix II Devices, Altera http://www.altera.com/products/devices/stratix2/features/sec urity/st2-security.html

FPGA Design With Security Scheme



Design Security With Waveforms

Jean-Charles Bouzigues

© 2005 Altera Corporation

Agenda

- FPGAs in Waveform Processing
- Design Security Overview
- SRAM-Based FPGA Design Security
 - Configuration Bitstream Encryption
 - Handshaking Tokens





FPGAs in Waveform Processing

© 2005 Altera Corporation



FPGA Market Trend

FPGA Values

- Fast Time-to-Market
- No NRE Cost

Re-ProgrammabilityLow Risk



Source: Dataquest (as of Nov. 2004) & Altera Estimates

© 2005 Altera Corporation - Confidential

FPGA Advancement Lead by SRAM-Based FPGAs 180K LEs 90 nm Features **80K LEs** Faster 130 nm **FPGA** 52K LEs Bigger 180 nm 12K Logic Elements (LEs) 300 nm 1998 2000 2002 2004 Year

Source: Altera Corporation

© 2005 Altera Corporation - Confidential



Increasing Need for Design Security

FPGAs Contain Valuable IP



Information/Content Go Electronic Products Manufactured & Shipped Globally



Partners & Competitors



Contracting Agency	Integrators/ Prime	Contractors & SubContractors
U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command (CECOM)	GENERAL DYNAMICS Strength On Your Side ^{**}	BAE SYSTEMS Rockwell Collins
Special Operations Acquisition and Logistics	ØBOEING	THALES
Space and Naval Warfare Scommand	LOCKHEED MARTIN We never forget who we're working for ^w	DEFENENCE THE FUTURE



© 2005 Altera Corporation - Confidential



Design Security Overview

© 2005 Altera Corporation

Device Design Security Concerns

Form	Definition	Damage
Copying	Make Identical Copies of the Design	 Revenue Loss to the Designer Steal Military Technology for Use
Reverse Engineering	Recreate the Original Design in RTL or Schematic Form	 Modify & Improve the Design to Gain Competitive Edge Steal Military Technology for Analysis & Countermeasures or Improvement
Tampering	Modify or Replace the Design Stored in the Device	 Cause System Malfunction Steal Sensitive System Data or Services



FPGA & ASIC Design Attacks

	ASICs	Flash- Based FPGAs	Antifuse- Based FPGAs	SRAM- Based FPGAs	SRAM FPGA With On-Chip Configuration
Black Box Attack					
Readback Attack					
Configuration Bitstream Probing					
Programming State Probing					
Reverse Engineering Configuration Data					
Reverse Engineering Device					
Re-Programming					



Black Box Attack

- Determine Functionality of the Device by Feeding Input & Exam Output Exhaustively
- Can Be Used to Copy or Reverse-Engineer Simple Designs
 - Not Useful for Complex Designs
 - Can Add Bogus Logic to a Simple Design to Make Black Box Attack More Difficult





Readback Attack

- Readback Is a Feature for Most Non-Volatile Re-Programmable FPGAs to Read Back Configuration Data for Debugging
- Readback Usually Protected by Security Bits
 - Attackers Need to Detect & Deactivate Security Bits to Enable Readback
 - Use Multiple Security Bits Distributed Among the Device Under Layers of Metal to Make the Attack More Difficult





Configuration Bitstream Probing

- Volatile FPGAs Require Non-Volatile Memory to Store Configuration Data
 - Some Devices Combine Both Volatile FPGA & Non-Volatile Memory in a Single Chip
- During System Power Up, Configuration Data Is Sent to FPGA in Plain Text





Programming State Probing

- Non-Volatile FPGAs Store Configuration During Power Off
- Techniques to Analyze Programming State of Each Cell to Reveal Device Configuration
 - FIB (Focused Ion Beam)
 - Cross-Sectioning
 - SEM (Scanning Electron Microscope)
 - Microscope Imaging
 - TEM (Transmission Electron Microscope)
 - Higher Resolution Microscope Imaging
- Such Attack Is Time Consuming



Reverse Engineer Device

Invasive Attack







Configuration Bitstream Encryption

© 2005 Altera Corporation

Basic Concept of Configuration *Bitstream Encryption*





Secure Configuration Procedure





Secure Configuration Procedure

Step 3: Receive & Decrypt Encrypted Programming File





Choice of Encryption Algorithm

Industry-Standard Symmetric-Key Block Cipher Encryption Algorithm

	DES (Data Encryption Standard)	3DES (Triple DES)	AES (Advanced Encryption Standard)
Federal Information Processing Standard	FIPS 46-3	FIPS 46-3	FIPS 197
Year	1977	1999	2001
Key Length	56-bit	168-bit (112-bit Effective)	128-bit, 192-bit, 256-bit
Data Block	64-bit	64-bit	128-bit



