

On the Design and Security of Collective Remote Attestation Protocols

SHARAR AHMADI, University of Surrey, UK

JAY LE-PAPIN, University of Surrey, UK

LIQUN CHEN, University of Surrey, UK

BRIJESH DONGOL, University of Surrey, UK

SASA RADOMIROVIC, University of Surrey, UK

HELEN TREHARNE, University of Surrey, UK

Collective remote attestation (CRA) is a security service that aims to efficiently identify compromised (often low-powered) devices in a (heterogeneous) network. The last few years have seen an extensive growth in CRA protocol proposals, showing a variety of designs guided by different network topologies, hardware assumptions and other functional requirements. However, they differ in their trust assumptions, adversary models and role descriptions making it difficult to uniformly assess their security guarantees.

In this paper we present *CATT*, a unifying framework for CRA protocols that enables them to be compared systematically, based on a comprehensive study of 40 CRA protocols and their adversary models. *CATT* characterises the roles that devices can take and based on these we develop a novel set of security properties for CRA protocols. We then classify the security aims of all the studied protocols. We illustrate the applicability of our security properties by encoding them in the *TAMARIN* prover and verifying the *SIMPLE+* protocol against them.

1 INTRODUCTION

An increasing number of heterogeneous devices are deployed in distributed and autonomous networks with applications including medical systems [23] to robotics [76]. These pervasive devices often operate in large, dynamic, and self-organising networks, called *swarms* [22]. The devices themselves are typically low cost and have limited memory and processing capabilities. This unfortunately, makes them targets for a wide range of attacks [47, 64, 77, 78].

One way to monitor these attacks is *remote attestation* (RA) [19, 20, 88] whereby a device, called a *verifier*, checks the software state of a remote device, called a *prover*. In RA protocols, a prover sends a report containing a measurement (e.g., of its software state) to the verifier, which can be matched against expected values to determine whether the prover can be trusted. However, when attesting multiple provers, an RA protocol must be executed for each prover individually, which is not scalable. Therefore, *collective remote attestation* (CRA) protocols (aka *swarm attestation* protocols) have been developed, which allow a verifier to efficiently attest a large number of provers [15, 22, 64]. CRA protocols can support *heterogeneous systems* (e.g., IoT networks) where provers may have different hardware and software configurations (e.g., [58]). Moreover, the provers may not be stationary (e.g., as part of an autonomous drone [53]), which further increases the design space for CRA protocols (e.g., as found in [59]).

Since the first CRA protocol, *SEDA* [22] was proposed, many new protocols have been developed to address different assumptions on interactivity, network topologies, device mobility, verifier behaviour, and reporting and validation requirements. The large number of protocols and their vast design space led to several efforts to classify the protocols. Carpent et al. [29], Ambrosin et al. [15], and Kuang et al. [64] have compared CRA protocols with respect to operational assumptions and

Authors' addresses: Sharar Ahmadi, b.dongol@surrey.ac.uk, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; Jay Le-Papin, jay.le-papin@surrey.ac.uk, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; Liqun Chen, liqun.chen@surrey.ac.uk, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; Brijesh Dongol, b.dongol@surrey.ac.uk, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; Sasa Radomirovic, s.radomirovic@surrey.ac.uk, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; Helen Treharne, h.treharne@surrey.ac.uk, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK.

design features such as the network’s topology and dynamicity, hardware requirements and cost, and quality of attestation.

Contributions. We present CATT a new unifying framework for Collective Attestation. CATT is the result of our findings from our systematic review of the adversary models, trust assumptions and security requirements of 40 CRA protocols and related literature on RA protocols. Namely, we make the following contributions with CATT.

(1) *Unified Protocol Model (§2)*. The literature on CRA protocols (including the aforementioned reviews [15, 64]) has generally evolved from RA protocols. However, different authors have applied extensions to the RA terminology in an ad hoc (often inconsistent) manner. CATT includes a novel protocol model, building on the RATS RFC [26], that clarifies the existing terminology and defines new roles such as a *relying party* and *delegated trusted party* for CRA protocols. We show that the CATT protocol model serves as a framework within which all of the protocols that we study can be characterised.

(2) *Trust and Threat Models (§3)*. We review the possible targets of attestation from which a measurement is generated and clarify how validation of measurements can be trusted. Additionally, we take the existing threat models [4, 15, 52] and recast them within CATT.

(3) *Defence Mechanisms Against Software and Physical Attacks (§4)*. We review techniques to defend against software attacks and *systematise* the mitigation and detection techniques for physical attacks, condensing approaches into five broad categories.

(4) *Security Definitions (§5 and §6)*. Unlike previous works, which have introduced ad hoc (informal) security definitions, CATT introduces a novel set of a security properties for CRA protocols based on our unified model, which we use to classify the security goals of all 40 of the protocols that we study. The framework comprises one authentication property and eight attestation properties. The former is used by many protocols to prevent unauthorised parties from starting the costly attestation process. The latter properties capture the main security goals, enabling comparison of CRA protocols across three dimensions: (i) accuracy with respect to the attestation target, (ii) granularity of the attestation result, and (iii) synchronicity of attestation reports.

(5) *Property Encoding (§7)*. Finally, we illustrate the CATT security properties by showing that they can be encoded in the Tamarin prover and demonstrate which ones hold for one of the reviewed CRA protocols, SIMPLE+ [16]. The significance of the encoding is that the properties can then be used directly in formal analyses of other CRA protocols.

2 A UNIFIED PROTOCOL MODEL FOR CRA

In the literature, CRA is often considered to be a protocol between a non-empty set of *provers* and a *verifier* (or set of verifiers) [15, 22, 64]. However, in our study, we discover that this formulation is not suitable for describing CRA protocols in general, because the precise trust assumptions and functionality of a verifier varies. This is unlike RA protocols, where a verifier is generally assumed to be trusted and have a fixed role of deciding whether the prover it interacts with is healthy [26]. CRA protocols follow a variety of designs ranging from untrusted verifiers [63] to not using verifiers at all [50]. Even when trusted verifiers are assumed, their functionalities often differ from verifiers in RA protocols, e.g., verifiers in a CRA protocol may only collect results generated by provers [16].

In CATT, we thus define a CRA protocol as one that specifies the behaviour of a set of *provers* and some intermediary devices to enable a *relying party* [26, 32] to determine whether the provers are trustworthy.

The core of a CRA protocol is the *measurement*, which provides information about the prover’s state at some *time*. The notion of time used by protocols is typically a real-time clock [14, 52, 60]




Fig. 1. Summary of roles and security properties in the CATT model. The prover(s) (yellow box) generate measurement(s) in response to request(s) from the initiator(s). Measurement(s) are verified by a range of mechanisms (green box) to generate result(s) that are sent to the relying party. We used dashed boxes to indicate that there are several design choices when selecting components that generate result(s) from measurement(s).

or a sequence number [12, 16, 29]. The measurement is sent by a prover in an *attestation report*, usually signed or alongside a MAC to authenticate the report. Attestation reports can be combined to create an *aggregated report*, and an aggregated report can be combined with other attestation or aggregated reports to create a more informative aggregated report. In the literature and also in this paper, the term *report* is overloaded to mean both a single attestation report and an aggregated report.

A CRA protocol depends on a (potentially abstract) list of *expected* states and a corresponding list of expected measurements, i.e., measurements that indicate the provers to be trustworthy. We say that a prover has a *healthy* (or uncompromised [22]) *status* at a particular time iff, the prover's state at that time is in the list of acceptable states for that prover at that time. Conversely, a prover has an *unhealthy* (or compromised [22]) *status* if the state is not an expected state. Depending on the CRA protocol, the prover might be considered by the relying party to be unhealthy if a response is not received in a timely manner [16, 22], be that due to the prover not completing the protocol, interference by an adversary, or other reasons. Other protocols distinguish between unhealthy and unresponsive [14]. The definition of the expected measurements varies between protocols and many CRA schemes keep it abstract, which we follow.

We assume that the attestation procedure is triggered by an *initiator* that signals provers to take their measurements for validation. There are a wide range of options for initiating attestation and the initiator and the provers are not always distinct devices (see §5.1 for details). Other common roles in CRA protocols may include a *verifier* (or sometimes group of verifiers) that performs attestation on behalf of the relying party; a *validator* (or sometimes group of validators) that checks whether the measurement generated by the provers are healthy; and an *aggregator* (or sometimes group of aggregators) that combines different reports into a single report to improve scalability.

As we shall see in §3.2, a CRA protocol may also use a trusted third party, which we refer to as a *delegated trusted party*, that may (but not always) include a verifier. An overview of the roles

is given in Fig. 1. This use of a delegated trusted party means that our systematisation for CRA protocols remains compatible with the roles assumed by RA protocols [26].

As highlighted in Fig. 1, CATT includes several security properties, split into two types. The first is an authentication property between initiators and provers, and the second describes security between the provers and the relying party.

3 DEVICE INTEGRITY

The purpose of the measurement in a CRA protocol is to provide evidence of the integrity of the prover’s software. Different CRA protocols differ in their *attestation targets* (see §3.1). We describe how trustworthiness of the verification (of the measurement) is achieved in terms of the CATT model in §3.2, and models of attacks and adversaries in §3.3. These considerations lead to different protocol designs which we summarise in Table 1.

Note 1 (Table 1). The following provides some additional notes on Table 1.

✗: The protocol does not use a delegated trusted party.

Provers*: In Poster and PADS, attestation includes a convergence phase where all provers obtain information about all other provers. The relying party can obtain the attestation result by querying *any* of the provers after convergence. In MVS-D2D the delegated trusted party is the initial prover.

Verifier†: These protocols additionally use edge verifiers. The edge verifiers are untrusted in SHeLA (and must be attested separately), but trusted in FeSA.

- (1): The validator is the Verifier in SeED but Self-L in SEDA, and it is not clear from the paper [52] who the validator is when the protocols are coupled.
- (2): ESDRA uses cluster heads chosen by a reputation mechanism to make decisions about provers. However, cluster heads’ reputation may change over time.
- (3): The validator in SHeLA is the same as the validator of the underlying RA protocol.

3.1 Attestation Target

A prover device is typically specified as a single entity in CRA protocols but, in most cases, it logically consists of two entities: a *trusted environment* (e.g., *Trusted Platform Module* (TPM)[21], *Trusted Execution Environment* (TEE) [82], TrustLite [57], SMART [43]), which serves as the *root of trust*, and an *untrusted environment* to be verified [91]. We give a summary of these environments for the reviewed protocols in the Appendix (Appendix A). Attestation code running inside the trusted environment is assumed to produce correct results except under the physical adversary threat model (§3.3). In the latter case, weaker, conditional trust assumptions are made, e.g., that the secure environment does not act arbitrarily or reveal secrets unless a physical adversary (see §3.3.4 for the definition of the adversary) takes the prover offline [51]. We discuss detection and mitigation measures against physical adversaries in §4.

The target of attestation is generally the memory in the untrusted environment. However, there is some variety on exactly what is measured in CRA protocols.

Program-memory (PM) attestation generates a measurement for the entire region in which the prover’s program (binary) instructions reside (e.g., DADS [93]). Some protocols generate the measurement by reading through the program memory locations in a randomised order (e.g., ATT-Auth [11] and SHOTS [25]).

Data-memory (DM) attestation aims to protect against compromise of the prover’s data memory at run-time (e.g., SADAN [7]).

