# Universally Composable Secure Computation with (Malicious) Physically Uncloneable Functions

Rafail Ostrovsky

Alessandra Scafuro

UCLA (USA)

Università di Salerno (ITALY)

Ivan Visconti

**Akshay Wadia** 

Università di Salerno (ITALY)

UCLA (USA)

## UC Security [Can01]

Impossible when relying on computational assumptions only.

Achieved under various relaxed notions:

```
relaxed security
(CRS [CLOS02], angels [PS04], super-polynomial time simulation [BS05])
```

- relaxed concurrency (timing [KLP05], bounded concurrency [Lin03,PR03,Pas04])
- physical assumptions (tamper-proof hardware [Kat07,CGS08,MS08,GKR08,GIS+10,DKMQ11])

# Physically Uncloneable Functions (PUFs) [PAP01,PRTG02]



A physical process generates a physical object that behaves similarly to a random function.

Generating two correlated objects is considered to be unfeasible.

#### **PUFs in Protocols**

#### comparison with Random Oracles:

- random oracles are always publicly accessible
  - > PUFs can be queried only when physically available
- random oracles can be programmed/simulated
  - not clear that the same can be done with PUFs.
- random oracles are honest/trusted
  - > should we trust PUFs produced by adversaries?

#### **PUFs in Protocols**

#### comparison with Tamper-Proof Hardware Tokens:

- Tokens are programmable/simulatable
  - PUFs are unpredictable only
- Tokens are constructed to behave as black boxes
  - > PUFs are not necessarily black boxes
- Tokens are cloneable
  - > PUFs are uncloneable
- Tokens can be stateful
  - PUFs are stateless

## **UC Security with PUFs**

C., Brzuska, M. Fischlin, H. Schröder, S. Katzenbeisser: Physically Uncloneable Functions in the Universal Composition Framework, CRYPTO 2011 ([BFSK11])

- minimalist model (uncloneability and unpredictability)
- PUFS are non-simulatable
- Unconditional UC Secure Computation
- only honest PUFs
- only honest access to PUFs





#### **UC Security with PUFs**

BFSK11: honest generation of PUFs only



o is it safe to assume that a real-world adversary can not be able to produce a physical object that looks like a PUF but that internally includes a malicious behavior?

probably no...



## UC Security with MALICIOUS PUFs

R. Ostrovsky, A. Scafuro, I. Visconti, A. Wadia Universally Composable Secure Computation with (Malicious) Physically Uncloneable Functions, http://eprint.iacr.org/2012/143

 we give a new formulation of UC security where an adversary is allowed to have her own malicious PUF generation procedure

 we show that UC Security is possible in our new formulation by relying on computational assumptions (in presence of PUFs)

#### UC Security with Malicious Queries to PUFs

[BFSK11]: honest access to PUFs only



- is it safe to assume that an adversary is not able to query a honest PUF using a different physical process?
  - perhaps no...



#### o consequence:

- with PUFs, assuming that a simulator can see adversary's queries gives the same controversial flavour of non-standard non-black-box assumptions as the knowledge of exponent assumption (KEA)
- ➤ with UC security this is even more controversial since the simulator does not know the code of the environment

#### UC Security with Malicious Queries to PUFs

R. Ostrovsky, A. Scafuro, I. Visconti, A. Wadia Universally Composable Secure Computation with (Malicious) Physically Uncloneable Functions http://eprint.iacr.org/2012/143

surprisingly we show that we can achieve UC security in presence of malicious queries to PUFs....

unconditionally! (same claim of [BFSK11] but modelling a stronger adversary!)

#### UC Security with Malicious Queries to PUFs

# THANKS A LOT FOR YOUR PATIENCE!!!!!