

PUFBind: PUF-Enabled Lightweight Program Binary Authentication for FPGA-based Embedded Systems

Sneha Swaroopa, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Venkata Sreekanth Balijabudda, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Rajat Subhra Chakraborty, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Indrajit Chakrabarti, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA)-based embedded systems have become mainstream in the last decade, often in security-sensitive applications. However, even with an authenticated hardware platform, compromised software can severely jeopardize the overall system security, making hardware protection insufficient if the software itself is malicious. In this paper, we propose a novel low-overhead hardware-software co-design solution that utilizes Physical Unclonable Functions (PUFs) to ensure the authenticity of program binaries for microprocessors/microcontrollers mapped on the FPGA. Our technique binds a program binary to a specific target FPGA through a PUF signature, performs runtime authentication for the program binary, and allows execution of the binary only after successful authentication. The proposed scheme is platform-agnostic and capable of operating in a “bare metal” mode (no system software requirement) for maximum flexibility. Our scheme also does not require any modification of the original hardware design or program binary. We demonstrate a successful prototype implementation using the open-source *PicoBlaze* microcontroller on *AMD/Xilinx* FPGA, comparing its hardware resource footprint and performance with other existing solutions of a similar nature.

Index Terms—Cryptographic hash function, Field-Programmable Gate Array (FPGA), Physical Unclonable Function (PUF), Program Binary Authentication, SHA-256.

I. INTRODUCTION

Field-Programmable Gate Array (FPGA)-based embedded systems are being increasingly deployed in safety-critical domains such as aerospace, defense, power grid infrastructure, transportation, and financial systems. The proliferation of these systems is driven by their flexibility, and the adoption of industry-grade microprocessors and microcontrollers based on open-source instruction sets like RISC-V [1]. Hence, the privacy and security of these hardware systems are critically important due to the sensitive nature of the data that they handle, and the severe potential consequences of security breaches.

Threats to these critical systems can originate from *both* untrusted hardware and compromised software. The question that we aim to answer through this paper is: **even with secure**

hardware, how can we ensure overall system security if the software intended to run on it is itself malicious? This concern is particularly critical in scenarios where operating system-enabled security mechanisms are absent, such as during the pre-boot phase. In several other such “bare metal” embedded system application scenarios, including industrial and automotive control systems, malicious program binaries pose serious threat.

To address this gap, in this paper we have proposed and demonstrated a novel scheme (which we have named “PUF-Bind”) that extends the utility of Physical Unclonable Functions (PUFs) to include program binary authentication. Physical Unclonable Functions (PUFs) are lightweight hardware-security primitives that generate unique device-specific “electronic fingerprints” [2]. Our proposed solution includes an innovative approach – leveraging PUFs to *bind* a given program binary to a target (trusted) FPGA-based hardware platform, ensuring the following:

- the program binary cannot execute on any other FPGA, including unauthorized or counterfeit ones, and,
- only a program binary that has been successfully authenticated by hardware means, is allowed to execute on the target FPGA platform.

While binding of the program binary is achieved through a PUF signature, the authentication is through the industry-standard SHA-256 cryptographic hash function. The combination of the PUF signature and the SHA-256 digest places the proposed authentication scheme on sound security foundations, linking the program binary and the FPGA-platform by cryptographic means.

PUFBind consists of two main steps:

- 1) **Step-1 (Trust establishment of FPGA platform):** A PUF circuit is mapped on the target FPGA, and its signature noted. Later, an FPGA-under-test is authenticated by implementing the same PUF circuit on it, and noting its signature. If the obtained PUF signature matches the expected PUF response, the FPGA is declared to be authentic. Error Correction Codes (ECCs) are employed to address reliability issues associated with PUF responses.
- 2) **Step-2 (Authentication of program binary on a pre-authenticated FPGA platform):** This step consists of several sub-steps, as described below.
 - *Binding a Given Program Binary to a FPGA:* The PUF response from the target FPGA is used to crypto-

S. Swaroopa, V. S. Balijabudda and R. S. Chakraborty are with the Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur, West Bengal, India – 721302. Email: swaroopasneha202@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in, sreekanthbv@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in, rschakraborty@cse.iitkgp.ac.in.

I. Chakrabarti is with the Dept. of Electronics and Electrical Communication Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur, West Bengal, India – 721302. Email: indrajit@ece.iitkgp.ac.in.




Fig. 1. The different authentication scenarios and the corresponding outcomes, as enforced by *PUFBind*.

graphically bind a program binary to the hardware. A SHA-256 digest of a given program binary is XORed with the PUF signature from the trusted target FPGA, to obtain a “golden signature”. This golden signature, representing the authentic program binary and its intended target FPGA, is then piggybacked on the program binary file itself. This sub-step is a one-time effort for each <program binary, FPGA> pair.

- *Verification of Program Binary:* Prior to allowing a given program binary to execute on a soft microprocessor/microcontroller mapped on a trusted FPFPGA, the program binary is authenticated in real time by hardware. If authentication passes, normal execution ensues. Otherwise, any further reading of the memory containing this program binary is disabled by hardware controllers, which thereby forbids any further execution of it.
- *Trustworthy Program Binary Execution:* A complementary scenario arises when the program binary is trustworthy, but the FPGA on which it is intended to run is unauthorized, i.e., not the intended FPGA to which the program binary was bound. Again, a real-time hardware-based authentication mechanism disables execution of the program binary.

Fig. 1 capture the different scenarios and the corresponding outcomes, as enforced by *PUFBind*.