AES Modes of Operation

- Data Size Rarely Exactly 128 bits
- Recommendation for Block Cipher Modes of Operation by NIST*
 - Electronic Codebook (ECB)
 - Cipher Block Chaining (CBC)
 - Cipher Feedback (CFB)
 - Output Feedback (OFB)
 - Counter (CTR)

http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-38a/sp800-38a.pdf

* National Institute of Standard and Technology (NIST): Non-Regulatory Federal Agency Within U.S. Commerce Department's Technology Administration.



Choice of Key Storage

	Volatile Key	Non-Volatile Key
Battery Backup	Yes	No
Reliability	No	Yes
Cost		Low
Manufacturability		Better
Security Against Copying & Reverse Engineering	Yes	Yes
Security Against Tampering		Yes

High Cost of Implementation for Volatile Key



Security Against Copying

- Two Approaches to Copying
 - Obtain Original Configuration File Requires Decryption of Encrypted Configuration File
 - Only Encrypted Configuration File Exists in End System
 - Key Securely Stored Within FPGA
 - Not Knowing the AES Mode Makes It More Challenging
 - Program Key Into the FPGA & Use Encrypted Configuration File to Configure the FPGA
 - Key Securely Stored Within FPGA
 - Key Programming File Cannot Be Easily Generated From Key Stored within FPGA

Important to Keep the Key Secure in the FPGA



Security Against Design Reverse Engineering

Obtain Original Configuration File First

Similar Difficulty as Copying

Map Configuration Data to Device Resource Level

- Then Map to RTL & Schematic Format

- Difficult if Vendor Does Not Disclose Configuration Data Format
 - Need to Reverse Engineer the Device or Design Software



Security Against Tampering

Volatile Key Storage Does Not Prevent Tampering

- Key Is Erased by Removing Battery
- Non-Volatile Key Storage Can Be Designed to Detect Tampering
 - Make The Device Only Accept Encrypted
 Configuration File After Key Programmed





Handshaking Tokens

© 2005 Altera Corporation

Configuration File Not Protected





Basic Concept of Solution

- Security Provided by a Security Device
 - Sends Continuous Handshaking Tokens to the FPGA During Device Operation
 - FPGA User Design Only Enabled If the Handshaking Tokens Are Verified



Prevent FPGA User Designs From Being Copied



Similar to Software Licensing

1. Install Software



1. Configure FPGA



2. Software Operation



2. Device Operation





© 2005 Altera Corporation - Confidential

Simplified Example Implementation





Disable/Enable User Design





Solution's Security

Security Device Needs to Be Secure

- CPLDs Are Non-Volatile & Retain Their Configuration
- Security Processor With On-Chip Cache
- Handshaking Token Needs to Be Unpredictable
 - Random Number Generator
 - Generates Different Initial Value
 - Prevents Storage of Handshaking Tokens
 - Proven Encryption Standards
 - 3DES, AES



Solution's Security

Security Block Cannot Be Disabled

- Clock Feeding Security Block Should Be the Same as Clock Feeding FPGA User Design
- Enable Signal Should Be Difficult to Tamper With
 - Reverse Engineering FPGA Configuration
 Bitstream Should Be Difficult
 - Comparator Can Be Duplicated to Generate
 Different Enable Signals to Enable Different
 Portions of the User Design



Cost of Implementation

Resource Utilization in CPLD

- Approximately 600 Logic Elements (LEs) Using 3DES Encryption Standard *
- Why Not Use Non-Volatile FPGA?
 - Combined Cost of SRAM-Based FPGA & CPLD
 Can Be Lower Than a Non-Volatile FPGA
 - Utilize Unused Area of a CPLD
 - Non-Volatile FPGA Limitation
 - Density, Features
 - Re-Programmability

*Source: Altera Corporation

Summary

- SRAM-Based FPGAs Are The Most Cost Effective FPGAs
- Design Security Using Configuration Bitstream Encryption Is Available on High-Density SRAM-Based FPGAs
- Handshaking Token Security Scheme Can Protect Any SRAM-Based FPGA From Copying

Always Consider Level of Security & Cost of Implementation





Thank You Jean-Charles Bouzigues

© 2005 Altera Corporation