Entire-memory (EM) attestation aims to protect against malicious code injection by measuring the entire memory including the data and program memory and free space. A protocol may first

Table 1. Summary of CRA protocol designs

Protocol	Year	Attestation Target (§3.1)	DTP (§3.2)	Validator (§3.2)	Interactivity (§5.1)	Attestation Set (§6.1)	QoSA (§6.4)
SEDA [22]	2015	PM	Verifier	Self-L	Interactive-T	All	Binary
DARPA [51]+SEDA [22]	2016	PM	Verifier	Self-L	Interactive-T	All	Binary
SANA [12]	2016	PM	Verifier	Self-V	Interactive-T	All	List
LISA-s [29]	2017	PM	Verifier	Self-L	Interactive-T	All	List
LISA- α [29]	2017	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	List
SeED [52]+SEDA [22]	2017	PM	Verifier	(1)	Noninteractive	All	Binary
SCAPI [58]	2017	PM	Verifier	Self-V	Interactive-T	All	Binary, List
ERASMUS [31]+LISA- α [29]	2018	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Noninteractive	All	List
ERASMUS+OD [30]+LISA- α [29]	2018	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	List
Poster [13]	2018	PM	Prover*	Self-LC	Noninteractive	All	List
PADS [14]	2018	PM	Prover*	Self-LC	Noninteractive	All	List
SALAD [59]	2018	PM	Verifier	Self-V	Interactive-T	Sample	List
WISE [17]	2018	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	Sample	List
slimIoT [18]	2018	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	List
US-AID [49]	2018	PM	✗	Neighbour	Interactive-U	All	List
ATT-Auth [11]	2018	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	Sample	Binary
MVS-D2D [92]	2018	PM	Prover*	Verifier	Interactive-U	All	List
MVS-Consensus [92]	2018	PM	✗	Verifier	Interactive-U	All	List
μ SEDA [75]	2018	PM	Verifier	Neighbour	Interactive-T	All	List
SAP [34]	2019	PM, DM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	Sample	Binary
MTRA [90]	2019	EM	Verifier	Self-L	Interactive-T	All	List
RADIS [33]	2019	PM, DM, SF	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	Binary
ESDRA [65]	2019	PM	(2)	Neighbour	Interactive-U	Sample	List
EAPA [95]	2019	PM	Verifier	Neighbour	Noninteractive	All	List
SHeLA [80]	2019	PM	Verifier [†]	(3)	Interactive-T	All	List
HEALED [50]	2019	PM	✗	Neighbour	Interactive-U	Sample	List
SADAN [7]+DIAT [6]	2019	DM, CF	✗	Jury	Interactive-U	Sample	List
SFS [94]	2019	PM	Verifier	Self-V	Interactive-T	All	List
PASTA [60]	2019	PM	✗	Neighbour	Interactive-U	All	List
DADS [93]	2019	PM	Verifier	Neighbour	Interactive-T	All	List
SIMPLE+ [16]	2020	PM	Verifier	Self-V	Interactive-T	All	List
CoRA [38]	2020	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	Binary, List
SARA [40]	2020	PM, SF	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	Sample	List
FADIA [72]	2021	PM	Verifier	Self-L	Noninteractive	All	Binary, Intermediate, List
BFB [45]	2021	PM	Verifier	Self-LC	Noninteractive	All	Binary
M2N [70]	2021	PM	✗	Neighbour	Interactive-U	All	List
SWARNA [67]	2022	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	List
SHOTS [25]	2022	PM	Verifier	Verifier	Interactive-T	All	List
HolA [91]	2022	PM	✗	Neighbour	Interactive-U	All	List
FeSA [63]	2022	PM	Verifier [†]	Verifier	Interactive-T	Sample	List
SCRAPS [79]	2022	PM, SF	✗	Proxy Verifier	Interactive-T	Sample	List

fill the free space with random values (unknown to the adversary) before taking a measurement. As with PM above, EM protocols may also attest a (possibly random) memory set of locations (e.g., MTRA [90]).

Control-flow (CF) attestation aims to protect the control-flow of instructions at run time, defending against tampering of the runtime stack or heap may be tampered with (e.g., causing the order of instructions that are executed to be modified), without changing the binaries. There are many control-flow protocols for RA [3, 36, 37, 66, 89], however, to the best of our knowledge, the only CRA in the category is SADAN [7], which is built on a data integrity RA, called DIAT [6].

Service-flow (SF) attestation aims to protect against adversaries that change the performed service, which is an expected functionality of a prover performed by an independent software. In this case, the attestation verifies the flow of data communicated between devices to assure that provers are not taking actions based on data from malicious services (e.g., RADIS [33], SARA [40]).

3.2 Trustworthiness of Verification

Devices executing a CRA protocol may take on more than one role. For example, a device may be both a prover and a verifier [13], both a prover and an aggregator [16], or both a verifier and an aggregator [80]. In many protocols, the role of the aggregator is implicitly included in the prover’s role [16]. This requires a careful consideration of the trust assumptions that are made in the CRA protocol.

Ultimately, unhealthy devices must be identifiable to a *relying party* [26]. Our trust assumptions are therefore made from the perspective of this relying party.

The relying party may assume a special entity to provide a trustworthy judgement on the healthiness of provers (see Table 1). In this paper, we refer to this entity as a *Delegated Trusted Party* (DTP). In RA protocols, the DTP is usually referred to as a *verifier*, which receives a measurement from the attestors (provers) and provides a result to the relying party [26]. Following this idea, the most common approach in CRA protocols is to designate a special *verifier* to perform the attestation (e.g., SEDA [22], SARA [40]). However, CRA protocols that use centralised verifiers may have a single point of failure, scale poorly or require maintenance of a specific network topology, which may not be possible in dynamic networks. Therefore, a variety of other mechanisms for building trustworthiness of verification have been developed.

A CRA verifier (when used) may store information about the swarm, such as the number of provers, shared and private keys with the provers, expected measurements, etc. As such, a CRA verifier is often assumed to be a more powerful computational device than the provers, with a greater range of capabilities [90]. Even when a verifier is used, the functionality assumed of a verifier is not fixed, and often differs from an RA verifier. For example, in SIMPLE+, a prover generates its own attestation results, and the verifier is only tasked with collecting these and reporting them to the relying party [16].

We therefore consider the task of *validating* a measurement to be separate from the verifier. As we shall see below (and in the *Validator* column of Table 1), judging the acceptability of a measurement may be carried out using a range of techniques, e.g., in Poster [13] and PADS [14] all provers share the attestation results of all other provers and converge to a decision about the entire swarm. After convergence, the relying party may query any of the provers to obtain the attestation result. SHeLA [80] and FeSA [63] use edge verifiers and ESDRA [65] uses cluster heads to split the swarm into sub-networks. FeSA [63] assumes that the edge verifiers are trusted, but SHeLA [80] and ESDRA [65] ensure trustworthiness by periodically attesting the edge verifiers [80] or using a reputation score over the cluster heads to determine whether they need to be attested [65].

Several protocols (e.g., [49, 50, 60, 92]) do not use a DTP, and instead assume that validation is carried out by a (group) of other provers, e.g., using a consensus protocol to build up trustworthiness of the result. In general, after a prover generates a measurement there are many options

for validating (i.e., verifying in RA terms [26]) whether it matches an expected one (i.e., a healthy status) and producing a trusted result. We classify these as follows.

Self protocols, where the measurement is validated by prover device itself. The prover therefore needs to know the expected measurements, and here there are two options: (1) *Self verifier* (Self-V) protocols, where a verifier sends the set of expected measurements to provers, and (2) *Self local* (Self-L) protocols where the expected measurements are stored locally within the prover itself. Both Self-L and Self-V protocols assume a trust anchor (see §4.1) within the provers themselves to ensure trustworthiness of the validation. When such a root of trust is not available, a CRA protocol may run a consensus algorithm to come to agreement about on the validation results. We categorised these as *Self-Local Consensus* (Self-LC) CRA protocols.

External protocols, where the provers send their measurements to a third party for validation. We classify these as follows: (1) *Verifier* protocols, where the measurements are validated by a centralised verifier, (2) *Neighbour* protocols, where the measurements are validated by the prover’s neighbouring provers, and (3) *Jury* protocols, where the measurements are validated by a jury of provers. The recently developed SCRAPS [79] protocol delegates validation to an untrusted *proxy verifier* implemented as a smart contract on a blockchain. The proxy verifier interacts with the (trusted) manufacturer smart contract to perform validation.

3.3 Threat Models

An adversary can interfere with inter-device communication and compromise any untrusted ones – being able to read their memory and modify their behaviour. In this section, we discuss possible attacks on CRA protocols, then present adversary models to capture different attacker capabilities.

3.3.1 Software Attacks. By exploiting software vulnerabilities, a remote attacker can read from or write to any unprotected memory regions on a device. As well as enabling the attacker to execute arbitrary code, the following are examples of attacks that may be performed on an attestation protocol if there are no hardware (such as SMART [43] or TrustLite [57]) or software restrictions (such as in SIMPLE+ [16]) in place to prevent it (i.e., if the attestation code is in the untrusted rather than trusted environment, §3.1).

- *Illegitimate results*, where an attacker may modify the measurement algorithm, which may result in the prover generating an incorrect attestation result [16, 43].
- *Forged results*, where an attacker may read the secret keys of a prover and forge a measurement for that prover [29, 43].
- *Pre-generated results*, where an attacker may trick a prover into generating measurements of the current (healthy) software state for future use by manipulating the prover’s clock. These measurements are then used as responses during an attack, when the true software state is unhealthy [52].

3.3.2 Physical Attacks. If a device is physically attacked, the attacker can modify attestation code or extract information such as secret keys, even if restrictions exist to protect these from software-based attacks. A physical attack can either be intrusive or non-intrusive. *Non-intrusive attacks* include fault injection or side-channel attacks to extract a device’s secret keys without interfering with its normal operation [5, 81, 87]. This generally requires the help of a physical tool (e.g., an oscilloscope or EM-receiver/demodulator) that is attached to the victim prover or installed in close proximity [51]. *Intrusive attacks* involve taking the target device offline for a non-negligible amount of time to extract information and/or modify a device’s software and/or hardware.

3.3.3 *Network Attacks*. Without compromising any provers, an attacker can exploit any vulnerabilities in a CRA protocol at the network level. For example, as described by Ibrahim et al. [52] this includes the following attacks.

- *Delay attacks*, where an attacker delays an attestation request to evade detection until the attacker’s goal is achieved.
- *Dropping attacks*, where an attacker drops every report that does not indicate a healthy status to prevent detection of compromised provers.
- *Record and replay attacks*, where an attacker records and drops healthy attestation results and later replays them to make an unhealthy prover appear healthy.

To avoid such attacks, a protocol can utilise nonces, counters, or timestamps stored in a secure memory [28]. In the case of timestamps, provers and verifiers must have synchronised clocks to provide them with attestation times.

3.3.4 *Adversary Models*. CRA adversary models have been inherited from RA adversary models, e.g., Abera et al. [4], and further discussed in the CRA context in [15, 28, 52]. The following adversary capabilities summarise the capabilities found in the CRA protocol literature and are written in the context of the trusted/untrusted environments described in §3.1. The mapping of the reviewed CRA protocols to these adversary models is shown in Table 2.

Software Adversary (Adv_{SW}), which can modify any memory in the untrusted environment. However, once it has done so, this adversary cannot restore the memory to the original (presumably expected) state.

Mobile Software Adversary (Adv_{MSW}), which inherits the abilities of Adv_{SW} , but *can* restore memory to its original state. Adv_{MSW} may use its abilities to try to avoid detection. E.g., if a piece of malware knows when a prover is going to perform attestation, it can erase itself to make the device appear healthy when attestation is performed.

Physical Non-Intrusive Adversary (Adv_{PNI}), which can read from but not write to *any* memory location on the target device, including memory in the trusted environment.

Physical Intrusive Adversary (Adv_{PI}), which can read from and write to *any* memory location on the targeted device, including memory in the trusted environment by taking a device offline for some amount of time.

Dolev-Yao Adversary [39] (Adv_{DY}), which is assumed to have full control over the communication network. It can eavesdrop on, modify, delay, drop and inject messages.

4 PROTECTION AND MITIGATION

In this section, we identify how CRA protocols mitigate software threats using their underlying minimal secure hardware (see §4.1) and consider scenarios where the secure hardware itself is physically attacked, and present a systematisation of techniques found in the literature to mitigate or detect such attacks (see §4.2). Finally we discuss DoS attack mitigation (see §4.3).

4.1 Defending Against Software Attacks

As discussed in §3.1, CRA protocols assume that provers are also equipped with a *root of trust* [49, 50, 79, 91] to protect against software attacks. CRA protocols are designed in three different ways, based on assumptions on the underlying architecture of the root of trust of the provers: software, hardware, or hybrid. Software-based protocols (e.g., [62, 69, 83–86]) do not have any specific hardware requirements; thus they are cheap, however, they rely on strong assumptions that may be hard to achieve. These assumptions themselves are the root of trust for software protocols.

Hardware-based protocols (e.g., [46, 61, 73]) rely on a secure hardware such as TPM [21] or *Physically Unclonable Functions* (PUFs) [48] where attestation code is executed in a secure environment. Such hardware components play the role of the root of trust but may be too complex and expensive for medium- and low-end devices.