A. Salient Features of *PUFBind*

We have made the following security assumption: **an adversary aiming to maliciously modify the program binary,**

does not have access to the FPGA platform(s) to which the binary is securely bound. Under this assumption, *PUFBind* offers the following:

- *PUFBind* eliminates the need for encryption followed by run-time decryption of the program binary, thus avoiding adverse impact to throughput.
- *PUFBind* operates without requiring a complex software stack, in a *bare metal* mode.
- *PUFBind* does not place any limit on the program binary size.
- *PUFBind* is completely **non-invasive** – it requires no modification to the hardware modules to be mapped on the FPGA, and requires only minimal and trivial modifications to the program binary. Hence, there is no need to separately store the authentication signature in non-volatile memory.
- The hardware platform (FPGA) authentication is a one-time operation, carried out before the program binary begins execution on the FPGA. It has no adverse impact on the throughput of the normal functional units.
- *PUFBind* seamlessly supports authorized updates to the program binary and porting the given program binary to another target FPGA platform - only the initial one-time binding process needs to be re-executed.
- *PUFBind* has a very small resource footprint (please refer to Table II). Since the authentication unit can be powered-down after successful authentication, it is also power-efficient.
- Lastly, *PUFBind* ensures the complete satisfaction of the CIA triad of security — **Confidentiality, Integrity, and Availability**. *Confidentiality* is achieved indirectly by binding the program binary to authorized hardware using PUF-based authentication, ensuring that only secure, trustworthy hardware can access (read from memory) and execute the program binary, while preventing access or execution on untrusted devices. *Integrity* is maintained through cryptographic hashing, which detects even a single bit modification to the binary and prevents execution if tampering is detected. Finally, *Availability* is ensured by enabling execution immediately after successful pre-execution authentication, guaranteeing the program runs as intended without additional delays.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to leverage PUFs for authenticating program binaries before execution [3]

B. Organization of the Paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we provide necessary background of program binary authentication, PUFs, PUF-based secure system development, and our contribution with respect to state-of-the-art. In Section III-B, we describe the PUF design and the proposed scheme in detail, and provide a security proof. In Section IV, we present hardware resource estimates for a prototype implementation of the proposed scheme and compare the results with those of existing alternatives for program binary authentication. We conclude in Section V, with future directions of research.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Program Binary Integrity and Its Impact

At current state-of-the-art, it is relatively straightforward to disassemble (reverse-engineer) a program binary using powerful (often free-of-cost) disassemblers [4], make malicious modifications by adding or modifying instructions [5], and then assemble it back again to another valid program binary. Alternatively, well-directed faults can be injected to make malicious modifications to program binaries [6], [7]. If the modification of a program binary is undetected, and a compromised program binary is deployed in-field, it can cause severe functionality losses or disruptions [8]. For instance, the *Stuxnet* malware [9] caused physical damage to Iran’s nuclear facilities, while the *SolarWinds* cyber-attack [10] led to the surreptitious leakage of large volumes of sensitive information. More recently, compromised communication devices (pagers) in possession of members of an internationally-recognized terror-outfit, exploded after receiving deceptive specially-encoded messages, which acted as malicious triggers [11]. It can be envisaged that the modified firmware in these compromised devices, on recognizing the trigger messages, executed unintended and catastrophic commands, resulting in physical damage and multiple explosions of the devices.

B. Existing Schemes for Program Binary Authentication

1) *Remote System Monitoring and Attestation*: Faced by the abovementioned challenges, protocols for secure software (including firmware) updates and remote device and firmware attestation have become major areas of research [8]. These have led to the development and standardization of advanced and complex protocols for system state monitoring and attestation, encompassing both hardware and deployed firmware/software, e.g., through *Security Protocol and Data Model* (SPDM)-based schemes [12].

2) *Hardware-assisted Software and Platform Authentication*: Another popular solution option is to adopt an integrated solution that entwines the security of software and the hardware platform on which it will execute, e.g., the widely used hardware-enabled *Trusted Platform Module* (TPM) [13], [14], *Secure Enclave* [15] for Apple platforms, and the *TrustZone* [16] technology from ARM. Among the existing solutions, these security schemes are the closest to our proposed PUF-based program binary authentication scheme. However, they are far more complex, often platform-specific, incapable of operating in a bare-metal mode, require static *in situ* storage of keys, and are often not suitable for resource-constrained devices (except *TrustZone*). Table I summarizes the differences between *PUFBind* and these schemes. Other sophisticated but complex commercially available schemes for firmware authentication include [17].

C. Confidential Computing Solutions

Confidential Computing techniques [18], such as the *Intel Trust Domain Extensions* (Intel TDX) [19], enable the creation of tamper-evident and private execution environments via hardware-based isolation in computer systems with advanced

multi-core processors. These solutions leverage instruction-set extensions and specialized hardware accelerators to securely deploy virtual machine instances even in untrusted environments, including untrusted operating systems and hypervisors. Again, our proposed approach differs fundamentally from Confidential Computing schemes in many regards, including avoiding the need for instruction-set extension or vendor-specific hardware. Also, our proposed technique is highly adaptable across a diverse range of systems.

D. PUF and PUF-based Secure System Development

PUF [2], [20] has emerged as a popular low-overhead hardware security primitive, serving as an alternative to traditional cryptographic primitives. PUFs allow secure systems to be built with no (or minimal) storage of secure keys *in situ*. The operation of PUFs relies on the random and unpredictable impact of manufacturing process variation on the nanoscale transistors and interconnects in integrated circuits, to generate unique identifiers or “electronic fingerprints” for ICs. PUF technology has matured to a point where silicon-ready PUF intellectual property (IP) modules, which can be directly integrated to be part of any larger design, are available from leading vendors [21]–[23]. PUFs have been used in a plethora of security applications, as described below [23], [24]:

1. PUF-based secret key protection (“Key vault”) [25]:

An input user key is cryptographically “wrapped” using a PUF response, and the wrapped key is then used to encrypt sensitive information. Later, the same procedure is used to generate the wrapped key that can decrypt the encrypted information.

