

Multidimensional Strong PUF based on multifunctional thin films

Journées C2 2023 Oct. 15-20, 2023 Najac (France)

Benjamin Malthiery^{1,2} (ORCID <u>0000-0002-4299-4467</u>), Estelle Wagner¹ (<u>0000-0003-4837-483X</u>), Philippe Elbaz-Vincent² (<u>0000-0002-8629-3021</u>), Giacomo Benvenuti¹ (<u>0000-0002-8369-636X</u>)

1. 3D-Oxides SAS, 41 rue Henri Fabre, F-01630 Saint-Genis-Pouilly, France

2. Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, IF, 38000 Grenoble, France

16/10/2023

Journées C2 2023 - benjamin.malthiery@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr / benjamin.malthiery@3d-oxides.com

Outline



- I. Introduction
- II. Thesis workObjectivesExperimental results
- III. Outlook



I. Introduction



- Need: combat counterfeiting and usurpation at lower cost
 - Financial losses
 - Deteriorated brand image
 - Security & Public health problem
 - Data exposed to a malicious actor



<u>CC BY-SA 3.0</u> <u>DangApricot</u> (rotated & cropped)

- Context: IoT growth and process automatization
- Concept: Applying biometrics to objects to provide reliable IDs at lower cost

Conceptual definition



• Physical Unclonable Function (PUF) [1]



Use-cases and examples 1/2



- Optical PUF & Authentication
 - Authors: Pappu et al. (2002) [2]
 - Challenge: Relative position of the laser beam
 - Response: Speckle pattern





Use-cases and examples (2/2)



- SRAM PUF & Cryptographic key generation
 - Authors: Guajardo et al. (2007) [3]
 - Challenge: Position of the SRAM element
 - Response: Power up state



Power-up behavior of an SRAM cell [4][5]



16/10/2023

II. Thesis work – Objectives

- PUF advantages vs. Secure Elements:
 - Contained cost
 - Improved logistics by skipping key provisioning
- Identified limitations:
 - Reader cost
 - Clonability (SRAM) and modelling possibility [6]
- Project objective: Develop a new PUF design based on oxides thin films
 - Increase capacity of diversification
 - Miniaturized and integrated reader





Our approach

- Multifunctional oxides thin films
 - Multi-values basis
 - Multi-properties challenges
- Theoretical challenge space: L^{Z*N}
 - L: Number of distinguishable values
 - Z: Number of stimuli/properties
 - N: Number of points

16/10/2023

• Property: optical transmittance

Substrate Deposit 1 Deposit 2 Thin film dots' thickness AFM measurement (N)

μm

Deposit sum

Mask

Source 1 Source 2



Oxides thin films reflectivity at different wavelengths (L&Z)



142

0

Thickness (nm)

Experimental results – Macro PoC (1/2)



• Non-linearity of transmittance Thickness gradient (112 nm to 584 nm)





- Oscillations between 76% and 97%
- Interference effects decreases with increasing thickness (diffusion losses)

16/10/2023

Experimental results – Macro PoC (2/2)



• Reproducibility of transmission ratio





Arrangement of LED sources on the macroscopic system

Experimental results – Compact PoC (1/3)



- Shift to more compact prototype:
 - OLED display replaces LEDs
 - CMOS sensor replaces photodiodes
 - Peripherals controlled by Raspberry Pi
- Preliminary analyses:
 - RAW values & sub-pixel control



Photograph of the experimental set-up

a) With macro

Micro lens

Color filter

Photosite

_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

b) Without macro lens

lens

• Problems caused by changing components:



Bayer filter pattern (BGGR)→ Limit effect of thin film

Micro lens shifted on edges

 \rightarrow Crosstalk

Results for expus set to 378100us Average curve profile along rows Avg. pooling over Bayer filter Unit) (Arb. 008 200 pu Column Intensity 400 600 200 400 Row index Row index Delta variation over rows 0.01 Delta 0.00 -0.01200 400 Row index Refresh rate + Exposure time

→ Flickering phenomenon

3D-

16/10/2023

Experimental results – Compact PoC (3/3)

• Comparison of results with TiO₂ and LiNbO₃:

	Target	TiO ₂	LiNbO ₃
Uniformity (%)	50	51.4	48.7
Reliability (%)	100	91.1	94.5
Uniqueness (%)	50	48.5	45.0













- Results confined to the experimental prototype to date
- Several avenues for progress identified:
 - Custom CMOS sensor
 - FPGA/ASIC-based reader
 - Simulation tools (noise, response discrepancy)
 - Post-processing operations



Thank you for your attention









Journées C2 2023 - benjamin.malthiery@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr / benjamin.malthiery@3d-oxides.com

References



- [1] Maiti, Abhranil, Vikash Gunreddy, et Patrick Schaumont. « A Systematic Method to Evaluate and Compare the Performance of Physical Unclonable Functions ». In *Embedded Systems Design with FPGAs*, édité par Peter Athanas, Dionisios Pnevmatikatos, et Nicolas Sklavos, 245-67. New York, NY: Springer, 2013. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-1362-2_11</u>.
- [2] Pappu, Ravikanth, Ben Recht, Jason Taylor, et Neil Gershenfeld. « Physical One-Way Functions ». Science 297, n° 5589 (20 septembre 2002): 2026-30. <u>https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1074376</u>.
- [3] Guajardo, Jorge, Sandeep S. Kumar, Geert-Jan Schrijen, et Pim Tuyls. « FPGA Intrinsic PUFs and Their Use for IP Protection ». In *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems - CHES 2007*, édité par Pascal Paillier et Ingrid Verbauwhede, 63-80. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2007. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74735-2_5</u>.
- [4] Maes, Roel. Physically Unclonable Functions: Constructions, Properties and Applications. Physically Unclonable Functions: Constructions, Properties and Applications. Vol. 9783642413957, 2013. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41395-7</u>.
- [5] Zhang, Shen, Bin Gao, Dong Wu, Huaqiang Wu, et He Qian. « Evaluation and Optimization of Physical Unclonable Function (PUF) Based on the Variability of FinFET SRAM ». In 2017 International Conference on Electron Devices and Solid-State Circuits (EDSSC), 1-2. Hsinchu: IEEE, 2017. <u>https://doi.org/10.1109/EDSSC.2017.8126474</u>.
- [6] Helfmeier, Clemens, Christian Boit, Dmitry Nedospasov, et Jean-Pierre Seifert. « Cloning Physically Unclonable Functions ». In 2013 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware-Oriented Security and Trust (HOST), 1-6, 2013. <u>https://doi.org/10.1109/HST.2013.6581556</u>.

Supplementary Information





16/10/2023