Almost all CRA protocols are implemented on hybrid RA architectures, e.g., SANA [12] is implemented on SMART [43] and TyTAN [27], EAPA [95] on TrustLite [57], and FeSA [63] on HYDRA [42]. Hybrid architectures combine software and a minimal amount of hardware to create a root-of-trust [44]. This hardware may include a *Read-Only Memory* (ROM) to prevent modification of attestation code and a *Memory Protection Unit* (MPU) [24] to guarantee non-interruptability (aka atomicity) of the attestation procedure as well as privileged access to secret keys, session ids, nonces, counters, time stamps, and clocks. For example:

- SeED [52] assumes hardware-protected *Reliable Read-Only Clocks* (RROCs) that are (loosely) synchronised within devices running the CRA protocol. Without an RROC, Adv_{SW} may manipulate the clock and pre-generate healthy attestation results for future use when the prover is actually unhealthy.
- ERASMUS+LISA- α [29, 31] and SeED [52] assume hardware-protected *Pseudo Random Number Generators* (PRNGs) that are initialised with a secret seed and used to generate attestation times. Without these, an Adv_{MSW} that knows the time interval between attestation rounds may be able to hide by deleting itself prior to measurements being taken. The PRNG and secret seed are used to perform attestation at random time intervals that cannot be predicted by Adv_{MSW} .

Ammar et al. [16], propose a design that deviates from the above classification. They implement a root of trust using a formally verified software-based memory isolation hypervisor ($S\mu V$) to implement a root of trust that claims to provide the same guarantees as traditional architectures, without specific hardware requirements.

4.2 Defending Against Physical Attacks

A physical attack allows an attacker to bypass a device’s hardware restrictions to gain access to any secrets stored on a device. These secrets can be used to impersonate the captured device, or malware on the device can perform arbitrary operations using the secrets.

A CRA protocol with no protection against physical attacks may leave the entire swarm vulnerable if just one prover is physically compromised. An example is SIMPLE+ [16] where two symmetric keys are shared by all provers and a verifier. The physical compromise of any prover gives the adversary access to both keys, with which it can impersonate the entire swarm and send the verifier seemingly legitimate reports as the verifier cannot tell whether this has occurred.

Few CRA protocols consider a *non-intrusive* physical adversary rather than a *intrusive* physical adversary.¹ Although devices spread over a large area are difficult to monitor, non-intrusive attacks require physical tools to be attached to the victim device, making them difficult to perform. Several protocols do provide mitigation and detection against *intrusive* physical adversaries (e.g., SCAPI [58]). We discuss existing mitigation and detection approaches next and show the mapping of the reviewed CRA protocols to their protection strategies in the middle column of Table 2. It is worth noting that in dynamic wireless environments with a deployed swarm of devices, e.g., environmental sensors in remote unmonitored areas, an adversary could tamper with some devices. However, the details of hardware tamper resistance [8, 55], industry certification practices (e.g., Common Criteria [1]), and open source designs (e.g., OpenTitan [2]) are outside of the scope of this paper.

¹SALAD [59] is an exception, which considers side-channel attacks.

4.2.1 Physical Attack Mitigation. The minimal defence against physical intrusive attacks is to prevent the compromise of one device from affecting the security of other devices. For example, SANA [12] gives each prover its own asymmetric key to sign its report with. If a prover is physically compromised, giving its key to an adversary, the adversary can impersonate the compromised prover, but not the provers it has not physically compromised because they use different secrets. Mitigation techniques make it difficult for adversaries to forge reports for compromised devices, enhance security against invasive physical attack on conventional memories, or prevent attackers from decrypting previous messages.

Mitigation via unique keys (M-UK). SALAD [59] authenticates each device’s attestation report with a unique key. This protocol mitigates physical attacks by executing code inside devices’ TEEs and authenticating reports with unique attestation keys, making it difficult for adversaries to forge reports of compromised devices.

Mitigation via PUFs (M-PUF). Physically Unclonable Functions (PUFs) are functions embedded into circuits, producing different outputs in each device. They can be used to generate secrets, eliminating the need to store secrets in memory. The authors of SHOTS [25] and ATT-Auth [11] claim this makes their schemes resistant to physical attacks; however, their physical adversary can only read from and not write to memory, unlike ours (in §3.3.4). As each PUF is unique, this mitigation inherits the properties of M-UK.

4.2.2 Physical Attack Detection. A stronger defence against physical intrusive attacks is to detect them. CRA protocols use different techniques to detect physical attacks under the assumption that performing such an attack requires the victim device to be taken offline for a non-negligible amount of time [18, 49, 51, 58, 72, 91, 95], which we refer to in this paper using δ_{PI} . These techniques broadly fall in to three categories: frequent heartbeats; frequent secret updates; and frequent attestation².

Heartbeat protocol (D-HB). A heartbeat protocol frequently checks that provers are online. If a prover is not reached for more than δ_{PI} , that prover is considered physically compromised. A heartbeat protocol may be standalone (e.g., DARPA [51]) or it may be incorporated into a CRA protocol (e.g., HoLA [91], US-AID [49]).

Secret updates (D-SU). A CRA protocol can frequently update the secrets required to participate in attestation (e.g., keys in SCAPI [58]). If a prover fails to receive the updated secret (e.g., due to being offline), it can no longer participate in the protocol and be successfully attested.

Attestation (D-ATT). If δ_{PI} is large enough, and the attestation time short enough, it is feasible to simply ensure that provers attest themselves more frequently than δ_{PI} . If a prover fails to attest itself, it may be presumed to be physically compromised.

HoLA [91] uses a combination of D-HB and D-ATT, and assumes that the attestation protocol is executed significantly more frequently than δ_{PI} . If a device fails to participate in the attestation protocol, a heartbeat protocol begins until the device either responds, or is missing for $\geq \delta_{PI}$. slimIoT [18] uses a combination of D-ATT and D-SU. Attestation is performed frequently but the attestation procedure also updates a secret. This both detects the absent device by attestation and prevents the captured device from participating in future rounds of the protocol.

4.3 Defending Against DoS Attacks

Denial of Service (DoS) is a threat to all networked devices. It is not within the capability of a CRA protocol to prevent all DoS attacks, however CRA protocols should (and do) consider application layer DoS attack vectors introduced by the CRA protocol itself (e.g., LISA [29], SeED [52]).

²By frequently, we mean at least every δ_{PI} .

Because provers in CRA protocols are envisioned as low-power devices, performing attestation is an expensive (and blocking) task for provers. If an adversary can induce provers to attest more often than the protocol intends, they can easily perform a DoS attack on the swarm, preventing devices from performing their intended function. In the next section, we will explore two ways of preventing such an attack, namely, designation of *Non-interactive* CRA protocols and the *Initiator Authentication* security property.

5 INTERACTIVITY AND INITIATOR AUTHENTICATION

We now turn to *initiator authentication*, the first security property described in Fig. 1. It ensures that provers only perform attestation if legitimate initiator(s) kick-start the attestation process. As provers are assumed to be low-power devices, attestation is an expensive (and blocking) task for them and generally cannot be interleaved with other tasks. An adversary that induces provers to attest more often than planned or attest at inopportune times can disrupt the services these devices are expected to provide. Whether initiator authentication is an appropriate mechanism to prevent such an attack depends on the CRA protocol’s design. We therefore first discuss the notion of *interactivity* (§5.1) before defining initiator authentication (§5.2).

5.1 Interactivity

Attestation procedures may be initiated in several ways. The categories below are inspired by Ambrosin et al. [15], who distinguish between interactive and non-interactive CRA protocols. Unlike Ambrosin et al. [15], who only consider protocols with a *trusted* initiator, we additionally consider protocols that may be initiated by an *untrusted* device to better understand how protocols ensure the legitimacy of attestation requests (summarised in Table 1).

In *Interactive* (aka on-demand) protocols provers perform attestation after receiving a specific attestation request message. We distinguish two subtypes: (i) *interactive trusted*, denoted **Interactive-T**, where requests originate from trusted devices and (ii) *interactive untrusted*, denoted **Interactive-U**, where requests may originate from *untrusted* devices.

In *non-interactive* protocols provers decide for themselves when to perform attestation, e.g., by using a secure clock to trigger attestation at set points in time.

In Interactive-T protocols, attestation requests are by definition assumed to be legitimate. However, in Interactive-U protocols, the initiator may be a compromised neighbouring prover device. A mechanism to ensure in this case that the attestation is only initiated when desired, is to protect the initiation code within the initiating prover’s trusted environment (e.g., US-AID [49]). Interactive-U protocols also use other techniques to counter illegitimate attestation requests. ESDRA [65] and M2N [70] use a reputation mechanism to choose cluster heads and only provers with a high enough reputation score may initiate the attestation. In PASTA [60], the initiator sends attestation requests after a timeout, but only after verifying that its software state is trustworthy. Moreover, attestation requests are only sent to prover devices that were known to be healthy in the previous attestation round. In SADAN [7], a device may *blame* other devices and request a jury to attest them. However, any prover that blames a healthy device will itself be blamed by the jury of the current round and hence attested in the next round.

Interactive CRA protocols may be used in settings where initiators make decisions based on some event, e.g., when an intrusion detection system shows that a prover is suspected of being compromised [9, 10], or when a monitoring mechanism requests attestation in response to demand [30]. Non-interactive protocols reduce the communication overhead of attestation requests (and hence energy costs and run-time). They also mitigate computational DoS attacks, as there is no attestation request that originates from the initiator (e.g., SeED+SEDA [22, 52]). The frequency

of an initiator’s requests can also be decoupled from the frequency of a prover’s measurements allowing for the implementation of a simple collection phase on the provers (e.g., ERASMUS [31]).

5.2 Initiator Authentication

To prevent an adversary from exploiting the initiation mechanism, it is necessary that provers only perform attestation in response to legitimate requests. We define *initiator authentication* based on Lowe’s injective agreement [71] to ensure a prover only accepts requests genuinely from the initiator (as defined in §2), and each unique request no more than once.

Definition 1 (Initiator Authentication (*IA*)). A CRA protocol guarantees *IA* to a prover p iff, whenever p completes a run of the protocol, apparently having received an attestation request from an initiator i , then i has previously been running the protocol, sending an attestation request to p . Furthermore, each run of the protocol by p corresponds to a unique attestation request sent by i .

On its own, *IA* only prevents replay attacks. To prevent the above DoS attack, where the adversary replays attestation requests, the initiator i must be honest. If i is dishonest, it can spam a prover with legitimate attestation requests, causing a DoS attack without violating *IA*. In practice, this assumption may take the form of requests coming from a trusted third party (e.g., such as in SEDA [22], SIMPLE+ [16], SANA [12], LISA [29]), or some secure attestation trigger on the attested device (e.g., such as in SeED [52], PADS [14]).

To prevent legitimate attestation requests from being replayed, a CRA protocol may employ standard techniques such as counters (e.g., SALAD [59]), timestamps (e.g., SANA [12]), or nonces (e.g., SCRAPS [79]).

Non-interactive protocols assume the existence of secure hardware on the device to initiate attestation, such as SeED’s timeout circuit and non-maskable interrupt [52]. Abstractly, in our model (Fig. 1), this device could be considered both an Initiator and a Prover, but there is no actual request message sent. As there is no message to forge, we assume *IA* cannot be violated in non-interactive protocols. Ensuring the security of the attestation trigger (abstractly, the honesty of the initiator) is a hardware/software level problem, not a protocol level one.

6 ATTESTATION CORRECTNESS

We now present different techniques used by CRA protocols to select the provers to be attested (§6.1). Then, we present our eight security properties (Def. 6 and Def. 7) that address attestation correctness between the provers and the relying party (see Fig. 1). Our definitions are hierarchical and first consider the correct status of an individual prover at particular point in time (§6.2). Then we consider synchronisation aspects, which yields two further definitions that reflect *when* a collection of provers has a particular status (§6.3). These are then combined with the notion of *Quality of Swarm Attestation* (QoSA) [29] to give rise to two distinct sets properties depending on whether the CRA procedure can determine the status of an individual prover or a group of provers as a whole (§6.4).

Although the QoSA dimension has been extensively discussed in prior works, our contribution is to define status correctness and synchronicity, which lack formal definitions in the literature.

Note 2 (Table 2). The following provides some additional notes on Table 2.