2. **PUF-based hardware IP locking [26]:** The “firm” (gate-level) IP is encrypted using a PUF generated key, and can only be unlocked in the correct hardware instance (IC), thus providing protection against reverse-engineering. Additionally, the technique provides protection against cloning and overbuilding, as the firm IP module locked with a given PUF key cannot be unlocked by a different PUF key sourced from a different (cloned or overbuilt) IC.

3. Cryptographic co-processors including PUF [23], [27]:

These are comprehensive solutions that include PUF, True Random Number Generator, a complex hardware cryptographic engine capable of performing key derivation, key wrapping, symmetric key encryption/decryption, cryptographic hash functions, message authentication code, etc.

It is to be noted that in many recently proposed applications PUFs do not completely replace traditional cryptographic operations, but are used in conjunction with them (e.g. see [28]). We also adopt a similar approach, where we use PUFs in conjunction with cryptographic hash functions.

Next, we describe the *PUFBind* scheme in detail.

III. *PUFBind*: DETAILS OF THE SCHEME

A. Butterfly PUF: FPGA Implementation and Reasons for Choosing It

The *Butterfly PUF* (BPUF) is a relatively simple and widely-used PUF circuit, originally proposed in [29]. Fig. 2(a) shows the circuit schematic of a single PUF cell, as implemented using hardware primitives available on our FPGA

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF EXISTING HARDWARE-ASSISTED SCHEMES AND PROPOSED SCHEME FOR PROGRAM BINARY AUTHENTICATION

Aspect	Secure Enclave [15]	TPM [13], [14]	TrustZone [16]	<i>PUFBind</i> (proposed)
Platform Dependency	Platform-specific, tightly integrated with Apple's hardware	Platform-agnostic but requires TPM hardware support, common in Windows-based systems	Tightly coupled to Arm architecture, requires specific Arm processors with TrustZone architectural extensions	Platform-agnostic, adaptable to various hardware and operating systems without vendor-specific dependencies.
Vulnerabilities	Potentially vulnerable due to shared memory keys between Secure Enclave and Secure Neural Engine. If memory protection isn't properly enforced, shared memory space may be exploited.	Prone to attacks like buffer overflows (CVE-2023-1017 and CVE-2023-1018), risking cryptographic keys and data.	No separation of normal and secure world resources. Vulnerable to malicious binaries in the secure domain due to limited hardware-based isolation and resource sharing.	Eliminates static storage of keys, dynamically generates PUF responses using device-specific physical variations, reducing risk.
Resource Requirements	Requires dedicated hardware resources integrated into the system's chipset, adding to cost and power.	TPMs require dedicated hardware, either as a discrete chip or integrated within the CPU. This dedicated TPM hardware, increases cost and power consumption, especially for smaller devices.	Leverages Arm TrustZone extensions within the processor, avoiding extra hardware but sharing resources, limiting advanced isolation.	Leverages intrinsic hardware characteristics, no need for additional hardware modules, reducing cost and complexity.
Performance	Can experience performance degradation during cryptographic operations, including key generation and memory encryption/decryption tasks. The need for secure memory and cryptographic operations may affect performance during execution.	Hardware TPMs can throttle under high loads, such as intensive key generation or non-volatile memory operations.	Limited to two operational domains (secure and normal), reducing overall performance for systems requiring multi-domain isolation or complex secure operations.	No Runtime Overhead: Authentication occurs only once before the program binary begins execution. Once authentication is completed, there's no need for runtime decryption, resulting in no performance bottlenecks. This leads to optimal throughput in FPGA-based systems without the continuous overhead of encryption/decryption.
Scalability	Limited scalability across platforms due to platform-specific implementation.	Limited scalability in resource-constrained environments, such as IoT devices, due to cost and power overheads. Limited usability as TPM is typically tied to specific devices and platforms which has TPM hardware support.	Not inherently scalable due to dependence on Arm architecture and the inability to handle more than two payloads or cores simultaneously.	Highly scalable across various devices and platforms. Lightweight and low-cost, ideal for IoT and embedded systems, as it requires no specific vendor, architecture, processor, and operating system dependencies.
Flexibility	No flexibility due to tight integration with Apple's ecosystem.	Limited flexibility, mainly for devices that support TPM modules.	Limited flexibility, restricted to specific Arm-based processors with TrustZone extensions.	Very flexible, capable of working across various devices and systems without requiring proprietary hardware or software.
Key Management	The Secure Enclave generates and manages keys in a secure environment, with no key export capabilities.	TPM generates and manages keys for platform-specific tasks, can export keys for external use under certain conditions.	Uses the secure world for key management, relying on trusted software, but lacks inherent mechanisms to prevent malicious binary execution if the secure world is compromised.	PUF signatures are derived from unique physical characteristics of the hardware, eliminating static key storage, with no need for explicit key management.
Use Cases	Secure boot, encrypted storage, and authentication for Apple devices, ensuring confidentiality through encryption.	Secure boot, key exchange, disk encryption, and authentication for enterprise systems, focused on confidentiality.	Secure execution environment for trusted applications with separation of normal and secure worlds, but limited for multi-domain operations, ensuring confidentiality.	Ensures confidentiality through PUF-based binding to authorized hardware, while integrity and authenticity are guaranteed by cryptographic hashing.

platform of choice: the *Xilinx (AMD) Artix-7*. Note that while a SRAM cell consists of cross-coupled inverters, the BPUF chose to use cross-coupled latches, to bypass the difficulty of

implementing combinational loops on a FPGA.