- ✓: adversary model applies
- ✓: aims to hold
- ✗: does not aim to hold
- : the property is not inferable from the paper
- NI: non-interactive protocol thus *IA* is not applicable

Table 2. Summary of adversary models, physical protection and aimed security properties

Protocol Name	Adversary Model (§3.3)					Physical Protection (§4)	IA (§5)	Individual/Group Attestation (§6)	Sync/ASync Attestation (§6)	Weak/Strong Attestation (§6)
	Adv_{SW}	Adv_{MSW}	Adv_{PNI}	Adv_{PI}	Adv_{DY}					
SEDA [22]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Group	Async	Weak
DARPA [51]+SEDA [22]	✓				✓	$D-HB$	✓	Group	Async	Weak
SANA [12]	✓			✓	✓	$M-UK$	✓	Individual (*)	Async (*)	Strong (*)
LISA-s [29]	✓					✗	✓	Individual	Async (1)	Strong
LISA- α [29]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
SeED [52]+SEDA [22]		✓			✓	✗	NI	Group	Async	Weak
SCAPI [58]	✓			✓	✓	$D-SU$	✓	Individual/Group	Async	Weak
ERASMUS [31]+					✓	✗	NI	Individual	Async	Strong
LISA- α [29]	✓	✓								
ERASMUS+OD [30]	✓	✓			✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
+ LISA- α [29]										
Poster [13]	✓					✗	NI	Individual	Sync	Strong
PADS [14]	✓	✓			✓	✗	NI	Individual	Sync	Strong
SALAD [59]	✓			✓	✓	$M-UK$	✓	Individual (*)	Async (*)	Weak (*)
WISE [17]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
slimIoT [18]	✓			✓	✓	$D-SU + D-ATT$ (†)	✓	Individual	Async	Weak
US-AID [49]	✓			✓	✓	$D-HB$	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
ATT-Auth [11]			✓		✓	$M-PUF$	(✗)	Group	Async	Strong
MVS [92]	✓						–	Individual (2)	Async (2)	Strong (2)
μ SEDA [75]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
SAP [34]	✓					✗	(✗)	Group	Sync	Weak
MTRA [90]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Weak
RADIS [33]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Group (3)	Async (3)	Weak (3)
ESDRA [65]	✓				✓	✗	(✗)	Individual	Async	Weak (4)
EAPA [95]	✓			✓		$D-HB$	NI	Individual	Async	Strong (5)
SheLA [80]	✓				✓	✗	–	Individual	Async	Weak
HEALED [50]	✓				✓	✗	(✗)	Individual	Async	Strong
SADAN [7]	✓				✓	✗	–	Individual	Async	Strong (6)
SFS [94]	✓			✓	✓	$M-UK$ (§)	✓	Individual (*)	Async (*)	Strong (*)
PASTA [60]	✓			✓		$D-ATT$	✓	Individual	Sync	Weak
DADS [93]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
SIMPLE+ [16]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Weak
CoRA [38]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual/Group	Async	Weak
SARA [40]	✓	✓				✗	✓	Individual (7)	Async (7)	Strong (7)
FADIA [72]	✓			✓	✓	$D-ATT$	NI	Individual/Group	–	Strong
BFB [45]	✓	✓				✗	NI	Group	Async	Weak
M2N [70]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
SWARNA-agg [67]	✓					✗	✓	Individual	–	Strong
SHOTS [25]	✓		✓		✓	$M-PUF$	✓	Individual (*)	Sync (*)	Strong (*)
Hola [91]	✓			✓	✓	$D-ATT + D-HB$ (†)	✓	Individual	Async	Strong
FeSA [63]	✓	✓			✓	✗	NI	Individual	Async	Weak
SCRAPS [79]	✓				✓	✗	✓	Individual	Async	Strong

(*): These properties are not guaranteed but it is likely to be achieved.

(†): As described in §4.2.2.

(§): SFS [94] additionally uses a puncturable forward-secure signature scheme to prevent an attacker from forging signatures from previous attestation rounds.

(✗): These properties are conditional. Although ATT-Auth claims “mutual authentication between a prover and the verifier” as a security objective, it does not prevent replay attacks because it does not use any known countermeasure (e.g., nonce or timestamp). SAP acknowledges that it does not handle replay attacks (but gives suggestions of how to change the protocol). ESDRA and HEALED use nonces but only to prevent replay attacks on the response, not the challenge.

(1): LISA’s definition of synchronicity, which is different from ours, means each device waits for all of its children’s attestation responses before submitting its own.

(2): For MVS (consensus), we may adapt our definition for attestation property so that a group of untrusted verifiers collaborate to attest the swarm.

- (3): For RADIS, we adapt the attestation definitions so that the verifier attests a set of services as a group. We infer from the paper that services are asynchronous and if a prover does not respond, the corresponding service is marked as unhealthy, since it does not match to unexpected healthy one.
- (4): ESDRA uses some probabilistic parameters to increase the fault tolerance against false positive reports, yet it does not claim that it prevents them all.
- (5): In EAPA, the verifier accepts the absence message of healthy devices and deletes the suspicious devices in absence message from the swarm topology.
- (6): For SADAN, we may adapt our definition for attestation property so that the verifier will be a random jury of untrusted devices.
- (7): SARA's attestation target is service flow plus program memory. We may adapt our attestation definitions like the way we do for RADIS.

6.1 Attestation Set

When initiating the attestation procedure, there are several options for selecting the *attestation set*, i.e., the set of provers to be attested. Ideally, one would only attest provers when strictly necessary since attestation itself prevents the prover devices from performing useful work. Attestation may have significant performance implications in resource-constrained devices and settings where the prover devices execute time-sensitive operations.

Most of the CRA protocols studied in this paper attest *all* of the provers. However, to improve scalability, the set of all provers may be partitioned into different classes [18], e.g., based on geographical locations in static networks, common tasks among devices, network traffic distribution, etc.

Some protocols only attest a *sample* of provers, using various techniques to select the attestation set. One option is to simply pick a random subset of provers, e.g., as in ATT-Auth [11] and HEALED [50]. More sophisticated CRA designs such as WISE [17] use AI-based classification techniques over features such as the maximum amount of time between attestation requests and prover features such as its geographical location and underlying hardware. In ESDRA [65], cluster heads assign and update reputation scores on the provers. The protocol attests provers when their reputation drops below a certain threshold. In SADAN [7] each prover monitors other provers in the network and triggers attestation on any prover that it finds suspicious. WISE [17] provides probabilistic guarantees about the healthiness of all provers in the network even after sampling a subset of provers, where the history of previous attestation periods and device characteristics are used to select the attestation set.

In the remainder of this section, we define attestation properties between the prover(s) selected for attestation (irrespective of the selection strategy) and the relying party.

6.2 Status Correctness

A CRA protocol must maintain a list of states that are considered acceptable for each prover. This list may be updated over time, e.g., to reflect new software versions.

If a prover's state at some time is in the list of acceptable states for that prover at that time, then the prover has a *valid state* at that time and is considered *healthy*. If not, the prover is *unhealthy*. The condition of being healthy or unhealthy is the prover's *status*.

In some protocols, each status (i.e., Healthy or Unhealthy) observed by the relying party must match the actual state of the associated prover. Other protocols only require this for the Healthy case, allowing false-positive results. This gives rise to a weak and a strong version of status correctness.

Definition 2 (Weak Status Correctness). We say that s is a weakly correct status for prover p at time t iff, whenever $s = \text{Healthy}$, p had a valid state at t .

Definition 3 (Strong Status Correctness). We say that s is a strongly correct status for a prover p at time t iff, (1) it is a weakly correct status for p at t , and (2) whenever $s = \text{Unhealthy}$, p did *not* have a valid state at t .

6.3 Synchronicity

(A)synchronicity enables the categorisation of CRA protocols based on their ability to compute provers' measurements at different or the same time in an interval. The execution of CRA protocols proceeds over a period of time often between devices with no real-time clocks [12, 16, 22, 40], or only loosely synchronised ones [18, 49, 60]. This means that we need to be able to determine the correctness of a set of provers depending on when the results from the provers are collected. A verifier typically knows the result was produced within a known time interval T but it does not know at exactly what time the result was generated.

Definition 4 (Asynchronous Weak/Strong Correctness). The statuses for a set of provers P are asynchronously weakly/strongly correct in T iff, for all $p \in P$ there is some time $t \in T$ where the decided status of p is weakly/strongly correct for p at t .

According to this definition, the state of each prover in P can be measured at a different time in T – there is no guarantee that all provers are ever simultaneously healthy, even if the decided statuses of all provers in P are Healthy. If malware were to hop between devices during T it would be possible for every prover in the swarm to be correctly viewed as Healthy in T , even though at no single time in T is every prover in P Healthy [35].

The stronger *synchronous* correctness property avoids this limitation, requiring all statuses to be correct at a single time $t \in T$.

Definition 5 (Synchronous (Weak/Strong) Correctness). The statuses for a set of provers P are synchronously weakly/strongly correct in T iff, there is some time $t \in T$ such that for all $p \in P$ the status of p is weakly/strongly correct for p at t .

6.4 Attestation properties

Information about the provers' software states may be collected in several ways. Carpent et al. [29] define the notion of a *Quality of Swarm Attestation (QoSA)*, which describes how much information a relying party is able to retrieve from a report it receives (see Table 1). QoSA can be used to distinguish protocols as follows³.

Binary QoSA (B-QoSA) protocols, where the report only allows the relying party to distinguish between two states: all provers are healthy, or some prover is unhealthy.

List QoSA (L-QoSA) protocols, where report only allows the relying party to identify the healthy or unhealthy provers, or both.

Intermediate QoSA (I-QoSA) protocols, which lie between B-QoSA and L-QoSA. Here the provers are partitioned into sets of provers, and the report allows the relying party to identify the healthy sets without distinguishing the individual provers within the set.

As summarised in Table 1, the majority of CRA protocols are L-QoSA, since in most applications, it is necessary to precisely locate unhealthy provers to take further action, e.g., restoring healthy code [50] or disconnecting them from their neighbouring provers [49]. Furthermore, some CRA

³Carpent et al. [29] also define the notion of a *Full QoSA*, where a report identifies a list of attested devices along with their connectivity, i.e., swarm topology. However, as far as we are aware, there is no CRA protocol that implements Full QoSA.

protocols may have more than one QoSAs, e.g., CoRA [38] is initially a Binary protocol and if the result of the attestation is 1, it concludes that the entire swarm is healthy, otherwise, the protocol concludes that at least one device is unhealthy and proceeds to the detection phase where CoRA is List-QoSAs. In SCAP [58], the QoSAs metric is a parameter of the protocol, referred to as *attestation type*, whose value can be either Binary or List, and the relying party decides on the value of this parameter. FADIA takes a parameter for how many measurements should be aggregated. This number can be 0 (L-QoSAs), greater than the number of provers being attested (B-QoSAs), or an intermediate value (I-QoSAs).

QoSAs gives rise to two different ways for performing CRA: the protocol can deliver to the relying party the status of each prover in the swarm *individually*; or the relying party can be given one or more statuses, each representing the trustworthiness of a *group* of provers. We define security properties for each type of assessment. In these definitions we use the term *run*, which is a single execution of a protocol role by a device.

6.4.1 Individual Attestation. Individual Attestation is the simplest form of CRA, where the relying party receives one status per prover. This corresponds to L-QoSAs.

Definition 6 (Individual (A)Sync. Weak/Strong Att.). A protocol ensures Individual (A)Synchronous Weak/Strong Attestation to a relying party for a set of provers P during a time interval T iff, whenever the relying party completes a run of the protocol believing that each $p_i \in P$ has some status s_i during the time interval T , then the statuses for P are (a)synchronously weakly/strongly correct in T .

While in many protocols P is decided when attestation is initiated (corresponding to the attestation set in §6.1), our property is flexible and only requires it to be fixed at the end of the protocol run, when the claim is made. In PADS [14] for example, allows some provers in the attestation set to have an "unknown" status. In this case, P will contain only the provers that are reported to be healthy or unhealthy.

6.4.2 Group Attestation. In B-QoSAs and I-QoSAs protocols, a set of provers can have a *group status* – a single healthy/unhealthy value assigned to a set of provers as a group, based on the state of each prover in that set.

Definition 7 (Group (A)Sync. Weak/Strong Att.). Let $G_1, \dots, G_n \subseteq P$ for $n \geq 1$ be one or more sets of provers. Suppose a relying party completes a run of a protocol obtaining, for a time interval T , the statuses s_1, \dots, s_n for the sets of provers G_1, \dots, G_n , respectively. Then the protocol guarantees

- *weak asynchronous group attestation* iff, for all group statuses s_i , if $s_i = \text{Healthy}$ then for all $p \in G_i$ there is a time t in T where p had a valid state at t ,
- *weak synchronous group attestation* iff there is a time $t \in T$ such that, for all group statuses s_i , if $s_i = \text{Healthy}$ then for all $p \in G_i$, p had a valid state at t ,
- *strong (a)synchronous group attestation* iff (1) it guarantees weak (a)synchronous group attestation and (2), for all group statuses s_i , if $s_i = \text{Unhealthy}$ then at some time t in T , at least one $p \in G_i$ had an invalid state.