The implementation of each BPUF involves arranging two D-latches (upper one with asynchronous clear, and lower one




Fig. 2. Details of Butterfly PUF (BPUF) implementation on *Xilinx Artix-7* FPGA: (a) circuit schematic of a single BPUF cell showing cross-coupled latches (implemented with Xilinx-specific hardware modules LDPE and LDCE); (b) physical view of implementation of a single BPUF cell on *Xilinx/AMD Artix-7* FPGA; (c) physical view of symmetric placement of first 64 BPUF cells (out of 128) on the FPGA fabric; (d) physical view of control circuitry for the BPUF circuit on the FPGA fabric; (e) physical view of symmetric placement of the second 64 BPUF cells (out of 128) on the FPGA fabric.

with asynchronous preset) in a cross-coupled manner. The *excite* signal is connected to the clear of the upper and preset of the lower latch. The *Gate* (*G*) input of each latch is connected to the *gate* signal, and the *Gate enable* (*GE*) input is connected to the *clk_enable* signal. These two signals are enabled periodically. In the beginning, when the *excite* signal is made high for some clock cycles, the *Q* output of the upper latch is forced to become ‘0’, and that of the lower latch is forced to become ‘1’. Before making the *excite* signal low again, the *gate* signal is made high, so that the *D* to *Q* transfer is possible in Latch if the *GE* signal is activated, and after that, the *clk_enable* signal is also made high. Now, when the *excite* is made low, an unstable state occurs when the outputs of the latches hold opposite values, but since the *D* input of the upper latch is connected to the *Q* output of the lower latch, and *D* of lower is connected to *Q* of upper, so at the same time, outputs tend to hold same values. Now, when the *gate* is made low, the *D* to *Q* transfer in the last negative edge is taken into account. The exact value at which the output *response* settles is determined by small differences in the drive-strengths of the latches, arising out of unpredictable and uncontrollable silicon-level process-variation effects. The process variation also varies spatially across the FPGA fabric, resulting in a characteristic bit-pattern

for an array of BPUF cells, which act as the signature for the FPGA. To be practically useful, typically we require a BPUF signature to be length at least 128 bits. In addition, to eliminate design bias, it is important that the physical implementation of a BPUF cell should have symmetric routing of the interconnections, and the BPUF cells of the array should be placed symmetrically across the FPGA design fabric.

We chose the BPUF in our work because it is relatively easy to implement on any FPGA platform as it requires only latches, has excellent performance metrics (e.g. uniqueness), and incurs low hardware overhead (the other similar option that we considered is [30]). The *SRAM PUF* [21] and the *NeoPUF* [22] may be overall of more superior quality than the Butterfly PUF. However, the *SRAM PUF* is difficult to implement on a FPGA, since the automatic bit-clearing mechanism on power-up for all on-chip *SRAM* of the FPGA needs to be bypassed [31]. The *NeoPUF* is more suitable for a custom IC implementation, and is only available (to the best of our knowledge) as a “hard IP” targeting FPGAs from a single vendor [32], which is not portable across other FPGA platforms. The entropy and reliability of our PUF response is enhanced by “Fuzzy Extraction” for error correction, using the widely-used “helper data” algorithm [33], [34]. Note that a Butterfly PUF hardware IP solution is also commercially available targeting AMD/Xilinx FPGAs [35]. Fig. 2(b)-(d)




Fig. 3. Overall architecture of PUF-based program binary authentication through *PUFBind*, for a prototype implementation on *Xilinx (AMD) FPGA*.

show the physical view for different components of an 128-bit BPUF circuit implemented on FPGA, with controlled routing and placement, which was achieved through appropriate design constraints (details in Section IV).

Fuzzy Extractor [34], [36] is an advanced cryptographic tool used to derive reliable keys from noisy sources. The implementation employs Hamming distance as the error metric to generate the same key with high probability if the binary strings' distance is within a specified threshold. In our design, we utilized a Python-based software implementation of the Fuzzy Extractor, as described in [36]. The Fuzzy Extractor is instantiated with two key parameters: the input size n and the number of error bits k that can be corrected with high probability. Specifically, in our case, the input to the Fuzzy Extractor is $n = 128$, and the error correction capability is set to $k = 13$, representing the approximate number of bits the Fuzzy Extractor can reliably (i.e., with high probability) correct. It should be noted that k may vary around this value due to the inherent probabilistic nature (*fuzziness*) of the system. The 128-bit output generated by the BPUF is provided as input to the Fuzzy Extractor, along with auxiliary information termed "helper data" to aid in error correction [33], [34], to produce a secure output key. This key is then truncated to 448 bits and concatenated with 64 padding bits as per the SHA-256 specifications, resulting in a 512-bit input. The SHA engine processes this 512-bit input and computes a 256-bit SHA digest as the final output. The overall process is illustrated in Fig. 4.

B. Steps of PUFBind

As mentioned in Section I, *PUFBind* consists of two main steps:

- **Step-1:** Trust establishment of FPGA platform (hardware authentication), and,
- **Step-2:** PUF-based authentication of program binary on a pre-authenticated FPGA platform. It consists of the following sub-steps (as marked in Fig. 3):

A. Program Binary Generation

B. Binding Authentic Program Binary to FPGA

C. Mapping Soft Microcontroller on FPGA

D. Authentication of Program Binary

E. Trustworthy Program Binary Execution

In our description below, for ease of understanding, we consider a prototype implementation consisting of the *Xilinx/AMD Atrix-7* FPGA hosted on an *Digilent Nexys-A7* FPGA board, the 8-bit *PicoBlaze* open-source microcontroller made available as the *KCPSM6* soft macro IP free-of-cost by *Xilinx/AMD* [37], and the *Xilinx/AMD Vivado* FPGA design environment. **However, note that this is a completely generic and flexible scheme that can be adapted to any FPGA from any vendor on which a BPUF or a similar high-quality PUF can be implemented.**

The *KCPSM6* distribution comes with the software tools necessary for complete system development (including an assembler to generate program binaries targeting the microcontroller mapped on a *Xilinx FPGA*), and also includes an Universal Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter (UART) hardware core for easy communication.




Fig. 4. PUF-based FPGA platform trust establishment.


1) *Step-1: Trust Establishment of FPGA Platform (Hardware Authentication)*: The FPGA platform authentication is achieved using a PUF-based identifier unique to each FPGA chip. This step, referred to as “FPGA enrolment” is a one-time process performed by the FPGA manufacturer for each individual FPGA before it is released to the supply chain. Fig. 4 shows this step. A BPUF array with a pre-determined number of response bits, and pre-determined placement on the FPGA, is mapped on the FPGA, and its response (R_0) is recorded on a computer through an UART interface. Then, the Fuzzy Extractor is applied on R_0 . The Fuzzy Extractor operates in two distinct phases: the *Encoding* phase and the *Decoding* phase. The Encoding phase is responsible for generating a high-entropy “key” (K_0), along with auxiliary public information termed as “helper data” (HD_0) [33], [34].

While lightweight hardware implementations of the helper data scheme has been proposed [33], a hardware implementation is not essential, and we found an easy-to-use available software alternative (e.g. [36]) suitable for our scheme. Finally, a SHA-256 cryptographic digest of K_0 is generated ($SHA256_K_0$), by using a standard Linux command-line tool. We used the command-line SHA-256 digest calculation method in Step-1 to corroborate its results with the output generated by the hardware SHA-256 engine, thereby establishing the functional correctness of the SHA-256 hardware engine. The value $SHA256_K_0$ is used as the identifier for the FPGA instance. The tuple $\langle SHA256_K_0, HD_0 \rangle$ needs to be passed unchanged from vendor to vendor across the IC supply chain, up to the final customer, as an incorruptible unique identifier for the FPGA. To facilitate the FPGA authentication phase (described below), the authenticator will be provided the BPUF hardware IP.

A party in possession of the tuple $\langle SHA256_K_0, HD_0 \rangle$ and a FPGA chip corresponding to it, can perform “FPGA authentication”, by implementing the BPUF on the FPGA, collecting its response (R_1), and in conjunction with the helper data HD_0 , generates a key K_1 by Fuzzy Extractor Decoding (again by using a software mean). If the SHA-256 digest of K_1 , denoted by $SHA256_K_1$, matches $SHA256_K_0$, the FPGA is authenticated.

2) *Step-2: PUF-based Authentication of Program Binary on a Pre-authenticated FPGA Platform*: Fig. 3 gives a detailed view of Step-2 of *PUFBind*. We describe the sub-steps in detail below.

- A. *Program Binary Generation*: A given assembly language program targeting the PicoBlaze microcontroller is assembled to generate a hexadecimal (.hex) file. Each PicoBlaze instruction is 18 bits long. The .hex file is edited by a Python script written by us to prepend sufficient zeroes before every instruction, so that the end of each instruction is aligned to the end of a 32-bit word, to make it compatible with the word length of the FPGA’s internal *Block RAM* (BRAM) module (see Fig. 5). Fig. 5 shows an example modified program binary image to be loaded on the FPGA BRAM, where the BRAM has been configured to contain 32-bit words, and is of total size 4 kB (i.e. 1024 words). We emphasize that this is just an example – our scheme and the corresponding hardware architecture are capable of handling program binaries of arbitrary size.
- B. *Binding Authentic Program Binary to Trustworthy FPGA Hardware*: A SHA-256 signature of the given trustworthy program binary is generated (by software means) and then EXOR-ed with $SHA256_K_0$ (again by software means). This results in a “golden signature” $SHA_EXOR_Reference$ (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 5), that represents the binding of the authentic program binary and its intended target trustworthy FPGA. The binary file is appended with the necessary number of zeroes depending on the BRAM size, and then the 256-bit $SHA_EXOR_Reference$ value is then appended (piggybacked) to the binary file by another Python script, so that the total size of the binary file is exactly equal to the size of the configured BRAM. The complete binary image file is then loaded on the FPGA BRAM. **Note that this program binary modification is a one-time operation for a given program binary and its given specific target FPGA.**
- C. *Mapping Soft Microcontroller on FPGA*: The PicoBlaze soft microcontroller is instantiated on the FPGA.
- D. *Authentication of Program Binary*: Once the modified binary file is written to the BRAM of the FPGA, the authentication process ensues. A SHA-256 hardware engine mapped on the FPGA calculates the digest of the “key” generated from the response of the FPGA-mapped BPUF, after it has been corrected through an error correction code. This BPUF digest calculated by the hardware is named SHA_BPUF (Fig. 6). If the FPGA is authentic, the value of SHA_BPUF would be equal to $SHA256_K_0$. Following this, the program binary stored in BRAM undergoes block-wise processing for digest calculation. The program binary can be of arbitrary size, and the SHA-256 engine processes it by collecting 512 bits of it (in our case it is 16 words of 32-bit each) in a 512-bit buffer. After the final block of the program binary code has been processed (the portion appended with zeroes but excluding the piggybacked 256-bit $SHA_EXOR_Reference$),



* The program binary has $(32-18) = 14$ zeroes prepended to each 18-bit instruction, located in each row of the BRAM.

Fig. 5. Example program binary image and BRAM content, for a BRAM with 32-bit words and total size 4 kB.

the output digest is referred to as *SHA_Prog_Bin* (Fig. 6). This sequential reading and processing requires substantial synchronisation, and relatively complex control circuitry for it to handle arbitrary-sized program binaries. Subsequently, the two digests *SHA_Prog_Bin* and *SHA_BPUF* are EXOR-ed to generate a 256-bit value *SHA_EXOR_Hardware*. The *SHA_EXOR_Reference* value is then read from the BRAM and compared against *SHA_EXOR_Hardware*. If these two values match, authentication succeeds, reading of the program binary from the BRAM by the PicoBlaze microcontroller is enabled, and normal execution of the program ensues. On the other hand, if authentication fails, access to the program binary by the PicoBlaze microcontroller remains disabled, and an error condition is indicated by a single ON LED, as shown in Fig. 7(a).