Existing CRA protocols predominantly define a group to be unhealthy if one or more provers in that group have an invalid state and our property follows this. The one exception among the CRAs included in this paper is BFB [45], which allows more than one prover (up to some threshold) to have an invalid state, but still for the group to be considered healthy. Def. 7 can be relaxed to allow one or more provers not to be in a valid state for all times in T . We assume this modified version of Def. 7 in Table 2. We also note that for B-QoSAs protocols it is possible to simplify this property as there is only one group $G_1 = P$.

7 EXAMPLES AND VALIDATION

In §7.1, we present particular CRA protocols that exemplify the security properties that we proposed in §5 and §6 and map to these protocols in Table 2. In §7.3 we focus on one of the examples, SIMPLE+ [16], and validate the implementability of our security properties in a formal analysis of SIMPLE+ with respect to the properties.

7.1 Security Properties Examples

In the following descriptions (and in Table 2), we say that the considered CRA protocols *aim to satisfy* (rather than satisfy) our security properties for two reasons. First, while our properties are derived from the reviewed protocols' security goals, except for SIMPLE+, we have no proof that a considered protocol's claimed security property implies our security property. Second, most of the reviewed CRA protocols use proof sketches or informal reasoning to justify their security claims. Note that the attestation properties stated in Defs. 6 and 7 encompass eight types of attestation correctness properties. However, we offer a concrete CRA example for only six of them because none of the protocols we study address Group Asynchronous Strong or Group Synchronous Strong attestation.

Initiator Authentication (IA). CoRA [38] aims to satisfy *IA* under Adv_{SW} and Adv_{DY} by using an algebraic message authentication code scheme with a counter on each device, which is incremented by the verifier and each prover after each attestation procedure. The counters are stored in the trusted environment of all devices and are used to monitor the attestation sequence number, preventing replay attacks.

Individual Asynchronous Weak Attestation (IAW).

SIMPLE+ [16] aims to satisfy *IAW* under Adv_{SW} and Adv_{DY} . Here, all devices have shared attestation and authentication keys secured within their Trusted Computing Module (TCM), isolated by a $S\mu V$. The TCM also safeguards attestation code and a counter for report freshness. Provers calculate measurements asynchronously using the attestation key and generate reports, which include the counter and are signed with the authentication key. These reports consist of 1-bit binary values, and the final aggregated report comprises n -bit values. A '1' in the i -th bit indicates a healthy status for i -th prover, while '0' denotes unhealthiness. Thus, the verifier can determine the status of the individual provers contributing to the report. Unresponsive provers are considered to be unhealthy.

Individual Asynchronous Strong Attestation (IAS).

US-AID [49] aims to satisfy *IAS* under Adv_{SW} , Adv_{DY} and Adv_{PI} . It operates without a trusted centralised verifier, relies on network owner providing devices with attestation details, and secures protection through SMART [43] or TrustLite [57] architectures. US-AID detects absence using DARPA's heartbeat protocol, with neighbouring devices mutually authenticating through encrypted messages and checking each other's measurements asynchronously. Successful attestations result in reports stored in separate lists for healthy and unhealthy devices.

Individual Synchronous Weak Attestation (ISW). PASTA [60], already explained in §4.2, aims to satisfy *ISW* under Adv_{SW} , Adv_{DY} and Adv_{PI} .

Individual Synchronous Strong Attestation (ISS). PADS [14] aims to satisfy *ISS* under Adv_{SW} , Adv_{MSW} , and Adv_{DY} . Here, each prover performs a local attestation through its internal TEE. Periodically, each prover shares its observations representing the statuses of provers in the swarm. Other provers receiving these messages verify their authenticity, check their validity within a specified time interval, and use a consensus algorithm to share their knowledge with the swarm. Each prover keeps track of responsive unhealthy, responsive healthy, and unresponsive provers. Over

```

All V P0 P1 att0 att1 cntr #att_end .
Attestation_Complete_I(V, P0, P1, att0, att1, cntr) @
#att_end ==> Ex #att_start . (
  Attestation_Start(V, P0, P1, cntr) @ #att_start
  & (att0=healthy ==> IsHealthy(P0, #att_start))
  & (att0=unhealthy ==> IsNotHealthy(P0, #att_end))//Strong
  & (att1=healthy ==> IsHealthy(P1, #att_start))
  & (att1=unhealthy ==> IsNotHealthy(P1, #att_end))//Strong
)

```

Fig. 2. Lemma for IAS. The Lemma for IAW is obtained by omitting the cases (marked //Strong)

time, the view of every prover converges to the true state of the swarm, allowing a verifier to query a final report from any of them.

Group Asynchronous Weak Attestation (GAW). SEDA [22] aims to satisfy GAW under Adv_{SW} and Adv_{DY} . It employs a spanning tree topology where parent devices have separate shared keys with their child devices. Attestation results are generated asynchronously. When a parent attests its children, each child sends a report signed with the shared key stored in its ROM, protected by an MPU. The final aggregated report includes information about the number of successfully attested provers and the total number of provers attested in the subtree rooted at the initial prover. A verifier, aware of the total number of provers (s), checks if these two are equal to $s - 1$ and if the status of the initial prover is healthy. If these conditions are met, the verifier determines the overall group health status as healthy, unhealthy otherwise. Unresponsive provers are assumed to be unhealthy in this protocol.

Group Synchronous Weak Attestation (GSW). SAP [34] aims to satisfy GSW under Adv_{SW} . It employs a balanced binary tree topology where the root is the verifier. Attestation requests propagate through the tree, and secure clocks on devices ensure proper verification timing. Each device, upon receiving the request, performs attestation and sends the result to its parent. The parent combines the received results with its own attestation result and forwards an aggregated report to its parent. Eventually, the verifier receives the final report and validates it. The binary value in the report indicates whether the entire swarm is trustworthy (all provers are healthy) or not (one or more provers are unhealthy or unresponsive).

7.2 Encoding of Properties

We encode our security properties: IAS, IAW, GAS and GAW, as generic TAMARIN lemmas that are independent of any particular protocol. The TAMARIN lemma encoding IAS and IAW is shown in Fig. 2, while the Group Asynchronous Attestation lemmas can be found in Fig. 3.

In the Adv_{SW} adversary model, once a prover becomes unhealthy, it can never become healthy again. Therefore, if a prover is healthy at any time in an interval, it must be healthy at the start of the interval. Conversely, if a prover is unhealthy at any time in an interval, it must be unhealthy at the end of the interval. We exploit this to limit the possible values of t to $\#att_start$ or $\#att_end$, depending on whether the observed status is *healthy* or *unhealthy*, respectively. $\#att_start$ is tied to when the verifier first sends an attest request message for a round (each round is uniquely identified by a monotonically increasing counter $cntr$), while $\#att_end$ denotes the verifier V completing the attestation protocol and deciding on the status of the provers ($P0$ and $P1$). $IsNotHealthy$ and $IsHealthy$ are predicates that check whether the state of the prover has been modified.

7.3 Verification of SIMPLE+

We analyse the SIMPLE+ protocol using the lemmas encoded in §7.2, showing that SIMPLE+ satisfies Individual Weak Asynchronous Attestation and Group Weak Asynchronous Attestation, but fails to satisfy the Strong variants of these properties under the Adv_{SW} and Adv_{DY} adversary models.⁴ We build on Le-Papin et al.’s [68] symbolic protocol analysis of SIMPLE+ using TAMARIN [74], which was the first symbolic analysis of a CRA protocol. In particular, we reuse Le-Papin et al.’s TAMARIN model of SIMPLE+, implement our security properties within this model, then verify them automatically. Like Le-Papin et al., our analysis considers a scenario comprising two provers and up to two rounds. This extension shows that our properties can be used in the formal analysis of CRA protocols. A more detailed description of Le-Papin et al.’s model, can be found in Appendix C.

8 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

The CATT framework proposed in this paper offers protocol designers guidance on tailoring CRA protocols to specific needs. For instance, if the goal is to minimise false positive attestation results, designers should opt for a CRA ensuring *strong status correctness*. Similarly, if the aim is to reduce complexity by exchanging shorter attestation messages, a CRA evaluating the status of a *group* of provers collectively is preferable. Additionally, in scenarios where adversaries may evade detection by moving between provers, a promising choice is a CRA guaranteeing a *synchronous* security property, showcasing the practical applications and benefits of CATT’s unified approach.

Examining Table 2, we find that the majority of CRA protocols ensure Individual Asynchronous Weak Attestation. Three primary reasons contribute to this trend. (1) CRA designers prefer to enable relying parties to take additional steps, such as healing or disconnecting unhealthy provers from the rest of the swarm, necessitating individual detection [50]. (2) Achieving synchronicity is challenging, especially in dynamic environments. While it is great in theory, it is difficult to achieve in practice as it requires strong clock synchronisation (such as in SAP [34]) or dedicated hardware (such as in RATA [35]). As shown in Table 2, almost all CRA protocols only aim for asynchronous correctness. (3) The primary concern for relying parties is ensuring that if an attestation report indicates a prover’s health at a specific point, the prover was genuinely healthy at that time, and the concern is not avoiding false positives—if an attestation report indicates a prover is unhealthy, but the prover was genuinely healthy at that time.

By developing our CATT framework we identify several possible research challenges. We split these into three main themes.

Protocol robustness. The security properties proposed in this work are specifically applicable to CRAs where attestation failure may be attributed to adversarial attacks or network delays. However, it is acknowledged that attestation failures can also occur due to bugs in an implementation. Addressing this presents a research challenge, exploring the possibility of verifying that attestation is bug-free, particularly in swarms with multiple devices where multiple states may need resetting. Additionally, certain CRA protocols assume bug-free attestation code, posing a vulnerability and suggesting another area for research within the community.

Formal verification. In §7.2 and §7.3, we have shown that CATT’s security properties are amenable to formal verification. The next steps for future work are to formally prove that the security properties shown in Table 2 are indeed satisfied by the CRA protocols. We anticipate that this may

⁴Our models are submitted as supplementary material and will be made available.

require significant effort since the assumptions made by the protocols must be faithfully represented. Given the complexity of many of the protocols, there are also scalability challenges that must be overcome.

Protocol design. Tables 1 and 2 highlight numerous unexplored CRA protocol possibilities, such as protocols that guarantee group (a)synchronous strong attestation. Other possibilities include use of special hardware such as DICE (Device Identifier Composition Engine), which is a security control for assuring the trustworthiness of IoT devices. There are RA protocols that use TCG DICE [41, 54, 56] so an interesting line of research is to find out if these can be used to implement CRA protocols. Another promising avenue for future research is to investigate if the efficiency trick of CoRA [38] can be extended to other CRA protocols. This way, in the common case where all devices are healthy, the protocol just reports a simple healthy statement and it only goes into per-device status if at least one device is unhealthy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by VeTSS and EPSRC grants EP/Y036425/1, EP/X037142/1, EP/X015149/1, EP/V038915/1 and EP/R025134/2.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2024. Common Criteria. <https://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/index.cfm>
- [2] 2024. OpenTitan. <https://opentitan.org/>
- [3] Tigist Abera, N Asokan, Lucas Davi, Jan-Erik Ekberg, Thomas Nyman, Andrew Paverd, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2016. C-FLAT: Control-flow attestation for embedded systems software. In *CCS*. 743–754.
- [4] Tigist Abera, N. Asokan, Lucas Davi, Farinaz Koushanfar, Andrew Paverd, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2016. Invited – Things, trouble, trust: On building trust in IoT systems. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Design Automation Conference, DAC 2016, Austin, TX, USA, June 5-9, 2016*. ACM, 121:1–121:6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2897937.2905020>
- [5] Tigist Abera, N Asokan, Lucas Davi, Farinaz Koushanfar, Andrew Paverd, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2016. Things, trouble, trust: On building trust in IoT systems. In *DATE*. 1–6.
- [6] Tigist Abera, Raad Bahmani, Ferdinand Brasser, Ahmad Ibrahim, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Matthias Schunter. 2019. DIAT: Data Integrity Attestation for Resilient Collaboration of Autonomous Systems.. In *NDSS*.
- [7] Tigist Abera, Ferdinand Brasser, Lachlan J Gunn, David Koisser, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. 2019. SADAN: Scalable adversary detection in autonomous networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05190* (2019).
- [8] Sonia Akter, Kasem Khalil, and Magdy Bayoumi. 2023. A Survey on Hardware Security: Current Trends and Challenges. *IEEE Access* (2023).
- [9] Toqeer Ali, Muhammad Nauman, and Salman Jan. 2018. Trust in IoT: Dynamic remote attestation through efficient behavior capture. *Cluster Computing* 21 (2018), 409–421.
- [10] Tamleek Ali, Mohammad Nauman, and Xinwen Zhang. 2011. On leveraging stochastic models for remote attestation. In *INTRUST*. Springer, 290–301.
- [11] Muhammad Naveed Aman and Biplab Sikdar. 2018. ATT-Auth: A hybrid protocol for industrial IoT attestation with authentication. *IEEE Internet Things J.* 5, 6 (2018), 5119–5131. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2018.2866623>
- [12] Moreno Ambrosin, Mauro Conti, Ahmad Ibrahim, Gregory Neven, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Matthias Schunter. 2016. SANA: Secure and scalable aggregate network attestation. In *CCS*. 731–742.
- [13] Moreno Ambrosin, Mauro Conti, Riccardo Lazzaretti, Md Masoom Rabbani, and Silvio Ranise. 2017. Toward secure and efficient attestation for highly dynamic swarms: poster. In *WiSec*. 281–282.
- [14] Moreno Ambrosin, Mauro Conti, Riccardo Lazzaretti, Md Masoom Rabbani, and Silvio Ranise. 2018. PADS: Practical attestation for highly dynamic swarm topologies. In *SIOT*. IEEE, 18–27.
- [15] Moreno Ambrosin, Mauro Conti, Riccardo Lazzaretti, Md Masoom Rabbani, and Silvio Ranise. 2020. Collective remote attestation at the Internet of Things scale: State-of-the-art and future challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 22, 4 (2020), 2447–2461.
- [16] Mahmoud Ammar, Bruno Crispo, and Gene Tsudik. 2020. SIMPLE: A remote attestation approach for resource-constrained IoT devices. In *ICCPs*. IEEE, 247–258.
- [17] Mahmoud Ammar, Mahdi Washha, and Bruno Crispo. 2018. WISE: Lightweight intelligent swarm attestation scheme for IoT (the verifier’s perspective). In *WiMob*. IEEE, 1–8.

- [18] Mahmoud Ammar, Mahdi Washha, Gowri Sankar Ramabhadran, and Bruno Crispo. 2018. slimIoT: Scalable lightweight attestation protocol for the Internet of Things. In *DSC*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [19] Sigurd Frej Joel Jørgensen Ankergård, Edlira Dushku, and Nicola Dragoni. 2021. State-of-the-art software-based remote attestation: Opportunities and open issues for Internet of Things. *Sensors* 21, 5 (2021), 1598.
- [20] Orlando Arias, Fahim Rahman, Mark Tehranipoor, and Yier Jin. 2018. Device attestation: Past, present, and future. In *DATE*. IEEE, 473–478.
- [21] Will Arthur, David Challener, and Kenneth Goldman. 2015. *A practical guide to TPM 2.0: Using the new trusted platform module in the new age of security*. Springer Nature.
- [22] Nadarajah Asokan, Ferdinand Brasser, Ahmad Ibrahim, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, Matthias Schunter, Gene Tsudik, and Christian Wachsmann. 2015. SEDa: Scalable embedded device attestation. In *CCS*. 964–975.
- [23] Fabrice Axisa, Pierre Michael Schmitt, Claudine Gehin, Georges Delhomme, Eric McAdams, and André Dittmar. 2005. Flexible technologies and smart clothing for citizen medicine, home healthcare, and disease prevention. *IEEE Transactions on information technology in biomedicine* 9, 3 (2005), 325–336.
- [24] Ying Bai. 2016. *ARM® Memory Protection Unit (MPU)*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 951–974. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119058397.ch12>
- [25] Gaurang Bansal, Naren, Vinay Chamola, and Biplab Sikdar. 2022. SHOTS: Scalable secure authentication-attestation protocol using optimal trajectory in UAV swarms. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 71, 6 (2022), 5827–5836. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2022.3162226>
- [26] Henk Birkholz, Dave Thaler, Michael Richardson, Ned Smith, and Wei Pan. 2023. Remote attestation procedures (RATS) architecture. RFC 9334. <https://doi.org/10.17487/RFC9334>
- [27] Ferdinand Brasser, Brahim El Mahjoub, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, Christian Wachsmann, and Patrick Koeberl. 2015. Tyan: Tiny trust anchor for tiny devices. In *DAC*. 1–6.
- [28] Ferdinand Brasser, Kasper B Rasmussen, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2016. Remote attestation for low-end embedded devices: The prover’s perspective. In *DAC*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [29] Xavier Carpent, Karim Eldefrawy, Norrathep Rattanavipanon, and Gene Tsudik. 2017. Lightweight swarm attestation: A tale of two LISA-s. In *ASIA CCS*. 86–100.
- [30] Xavier Carpent, Norrathep Rattanavipanon, and Gene Tsudik. 2017. ERASMUS: Efficient remote attestation via self-measurement for unattended settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.09043*.
- [31] Xavier Carpent, Gene Tsudik, and Norrathep Rattanavipanon. 2018. ERASMUS: Efficient remote attestation via self-measurement for unattended settings. In *DATE*. IEEE, 1191–1194.
- [32] George Coker, Joshua D. Guttman, Peter A. Loscocco, Amy L. Herzog, Jonathan K. Millen, Brian O’Hanlon, John D. Ramsdell, Ariel Segall, Justin Sheehy, and Brian T. Sniffen. 2011. Principles of remote attestation. *Int. J. Inf. Sec.* 10, 2 (2011), 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10207-011-0124-7>
- [33] Mauro Conti, Edlira Dushku, and Luigi V. Mancini. 2019. RADIS: Remote attestation of distributed IoT services. In *SDS*. 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SDS.2019.8768670>
- [34] Ivan De Oliveira Nunes, Ghada Dessouky, Ahmad Ibrahim, Norrathep Rattanavipanon, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2019. Towards Systematic Design of Collective Remote Attestation Protocols. In *ICDCS*. 1188–1198. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDCS.2019.00120>
- [35] Ivan De Oliveira Nunes, Sashidhar Jakkamsetti, Norrathep Rattanavipanon, and Gene Tsudik. 2021. On the TOCTOU Problem in Remote Attestation. In *CCS (Virtual Event, Republic of Korea)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2921–2936. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460120.3484532>
- [36] Ghada Dessouky, Tigist Abera, Ahmad Ibrahim, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. 2018. LiteHAX: Lightweight hardware-assisted attestation of program execution. In *2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [37] Ghada Dessouky, Shaza Zeitouni, Thomas Nyman, Andrew Paverd, Lucas Davi, Patrick Koeberl, N Asokan, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. 2017. LO-FAT: Low-overhead control flow attestation in hardware. In *DAC*. 1–6.
- [38] Aïda Diop., Maryline Laurent., Jean Leneutre., and Jacques Traoré. 2020. CoRA: A scalable collective remote attestation protocol for sensor networks. In *ICISSP*. INSTICC, SciTePress, 84–95. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0008962700840095>
- [39] Danny Dolev and Andrew Yao. 1983. On the security of public key protocols. *IEEE Transactions on information theory* 29, 2 (1983), 198–208.
- [40] Edlira Dushku, Md Masoom Rabbani, Mauro Conti, Luigi V. Mancini, and Silvio Ranise. 2020. SARA: Secure asynchronous remote attestation for IoT systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 15 (2020), 3123–3136. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2020.2983282>
- [41] Michael Eckel, Dominik Roy George, Björn Grohmann, and Christoph Krauß. 2023. Remote Attestation with Constrained Disclosure. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (, Austin, TX, USA,) (ACSAC ’23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 718–731. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3627106.3627118>

- [42] Karim Eldefrawy, Norrathep Rattanavipanon, and Gene Tsudik. 2017. HYDRA: Hybrid design for remote attestation (using a formally verified microkernel). In *WiSec*. 99–110.
- [43] Karim Eldefrawy, Gene Tsudik, Aurélien Francillon, and Daniele Perito. 2012. SMART: Secure and minimal architecture for (establishing dynamic) root of trust.. In *NDSS*, Vol. 12. 1–15.
- [44] Aurélien Francillon, Quan Nguyen, Kasper B Rasmussen, and Gene Tsudik. 2014. A minimalist approach to remote attestation. In *DATE*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [45] Salvatore Frontera and Riccardo Lazzeretti. 2021. Bloom Filter Based Collective Remote Attestation for Dynamic Networks. In *ARES* (Vienna, Austria). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 80, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3465481.3470054>
- [46] Prosanta Gope and Biplab Sikdar. 2018. Lightweight and privacy-preserving two-factor authentication scheme for IoT devices. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6, 1 (2018), 580–589.
- [47] Vikas Hassija, Vinay Chamola, Vikas Saxena, Divyansh Jain, Pranav Goyal, and Biplab Sikdar. 2019. A survey on IoT security: Application areas, security threats, and solution architectures. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 82721–82743.
- [48] Charles Herder, Meng-Day Yu, Farinaz Koushanfar, and Srinivas Devadas. 2014. Physical unclonable functions and applications: A tutorial. *Proc. IEEE* 102, 8 (2014), 1126–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2014.2320516>
- [49] Ahmad Ibrahim, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2018. US-AID: Unattended scalable attestation of IoT devices. In *SRDS*. 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SRDS.2018.00013>
- [50] Ahmad Ibrahim, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Gene Tsudik. 2019. HEALED: Healing & attestation for low-end embedded devices. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, Ian Goldberg and Tyler Moore (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 627–645.
- [51] Ahmad Ibrahim, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, Gene Tsudik, and Shaza Zeitouni. 2016. DARPA: Device attestation resilient to physical attacks. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Security & Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*. 171–182.
- [52] Ahmad Ibrahim, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Shaza Zeitouni. 2017. SeED: Secure non-interactive attestation for embedded devices. In *WiSec*. 64–74.
- [53] Zineeddine Ould Imam, Marc Lacoste, and Ghada Arfaoui. 2021. Towards a Modular Attestation Framework for Flexible Data Protection for Drone Systems. In *17th International Conference on Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Communications, WiMob 2021, Bologna, Italy, October 11-13, 2021*. IEEE, 96–102. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WIMOB52687.2021.9606269>
- [54] Lukas Jäger, Richard Petri, and Andreas Fuchs. 2017. Rolling dice: Lightweight remote attestation for cots iot hardware. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*. 1–8.
- [55] Emil Johansson. 2020. Tamper Protection for Cryptographic Hardware: A survey and analysis of state-of-the-art tamper protection for communication devices handling cryptographic keys.
- [56] Jukka Julku, Jani Suomalainen, and Markku Kylänpää. 2021. Delegated Device Attestation for IoT. In *2021 8th International Conference on Internet of Things: Systems, Management and Security (IOTSMS)*. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IOTSMS53705.2021.9704959>
- [57] Patrick Koeberl, Steffen Schulz, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Vijay Varadharajan. 2014. TrustLite: A security architecture for tiny embedded devices. In *Proceedings of the Ninth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 1–14.
- [58] Florian Kohnhäuser, Niklas Büscher, Sebastian Gabmeyer, and Stefan Katzenbeisser. 2017. SCAPI: A scalable attestation protocol to detect software and physical attacks. In *WiSec*. 75–86.
- [59] Florian Kohnhäuser, Niklas Büscher, and Stefan Katzenbeisser. 2018. SALAD: Secure and lightweight attestation of highly dynamic and disruptive networks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 329–342.
- [60] Florian Kohnhäuser, Niklas Büscher, and Stefan Katzenbeisser. 2019. A Practical Attestation Protocol for Autonomous Embedded Systems. In *Euro S&P*. 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSP.2019.00028>
- [61] Joonho Kong, Farinaz Koushanfar, Praveen K Pendyala, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Christian Wachsmann. 2014. PU-Fatt: Embedded platform attestation based on novel processor-based PUFs. In *DAC*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [62] Xeno Kovah, Corey Kallenberg, Chris Weathers, Amy Herzog, Matthew Albin, and John Butterworth. 2012. New results for timing-based attestation. In *S&P*. IEEE, 239–253.
- [63] Boyu Kuang, Anmin Fu, Yansong Gao, Yuqing Zhang, Jianying Zhou, and Robert H. Deng. 2023. FeSA: Automatic federated swarm attestation on dynamic large-scale IoT devices. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20, 4 (2023), 2954–2969. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2022.3193106>
- [64] Boyu Kuang, Anmin Fu, Willy Susilo, Shui Yu, and Yansong Gao. 2022. A survey of remote attestation in Internet of Things: Attacks, countermeasures, and prospects. *Computers & Security* 112 (2022), 102498.
- [65] Boyu Kuang, Anmin Fu, Shui Yu, Guomin Yang, Mang Su, and Yuqing Zhang. 2019. ESDRA: An efficient and secure distributed remote attestation scheme for IoT swarms. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6, 5 (2019), 8372–8383.