E. *Trustworthy Program Binary Execution*: If the program binary has passed authentication, the PicoBlaze microcontroller mapped on the FPGA is allowed to access the BRAM to read the program binary one instruction per clock cycle, and execute the instruction. Note that the first 14 zero bits of each word read from the BRAM are ignored, and only the last 18 bits constitute the instruction. The result of normal execution may be indicated through multiple ON LEDs, as shown in Fig. 7(b).

C. Formal Proof of Security for PUFBind

We formally prove the security of the scheme by following the technique of “proof by contradiction”, where we assume the correctness of certain scenarios, and then show that our assumption leads to impossible conclusions. There are three possible cases that we must consider:

Case-1: a modified program binary, with the *SHA_EXOR_Reference* value corresponding to an authentic program binary piggybacked on it, passes

authentication on trustworthy FPGA. This would require the following condition to be satisfied:

$$SHA_EXOR_Reference = SHA_Prog_Bin' \oplus SHA_BPUF \quad (1)$$

where *SHA_Prog_Bin'* represents the SHA-256 digest of the modified malicious program binary. This implies the following condition must hold:

$$SHA_Prog_Bin \oplus SHA256_K0 = SHA_Prog_Bin' \oplus SHA_BPUF \quad (2)$$

However, if the FPGA is trustworthy, $SHA256_K0 = SHA_BPUF$. Hence, the necessary condition is:

$$SHA_Prog_Bin = SHA_Prog_Bin' \quad (3)$$

which occurs with extremely low probability, because SHA-256 is a collision-resistant hash function. Hence, our assumption about the authentication step passing must be incorrect.

Case-2: an unmodified (trustworthy) program binary, with an unmodified value of *SHA_EXOR_Reference* piggybacked on it, passes authentication on an untrustworthy FPGA (on which it is not bound). This would require the following condition to be satisfied:

$$SHA_Prog_Bin \oplus SHA256_K0 = SHA_Prog_Bin \oplus SHA_BPUF' \quad (4)$$

where *SHA_BPUF'* represents the signature computed from the PUF on the untrustworthy FPGA. This simplifies to:

$$SHA256_K0 = SHA_BPUF' \quad (5)$$

which occurs with extremely low probability, since these are SHA-256 digests of the “key” values generated from




Fig. 6. BPUF-based program binary authentication details: success and failure scenarios.

the fuzzy extractor for the two PUFs located on two different FPGAs. Hence, our assumption about Case-2 must be incorrect.

Case-3: the program binary is unmodified and the FPGA platform is trustworthy and bound to the program binary, but the piggybacked signature $SHA_EXOR_Reference$ has been modified to a different value, (say) $SHA_EXOR_Reference'$. It is trivial to see that this case will fail authentication, since $SHA_EXOR_Reference \neq SHA_EXOR_Reference'$.

Note that the other case where an untrusted program binary is targeted to be executed on an untrusted FPGA is irrelevant, because of our assumption in Section I-A.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Experimental Setup

We implemented the proposed scheme on many Xilinx/AMD Artix-7 FPGA, hosted on a Digilent Nexys-A7 board. The hardware architecture (including the SHA-256 hardware engine and the controllers) of the proposed scheme was implemented in Verilog, and the UART transmitter (written in VHDL) was adopted from the KCPSM6 distribution [37]. A 4 kB BRAM the FPGA was configured to consist of 1024 words, each word being 32 bits long (see Fig. 5). An open-source Python-based software Fuzzy Extractor [36] was leveraged. Assembly language programs targeting the PicoBlaze microcontroller were assembled using the KCPSM6 toolchain, and Xilinx/AMD Vivado was used as the overall hardware design and debug environment. Custom Xilinx

Design Constraint (.xdc) files were written to control the placement of the 128-bit BPUF mapped on the FPGA, and to map the on-board LEDs to circuit outputs. All software steps, including processing of the BPUF collected response, were achieved through custom Python scripts. A C program was used to automatically generate Verilog RTL for the complex finite state machine (FSM) that controls the interaction between the SHA-256 hardware engine and the BRAM, since the number of states and state transitions of the FSM depends on the given program binary size.

B. Verification of Functionality

To validate the functionality of *PUFBind*, three program binary images were construed: (a) an “authentic” program binary bound to the target FPGA, to make an array of on-board LEDs blink in a ring counter sequence; (b) a deliberately modified version of it, with a single arbitrary bit flip in some of the encoded instructions (“Case-1” of the previous section), and (c) a modified binary image where a single arbitrary bit-flip was made in the piggybacked signature portion (“Case-3” of the previous section). Each of these three program binaries were subjected to the proposed authentication flow. As expected, the first version passed authentication, while the other two versions failed authentication. Authentication also failed when the program binary bound to a specific FPGA was attempted to be executed on a different FPGA (“Case-2” of previous section). Fig. 7 shows two scenarios – for failed and passed authentication. Thus, the functionality of *PUFBind* is verified.




Fig. 7. Example response of the *PUFBind* authentication system for (a) failed, and (b) successful platform and binary authentication.