- [66] Boyu Kuang, Anmin Fu, Lu Zhou, Willy Susilo, and Yuqing Zhang. 2020. DO-RA: Data-oriented runtime attestation for IoT devices. *Computers & Security* 97 (2020), 101945.
- [67] Seema Kumar, Patrick Eugster, and Silvia Santini. 2022. Software-Based Remote Network Attestation. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 19, 5 (2022), 2920–2933. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2021.3077993>
- [68] Jay Le-Papin, Brijesh Dongol, Helen Treharne, and Stephan Wesemeyer. 2023. Verifying List swarm attestation protocols. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Security and Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*. 163–174.
- [69] Yanlin Li, Jonathan M McCune, and Adrian Perrig. 2011. VIPER: Verifying the integrity of peripherals’ firmware. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*. 3–16.
- [70] Jiangnan Lin and Qiuxin Wu. 2021. A Security Integrated Attestation Scheme for Embedded Devices. In *IC-NIDC*. 489–493. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IC-NIDC54101.2021.9660438>
- [71] Gavin Lowe. 1997. A hierarchy of authentication specifications. In *Proceedings 10th computer security foundations workshop*. IEEE, 31–43.
- [72] Mohamad Mansouri, Wafa Ben Jaballah, Melek Önen, Md Masoom Rabbani, and Mauro Conti. 2021. FADIA: Fairness-driven collaborative remote attestation. In *WiSec*. 60–71.
- [73] Jonathan M McCune, Bryan J Parno, Adrian Perrig, Michael K Reiter, and Hiroshi Isozaki. 2008. Flicker: An execution infrastructure for TCB minimization. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGOPS/EuroSys European Conference on Computer Systems 2008*. 315–328.
- [74] Simon Meier, Benedikt Schmidt, Cas Cremers, and David Basin. 2013. The Tamarin prover for the symbolic analysis of security protocols. In *Computer Aided Verification: 25th International Conference, CAV 2013, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 13-19, 2013. Proceedings 25*. Springer, 696–701.
- [75] Wenjuan Meng, Tao Jiang, and Jianhua Ge. 2018. Dynamic swarm attestation with malicious devices identification. *IEEE Access* 6 (2018), 50003–50013.
- [76] Hamid Menouar, Ismail Guvenc, Kemal Akkaya, A Selcuk Uluagac, Abdullah Kadri, and Adem Tuncer. 2017. UAV-enabled intelligent transportation systems for the smart city: Applications and challenges. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 55, 3 (2017), 22–28.
- [77] Rana S Mohammed, Ahmed H Mohammed, and Farah N Abbas. 2019. Security and privacy in the Internet of Things (IoT): Survey. In *ICECCPCE*. IEEE, 204–208.
- [78] Nataliia Neshenko, Elias Bou-Harb, Jorge Crichigno, Georges Kaddoum, and Nasir Ghani. 2019. Demystifying IoT security: An exhaustive survey on IoT vulnerabilities and a first empirical look on Internet-scale IoT exploitations. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 21, 3 (2019), 2702–2733.
- [79] Lukas Petzi, Ala Eddine Ben Yahya, Alexandra Dmitrienko, Gene Tsudik, Thomas Prantl, and Samuel Kounev. 2022. SCRAPS: Scalable collective remote attestation for Pub-Sub IoT networks with untrusted proxy verifier. In *USENIX Security*. 3485–3501.
- [80] Md Masoom Rabbani, Jo Vliegen, Jori Winderickx, Mauro Conti, and Nele Mentens. 2019. SHELA: Scalable heterogeneous layered attestation. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 6, 6 (2019), 10240–10250.
- [81] Srivaths Ravi, Anand Raghunathan, and Srimat Chakradhar. 2004. Tamper resistance mechanisms for secure embedded systems. In *17th International Conference on VLSI Design. Proceedings*. IEEE, 605–611.
- [82] Mohamed Sabt, Mohammed Achemlal, and Abdelmadjid Bouabdallah. 2015. Trusted execution environment: What it is, and what it is not. In *2015 IEEE Trustcom/BigDataSE/IsPa*, Vol. 1. IEEE, 57–64.
- [83] Arvind Seshadri, Mark Luk, and Adrian Perrig. 2008. SAKE: Software attestation for key establishment in sensor networks. In *International Conference on Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems*. Springer, 372–385.
- [84] Arvind Seshadri, Mark Luk, Adrian Perrig, Leendert Van Doorn, and Pradeep Khosla. 2006. SCUBA: Secure code update by attestation in sensor networks. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM workshop on Wireless security*. 85–94.
- [85] Arvind Seshadri, Mark Luk, Elaine Shi, Adrian Perrig, Leendert Van Doorn, and Pradeep Khosla. 2005. Pioneer: Verifying code integrity and enforcing untampered code execution on legacy systems. In *SOSP*. 1–16.
- [86] Arvind Seshadri, Adrian Perrig, Leendert Van Doorn, and Pradeep Khosla. 2004. SWATT: Software-based attestation for embedded devices. In *S&P*. IEEE, 272–282.
- [87] Sergei Skorobogatov. 2012. Physical attacks and tamper resistance. In *Introduction to Hardware Security and Trust*. Springer, 143–173.
- [88] Rodrigo Vieira Steiner and Emil Lupu. 2016. Attestation in wireless sensor networks: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 49, 3 (2016), 1–31.
- [89] Zhichuang Sun, Bo Feng, Long Lu, and Somesh Jha. 2020. OAT: Attesting operation integrity of embedded devices. In *S&P*. IEEE, 1433–1449.
- [90] Hailun Tan, Gene Tsudik, and Sanjay Jha. 2019. MTRA: Multi-Tier randomized remote attestation in IoT networks. *Computers & Security* 81 (2019), 78–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2018.10.008>
- [91] Alessandro Visintin, Flavio Toffalini, Eleonora Losiouk, Mauro Conti, and Jianying Zhou. 2022. HolA: Holistic and Autonomous Attestation for IoT Networks. In *ACNS Workshops*. Springer, 277–296.

- [92] Shivraj VL, Meena Singh Dilip Thakur, and Rajan Ma. 2018. A Novel Multi Verifier Device Attestation Scheme for Swarm of Devices. In *WAINA*. 124–129. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WAINA.2018.00074>
- [93] Samuel Wedaj, Kolin Paul, and Vinay J. Ribeiro. 2019. DADS: Decentralized attestation for device swarms. *ACM Trans. Priv. Secur.* 22, 3, Article 19 (jul 2019), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3325822>
- [94] Hu Xiong, Qian Mei, Yanan Zhao, Li Peng, and Hao Zhang. 2019. Scalable and Forward Secure Network Attestation With Privacy-Preserving in Cloud-Assisted Internet of Things. *IEEE Sensors Journal* 19, 18 (2019), 8317–8331. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2019.2919508>
- [95] Wenwen Yan, Anmin Fu, Yi Mu, Xia Zhe, Shui Yu, and Boyu Kuang. 2019. EAPA: Efficient attestation resilient to physical attacks for IoT devices. In *IoT S&P* (London, United Kingdom). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2–7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338507.3358614>

Table 3. Underlying hybrid environment for specific implementations in the CRA papers

architecture	protocol name
ARM TrustZone	SheLA [80], RADIS [33]
HYDRA	ERASMUS [31]+LISA- α [29], FeSA [63]
SMART	DARPA [51], HEALED [50], SANA [12], SEDA [22], SeED [52]+SEDA [22], SFS [94], US-AID [49]
SMART+	ERASMUS [31]+LISA- α [29], LISA- α [29], LISA-s [29]
Software+PUF	SHOTS [25], US-AID [49]
TrustLite	BFB [45], DADS [93], EAPA [95], ESDRA [65], HEALED [50], PADS [14], SANA [12], SAP [34], SEDA [22], SeED [52]+SEDA [22], US-AID [49]
TyTan	SANA [12]
hardware	protocol name
Arduino	slimIoT [18], WISE [17]
ATmega1284P-Xplained	SCRAPS [79]
ESP32-PICO-KIT V4	PASTA [60]
IntelN5000	SADAN [7]
LPC55S69-EVK	SCRAPS [79]
MicroPnP	slimIoT [18], WISE [17]
Microship STK 600	WISE [17]
Odroid XU4	MTRA [90]
Raspberry Pi	ESDRA [65], FADIA [72], HEALED [50], HoLA [91], MTRA [90], MVS [92], US-AID [49], WISE [17]
Raspberry Pi + PUF	SHOTS [25]
Stellaris EK-LM4F120XL	SCAPT [58]
Stellaris LM4F120H5QR	SALAD [59]
Teensy 3.2	CoRA [38]
Tmote Sky	FADIA [72], SARA [40]
Xilinx FPGA	SheLA [80]

A UNDERLYING HYBRID ENVIRONMENT

The underlying hybrid environment for specific implementations in the CRA papers are shown in Table 3. This provides a useful summary of the different environments and shows that TrustLite is currently the most popular which is applicable across all types of protocols.

B ADDITIONAL METRICS

The metrics referred to in this appendix have been identified in the previous literature [15, 29], but their systematic inclusion here serves to contextualise existing knowledge to show that there is little correspondence between the strength of the security properties of a protocol and how they align to particular network topologies, dynamic configurations of devices and considerations of how the final attestation report is recorded.

B.1 Network Topology

Depending on the application, there may be many different (logical) arrangements of devices. The network topology assumed by a CRA protocol can be constrained by several factors, e.g., the communication and computation capability of devices, the environment in which the protocol is used, the adversary capabilities, and the need to support device mobility. CRA protocols may assume any of the following topologies (shown in Column 2 of Table 4).

Spanning-tree (S. Tree) protocols maintain a structure where the root of the tree is the (set of trusted or untrusted) verifier(s) and the leaf nodes are provers. Devices corresponding to intermediate nodes may take the role of a prover or aggregator, or both. We distinguish between the following, which are specialised forms of spanning-tree topologies: (1) *Aggregation Layer (Agg. Layer)* protocols, where all devices in the intermediate nodes are aggregators and (2) *Balanced Binary Tree (BB. Tree)* topologies that maintain a balanced binary tree to ensure that the distance

from the verifier (root) to the provers (leaves) is logarithmic with respect to the number of devices in the swarm.

Distributed protocols allow devices to communicate with many neighbouring devices via an interconnected network.

Cluster protocols partition connected devices into clusters (aka classes) that are periodically attested. The clustering is based on various factors (e.g., geographical locations in static networks, common tasks among devices, network traffic distribution, etc.). Devices in each cluster interact with a cluster head device, and cluster heads may interact among themselves and/or with a centralised verifier.

Hierarchy protocols maintain different layers where each layer contains several *clusters* of devices with a set of cluster heads (aka edge verifiers). The provers in each cluster can be attested using (potentially different) attestation protocols. The reports are aggregated and received by the edge verifiers, which in turn, aggregate them with their own report and forward them to the upper layer. Finally, a set of verifiers (potentially singleton) receive the final reports from the cluster heads. Note that CRA protocols may leverage a mixture of topologies, e.g., SHELA [80] may utilise a different attestation protocol within each of its clusters and each of those protocols may work with a different topology.

Publish/subscribe (PubSub) protocols allow devices to take the role of a publisher or subscriber of *topics*, and asynchronous communication to take place through an intermediate broker. Publishers send messages tagged with a topic to the broker, and the broker forwards these to all subscribers on that topic.

Ring protocols allow devices to be logically linked to their predecessors and successors, thus creating a ring.

Spanning-tree is the most widely used topology in the CRA protocols and is a good fit in settings where devices do not have enough memory to store the reports of other devices but can aggregate and forward them (e.g., LISA [29]). Such CRA protocols typically require a reliable network where the devices maintain their connections with other devices, and are effective in a centralised settings. However, they perform poorly under device mobility, since the tree topology may be hard to maintain.

Aggregation layer CRA protocols allow untrusted aggregators as in the case of untrusted routers or cloud servers (e.g., SANA [12]). In interactive CRA protocols attestation requests have to travel down the leaf and reports back up to the root. To this end, *balanced binary tree* CRA protocols have been suggested (e.g., SAP [34]) to minimise the furthest path from the root verifier to a leaf prover, and hence minimise the communication overhead.