TABLE II
HARDWARE COST OF PROPOSED ARCHITECTURE FOR AUTHENTICATION (EXCLUDING PICOBLAZE MICROCONTROLLER)

Name	Slice LUTs (available: 63400)	Slice Registers (available: 126800)	F7 Muxes (available: 31700)	Block RAM Tile (available: 135)	Bonded IOB (available: 210)	BUFGCTRL (available: 32)
SHA_Engine	1402	1057	64	0	0	0
128-bit BPUF	0	256	0	0	0	0
Binary Program	0	0	0	1	0	0
Authenticator	88	0	0	0	0	0
Custom Controller	15	12	0	0	0	0
KCPSM6 Microcontroller	111	79	0	0	0	0
UART	55	155	8	0	0	0
Total Utilization (%)	1671 (2.64%)	1559 (1.23%)	72 (0.2%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

C. Resource and Performance Costs

Table II shows the hardware footprint of the proposed security scheme (excluding the PicoBlaze microcontroller), which establishes the hardware overhead to be very small. There is no impact on the critical path delay for the complete prototype system including the PicoBlaze microcontroller, i.e. zero timing overhead. For a BRAM with 32-bit words, it takes $(512 / 32 = 16)$ clock cycles by the SHA-256 engine to process 512 bits of content from the BRAM at a time. Since the processes of filling-up the input 512-bit buffer and computation of the SHA-256 digest are concurrent, for a 4 kB BRAM, it takes $16 * (64 \text{ blocks of } 512 \text{ bits}) = 1024$ clock cycles to compute the entire digest. One additional clock cycle is required to compare the *SHA_EXOR_Reference* and *SHA_EXOR_Hardware*. Hence, for a 4 kB binary image, authentication takes 1025 clock cycles in total. In the FPGA board we used, the system clock has a frequency of 100 MHz, implying an one-time initial authentication latency of 102.5 microseconds. Overall, the latency is more-or-less proportional to the binary image size.

D. Comparison of Overhead with Existing Schemes

A qualitative comparison of *PUFBind* with existing solutions in terms of features, functionality, and applicability was presented in Section II. A direct quantitative comparison between our proposed scheme and existing solutions is challenging since most available solutions are for general-purpose processors, use real-time encryption/decryption, and modifies the datapath. However, we note that the 128-bit BPUF hardware cost incurred is minuscule (only 2 flip-flops per bit),

and the hardware resource cost of the SHA-256 incurred by us compares favorably with the most hardware-efficient solutions reported in the comprehensive work [38]. Even if we had chosen to implement the Fuzzy Extractor algorithm in hardware on FPGA in place of a hardware implementation, it would have only cost us an additional ~ 237 slices, and 4-kB additional BRAM [33]. We have provided a comparison between the hardware implementation costs of a reconfigurable TPM, and *PUFBind* for an *Artix-7* target platform [39], [40] in Table III. Again, these results establish the relative lightweightness of our scheme. Note that it is difficult to estimate the hardware costs of proprietary technologies like *TrustZone* and *Secure Enclave*.

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF HARDWARE RESOURCE UTILIZATION BETWEEN TPM (FPGA IMPLEMENTATION) AND *PUFBind*

TPM Components	LUTs Used	Slice Registers Used
AES	4487 (7.08%)	1162 (0.92%)
SHA-1	1516	1587
Modular Exponentiation	1371	838
PRNG	348	205
System Components	612	699
RSA	22748 (35.88%)	24808 (19.56%)
TPM Cost (Total)	30842 (48.65%)	29120 (22.97%)
<i>PUFBind</i> Cost (Total)	1671 (2.64%)	1559 (1.23%)

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have proposed and successfully demonstrated a practical, non-invasive hardware-software co-design scheme that securely binds a given program binary to a target FPGA using a PUF and cryptographic hash function. The proposed

scheme eliminates the need for encryption and decryption of the program binary, thereby avoiding any performance penalties, and it does not require the storage of secret keys. Our experimental prototype shows that the scheme introduces minimal hardware overhead and zero runtime performance overhead, aside from a one-time authentication latency, while offering high scalability and flexibility. In future work, we aim to extend this scheme to RISC-V processors.

REFERENCES

- [1] RENESAS, Inc., “RISC-V 32 & 64-Bit MCUs and MPUs,” <https://www.renesas.com/us/en/products/microcontrollers-microprocessors/risc-v>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [2] C. Herder, M.-D. Yu, F. Koushanfar, and S. Devadas, “Physical Unclonable Functions and Applications: A Tutorial,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 102, no. 8, pp. 1126–1141, 2014.
- [3] R. Niranjana, “Security in FPGA-based Systems: Threats and Countermeasures,” <https://www.logic-fruit.com/blog/fpga/security-in-fpga-based-systems/>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [4] hex-rays, “IDA Pro: A powerful disassembler and a versatile debugger,” <https://hex-rays.com/ida-pro/>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [5] HHD Software Ltd., “Free Hex Editor Neo,” <https://hhdsoftware.com/free-hex-editor>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [6] I. Alshaer, B. Colombier, C. Deleuze, V. Beroulle, and P. Maistri, “Variable-Length Instruction Set: Feature or Bug?” in *2022 25th Euro-micro Conference on Digital System Design (DSD)*, 2022, pp. 464–471.
- [7] L. Rivière, Z. Najm, P. Rauzy, J.-L. Danger, J. Bringer, and L. Sauvage, “High precision fault injections on the instruction cache of ARMv7-M architectures,” in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*, 2015, pp. 62–67.
- [8] L. Keleman, D. Matic, M. Popović, and I. Kaštelan, “Secure firmware update in embedded systems,” in *2019 IEEE 9th International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE-Berlin)*, 2019, pp. 16–19.
- [9] D. Kushner, “The real story of stuxnet,” *IEEE Spectrum*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 48–53, 2013.
- [10] Fortinet, Inc., “SolarWinds Cyber Attack: An Overview,” <https://www.fortinet.com/resources/cyberglossary/solarwinds-cyber-attack>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [11] B. News, “Hezbollah pager devices linked to deadly explosions in september 2024,” <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cz04m913m49o>, 2024, accessed: December 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cz04m913m49o>
- [12] C. Cremers, A. Dax, and A. Naska, “Formal Analysis of SPDm: Security Protocol and Data Model version 1.2,” in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. Anaheim, CA: USENIX Association, 2023, pp. 6611–6628. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/cremers-spdm>
- [13] W. Arthur and D. Challener, *A Practical Guide to TPM 2.0: Using the Trusted Platform Module in the New Age of Security*, 1st ed. USA: Apress, 2015.
- [14] Intel, Inc., “Trusted Platform Module (TPM) Overview,” <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/business/enterprise-computers/resources/trusted-platform-module.html>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [15] Apple, Inc., “Apple Platform Security: Secure Enclave,” <https://support.apple.com/en-in/guide/security/sec59b0b31ff/web>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [16] Arm, “ARM TrustZone technology,” <https://developer.arm.com/documentation/100690/0200/ARM-TrustZone-technology>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [17] Texas Instruments Inc., “System Firmware Authentication and Decryption Requests,” https://software-dl.ti.com/tisci/esd/latest/6_topic_user_guides/authentication.html, 2016, Accessed: September 2024.
- [18] G. E. Suh, D. Clarke, B. Gassend, M. van Dijk, and S. Devadas, “AEGIS: architecture for tamper-evident and tamper-resistant processing,” in *Proceedings of the 17th Annual International Conference on Supercomputing*, ser. ICS ’03, 2003, p. 160–171.
- [19] Intel Corporation, “Intel Trust Domain Extensions (Intel TDX): Isolation, confidentiality, and integrity at the virtual machine (VM) level,” <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/tools/trust-domain-extensions/overview.html>, 2022, Accessed: September 2024.
- [20] B. Gassend, D. Clarke, M. van Dijk, and S. Devadas, “Silicon physical random functions,” in *Proc. of ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. New York, NY, USA: ACM Press, 2002, pp. 148–160.
- [21] Synopsys, “Enabling Authentication with PUF-based Security,” <https://www.synopsys.com/designware-ip/security-ip/cryptography-ip/puf.html>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [22] eMemory Technology Inc., “NeoPUF,” <https://www.ememory.com.tw/en-US/Products/Product?guid=19081314113656>, 2019, Accessed: September 2024.
- [23] PUFSecurity, “PUFcc: A PUF-based Crypto Coprocessor,” <https://www.pufsecurity.com/products/pufcc/>, 2019, Accessed: September 2024.
- [24] Synopsys, Inc., “Enabling Authentication with PUF-based Security,” <https://www.synopsys.com/designware-ip/security-ip/cryptography-ip/puf.html>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [25] —, “Synopsys PUF IP for Key Vault,” <https://www.synopsys.com/designware-ip/security-ip/cryptography-ip/puf/key-vault.html>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [26] —, “Firmware IP Protection: Protection against Reverse-Engineering, Counterfeiting/Cloning and Overbuilding,” <https://www.synopsys.com/designware-ip/security-ip/cryptography-ip/puf/firmware-ip-protection.html>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [27] Synopsys, “Synopsys PUF Base/Premium - Software,” <https://www.synopsys.com/dw/ipdir.php?ds=security-puf-ip-software>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [28] S.-W. Lee, M. Sakhani, Q. H. Le, O. H. Ahmed, M. Hosseinzadeh, A. M. Rahmani, and N. Bagheri, “Designing secure PUF-based authentication protocols for constrained environments,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2023.
- [29] S. Kumar, J. Guajardo, R. Maes, G.-J. Schrijen, and P. Tuyls, “Extended abstract: The butterfly PUF protecting IP on every FPGA,” in *Proc. of IEEE International Workshop on Hardware-Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*, June 2008, pp. 67–70.
- [30] J. H. Anderson, “A PUF design for secure FPGA-based embedded systems,” in *2010 15th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, 2010, pp. 1–6.
- [31] A. Wild and T. Güneysu, “Enabling SRAM-PUFs on Xilinx FPGAs,” in *2014 24th International Conference on Field Programmable Logic and Applications (FPL)*, 2014, pp. 1–4.
- [32] eMemory Technology Inc., “Achronix Adopts eMemory IP for FPGA Hardware Root of Trust,” <https://www.ememory.com.tw/en-US/News/News?guid=21042815130660>, 2021, Accessed: September 2024.
- [33] R. Maes, P. Tuyls, and I. Verbauwhede, “Low-overhead implementation of a soft decision helper data algorithm for sram pufs,” in *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems - CHES 2009*, C. Clavier and K. Gaj, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 332–347.
- [34] R. Canetti, B. Fuller, O. Paneth, L. Reyzin, and A. Smith, “Reusable Fuzzy Extractors for Low-Entropy Distributions,” *Journal of Cryptology*, vol. 34, no. 1, Nov 2020.
- [35] Synopsys, Inc., “Synopsys PUF FPGA-X Base/Premium,” <https://www.synopsys.com/dw/ipdir.php?ds=security-puf-fpga-x>, 2024, Accessed: September 2024.
- [36] Yageman, Carter, “A Python implementation of Fuzzy Extractor,” <https://github.com/carter-yagemann/python-fuzzy-extractor>, 2018, Accessed: September 2024.
- [37] I. Advanced Micro Devices, “PicoBlaze 8-bit Microcontroller,” <https://www.xilinx.com/products/intellectual-property/picoblaze.html#overview>, 2014, Accessed: September 2024.
- [38] H. E. Michail *et al.*, “On the exploitation of a high-throughput SHA-256 FPGA design for HMAC,” *ACM Trans. Reconfigurable Technol. Syst.*, vol. 5, no. 1, mar 2012.
- [39] M. D. James, “A Reconfigurable Trusted Platform Module,” Master’s thesis, USA, 2017, aAI28104420.
- [40] Z. Liu, Y. Wang, and T. Liu, “Research on the Implementation of Trusted Platform Module based on Reconfigurable Computing,” in *2010 International Conference on Anti-Counterfeiting, Security and Identification*, 2010, pp. 85–87.