Ensuring resilience is also challenging for spanning trees since the loss or delay of a device affects its entire subtree. An initiator is particularly susceptible to DoS attacks via fake attestation requests generated by an adversary. Spanning-trees are not recommended in particular for CRA protocols that aim to detect physical attacks via a heartbeat protocol, since if each prover sends out a heartbeat to its neighbouring provers and receives from them an accumulated heartbeat, the number of exchanged messages per periodically executed heartbeat period scales quadratically with the number of provers [51], which causes scalability issues in large swarms. A single failure in the transmission of a heartbeat suffices to cause a false positive, where a healthy device is mistakenly regarded as unhealthy [58].

Distributed topologies are good fit for swarms with mobility and are resilient to devices (re)joining or leaving the swarm, i.e., swarm can be scaled as required (e.g., SALAD [59]). They also provide resilience against device failure (e.g., SCAPI [58] uses absence detection scheme to identify physically captured provers). But they do not require initiators to be trusted (e.g., MVS [92]). Distributed

Table 4. Topology, Dynamicity, and Centralisation

Protocol	Topology (Appendix B.1)	Dynamicity (Appendix B.2)	Centralisation (Appendix B.3)
SEDA [22]	S. Tree	Static	Centralised
DARPA [51]+SEDA [22]	S. Tree	Static	Centralised
SANA [12]	Agg. Layer	Static	Centralised
LISA-s [29]	S. Tree	Q. Static	Centralised
LISA- α [29]	S. Tree	Q. Static	Centralised
SeED [52]+SEDA [22]	(S. Tree)	Static	Centralised
SCAPI [58]	S. Tree	H. Dynamic	Centralised
ERASMUS [31]+LISA- α [29]	(S. Tree)	H. Dynamic	Centralised
ERASMUS+OD [30]+LISA- α [29]	(S. Tree)	H. Dynamic	Centralised
Poster [13]	Distributed	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
PADS [14]	Distributed	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
SALAD [59]	Distributed	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
WISE [17]	S. Tree	Q. Static	Centralised
slimIoT [18]	S. Tree	H. Dynamic	Centralised
US-AID [49]	Distributed	Dynamic	Decentralised
ATT-Auth [11]	S. Tree	—	Centralised
MVS-D2D[92]	Distributed	—	Decentralised
MVS-Consensus[92]	Cluster	—	Decentralised
μ SEDA [75]	S. Tree	H. Dynamic	Centralised
SAP [34]	BB. Tree	Static	Centralised
MTRA [90]	Cluster	Static	Decentralised
RADIS [33]	Distributed	Static	Centralised
ESDR [65]	Cluster	Dynamic	Decentralised
EAPA [95]	Distributed	—	Decentralised
SHeLA [80]	Hierarchical	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
HEALED [50]	—	—	Decentralised
SADAN [7]+DIAT [6]	Distributed	Static	Decentralised
SFS [94]	S. Tree	—	Centralised
PASTA [60]	S. Tree	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
DADS [93]	S. Tree	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
SIMPLE+ [16]	S. Tree	Static	Centralised
CoRA [38]	S. Tree	—	Centralised
SARA [40]	PubSub	Static	Centralised
FADIA [72]	S. Tree	Static+ join/leave	Centralised
BFB [45]	Distributed	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
M2N [70]	Cluster	—	Decentralised
SWARNA [67]	S. Tree	Static	Centralised
SHOTS [25]	S. Tree	Static	Centralised
Hola [91]	Ring	Dynamic	Decentralised
FeSA [63]	Hierarchy	H. Dynamic	Decentralised
SCRAPS [79]	PubSub	Dynamic	Decentralised

protocols are much more difficult to design since it can be difficult to ensure correct synchronisation and timing, which may introduce additional communication overhead.

Cluster CRA protocols allow provers with greater memory and/or computational power act as cluster heads to perform more complicated tasks (e.g., MTRA [90]), however, if cluster heads need to communicate with each other, there is an increased cost of maintaining synchrony across them.

Hierarchical CRA protocols (e.g., SHeLA [80]) partition swarms into sub-clusters and are effective when edge verifiers have more computational resources than other devices. These protocols let a swarm be geographically widespread, with a single cluster head attesting devices locally. However, there is an increased cost of maintaining synchronicity across cluster heads.

In publish/subscribe CRA protocols, while the use of a broker potentially may reduce network communication (since subscribers will only be forwarded relevant messages), the broker itself becomes a potential point of attack [79]. A solution to this is decentralised publish/subscribe topology that guarantees events ordering among operations performed by devices that collaborate to deliver a distributed service [40].

Ring CRA protocols are efficient where there is no centralised verifier (see Appendix B.3) and each device is attested by its predecessor/successor device in the ring, otherwise the attestation results of all the devices must travel through other devices in the ring to reach the verifier; thus, if one device fails, the entire network is impacted. Ring protocols can be easily managed when a prover wants to (re)join.

B.2 Dynamicity

The structure of connections between devices may vary as they may be disconnected and (re)join due to network effects, device mobility or malicious actors. In this paper, we use the term *dynamicity* to refer to the level of change in swarm topology that can be tolerated while attestation is taking place and not between consecutive attestation procedures. CRA protocols often support dynamicity between two consecutive attestation procedures, however, some of them support dynamicity *during* attestation procedures (e.g., DADS [93]), and some not (e.g., SARA [40]). In the former case, the underlying assumption is that the connections between devices remain static, and there is no device leaving or (re)joining the swarm. We classify dynamicity as follows (shown in Column 3 of Table 4).

Static protocols, where the topology does not change during an attestation procedure.

Quasi-static (Q. Static) protocols, where the topology may change during an attestation procedure, as long as changes do not influence message exchange between devices. For example, a link may disconnect after a device finish sending a message and reconnect before any other message is exchanged between the same pair of devices.

Dynamic protocols, where the swarm may change during an attestation procedure in a limited way. A device may move gradually and change its set of neighbouring devices, but never disappears from one neighbourhood and reappears in a remote neighbourhood at once. Moreover, each device is always reachable in the swarm.

Highly Dynamic (H. Dynamic) protocols, where the topology may change unpredictably during an attestation procedure. Devices may be disconnected, (re)join, and freely move around to establish new connections with new neighbouring devices.

Static CRA protocols are often simpler to design, e.g., regarding aspects such as key management among adjacent devices, and are a good fit when devices are not mobile. However, they often require that the underlying network is reliable (e.g., SEDA [22]). Quasi-static CRA protocols inherit the pros/cons of static CRA protocols but are a good fit for networks where links may be disconnected then reconnected before sending a subsequent message (e.g., LISA [29]). Dynamic CRA protocols are useful when devices have continuous reachability, but may increase the communication costs, and should not be used when devices may be completely disconnected (e.g., autonomous swarms as in ESDRA [65]). Highly dynamic CRA protocols can cope with unreliable and disruptive networks and support device mobility (e.g., swarms of drones as in US-AID [49]). In both dynamic and highly dynamic CRA protocols, key management and routing mechanism become much more sophisticated.

B.3 Centralisation

Centralised CRA protocols usually accumulate the final aggregated report in an *initial prover* that directly exchanges messages with a verifier. The verifier requests the report from the initial prover (e.g., ATT-Auth [11]). There are also *decentralised* CRA protocols where the final (aggregated) report(s) is recorded by more than one device (possibly all devices) in the swarm and a verifier can query that report from any of them (see column 4 in Table 4). Decentralised CRA protocols may be fully distributed, where untrusted neighbouring provers attest each other and share their reports

with other provers, and provers use consensus algorithms to come to an overall conclusion about the swarm’s status (e.g., PADS [14]). CRA protocols with cluster or hierarchical topologies are also decentralised as a verifier queries the status of the provers in each cluster from the corresponding cluster head, which could be either an edge verifier (e.g., SHeLA [80]), or a prover with enough computation resources, which aggregates reports received from the provers in the corresponding cluster and will itself be attested later by the verifier (e.g., MTRA [90]).

C FURTHER DETAILS OF TAMARIN ENCODING

Here we give additional detail on our TAMARIN work. In Appendix C.1 we describe our lemma for Asynchronous Group Attestation. For completeness, in Appendix C.2 we describe Le-Papin et al.’s approach to modelling SIMPLE+.

C.1 Asynchronous Group Attestation

While SIMPLE+ is an L-QoSA (See §6.4) protocol, we can trivially produce a group result by AND-ing all the individual results. This allows us to verify Group Asynchronous Weak/Strong Attestation, shown in Fig. 3.

$prvs$ is the set of provers that att is a result for, referred to as G in Def. 7. However, as SIMPLE+ does not give the Relying Party information about which provers contributed to a report, it has no choice but to assume that all provers did, causing it to fail Group Asynchronous Strong Attestation.

C.2 SIMPLE+ Model

Le-Papin et al.’s model reflects assumptions, common in CRA protocols, that the protocol code execution is atomic (a prover cannot become compromised in the middle of the attestation procedure) and has controlled invocation (a prover never starts from the middle of the attestation procedure). The untrusted environment is modelled as follows. The state of the attestation target is represented by a constant (with the prover checking that this constant matches the one sent by the verifier). Software compromise of the prover is modelled by the state being replaced with a different constant. The remaining capabilities of a software adversary are subsumed by Adv_{DY} .

Le-Papin et al. consider a threat model where some provers can reveal their secrets to an attacker. The threat models we consider for SIMPLE+, Adv_{SW} and Adv_{DY} , do not permit this.

SIMPLE+ uses bitwise OR to aggregate reports. Le-Papin et al. faithfully models OR, with $onee/0$ and $zeroo/0$ functions representing ‘1’ and ‘0’. Then, the $or/2$ function works with these values as one would expect. In Fig. 4 we show this and our $AND/2$ function and equations, as used in Appendix C.1, which work in the same way.

The bitvector report is modelled as a pair $\langle attest_0, attest_1 \rangle$, with each value in the pair being either $onee$ or $zeroo$, representing one bit in the bitvector. Each prover has an id, represented as the constants ‘0’ and ‘1’. Each id represents a subtly different role, rather than all provers being the same. This is because they each create different initial reports $\langle attest, zeroo \rangle$ and $\langle zeroo, attest \rangle$, respectively. For tractability, ‘0’ is the only prover able to aggregate reports. This represents a restriction of the possible topologies, with the variations being $V - P0 - P1$, $V - P0$, and $V - P1$. Furthermore, the model is analysed with no more than two rounds. As the model was written before TAMARIN provided support for natural numbers, the counter is modelled as a multiset (‘1’ = 0, ‘1’ + +‘1’ = 1, etc.).

Our method has the advantage of directly proving the main security goal of a CRA protocol, as opposed to a set of properties⁵ that have not yet been proven to yield the primary security goal. However, this comes at a cost of taking longer to verify in TAMARIN (14.1 hours for Individual

⁵Le Papin et al. refer to these as Prover Authentication, Legitimate Response, and Result Timeliness.

```

All V prvs att cntr #att_end .
Attestation_Complete_G(V, prvs, att, cntr) @ #att_end ==>
(
Ex #att_start . Attestation_Start(V, cntr) @ #att_start
&
(
// All provers in prvs are healthy at #att_start
att = healthy ==> not(
// case: |prvs| > 1
(Ex P0 z . (P0 ++ z = prvs)
& IsNotHealthy(P0, #att_start))
|
// case: |prvs| = 1
(Ex P0 . (P0 = prvs) & IsNotHealthy(P0, #att_start))
)
)
&
( //Strong
// At least one prover is unhealthy by #att_end
att = unhealthy ==> (
// case: |prvs| > 1
(Ex P0 z . (P0 ++ z = prvs)
& IsNotHealthy(P0, #att_end))
|
// case: |prvs| = 1
(Ex P0 . (P0 = prvs) & IsNotHealthy(P0, #att_end))
)
)
)
)
)

```

Fig. 3. Lemma for Asynchronous Group Strong Attestation. Asynchronous Group Weak Attestation is similar, omitting the *att = unhealthy* case.

```

functions: or/2, and/2, onee/0, zeroo/0

equations: or(onee, onee) = onee,
           or(onee, zeroo) = onee,
           or(zeroo, onee) = onee,
           or(zeroo, zeroo) = zeroo,

           and(onee, onee) = onee,
           and(onee, zeroo) = zeroo,
           and(zeroo, onee) = zeroo,
           and(zeroo, zeroo) = zeroo

```

Fig. 4. Functions and equations for modelling binary OR and AND.

Attestation lemma versus a combined 4.6 hours for Le-Papin et al.'s analogous properties on the same hardware).