

Armored Core of PKI: Removing Signing Keys for CA via Efficient and Trusted Physical Certification

Xiaolin Zhang*, Chenghao Chen[†], Kailun Qin*, Yuxuan Wang*, Shipei Qu*
Tengfei Wang* Chi Zhang* and Dawu Gu*

*Shanghai Jiao Tong University

[†]Shanghai University

Abstract—The signing key protection for Certificate Authorities (CAs) remains a critical concern in PKI. These keys can be exposed by carefully designed attacks or operational errors even today. Traditional protections fail to eliminate such risk since attackers always manage to find an exploit path to capture the digital key leakage. Even a single successful attack can compromise the security. This everlasting dilemma motivates us to consider removing CA’s signing keys and propose ARMORED CORE, a PKI security extension using the trusted binding of Physically Unclonable Function (PUF) for certificate operations. By eliminating explicit signing keys, it makes key exposure attacks impossible.

In ARMORED CORE, we design a set of PUF-based X.509v3 TLS certificate functions for CAs, where they generate physically trusted “signatures” without using a fixed key. We formally prove the existential unforgeability of the certificates. We propose the first PUF transparency mechanism to effectively monitor the calling behaviors of PUF. We also provide an open-sourced implementation where ARMORED CORE is integrated into real-world PKI systems like Let’s Encrypt Pebble CA and Certbot. The results show that it achieves key removal without any additional performance overhead. It offers a more trusted basis for PKI security through efficient physical operations with compatible functions.

1. Introduction

Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) systems heavily rely on Certificate Authorities (CAs) who sign and issue digital certificates, providing the binding of a cryptographic public key to an entity. Protecting the long-term signing keys of CAs is crucial in PKI. If attackers were to obtain these keys, they could easily produce valid certificates for their unauthorized malicious domains. A single leaked signing key is sufficient to compromise the entire PKI ecosystem.

Despite their significance, keeping signing keys secret is challenging in the real world. In 2011, the attacker stole the signing key of DigiNotar [1] and issued 531 rogue certificates for famous domains like `google.com`. Trustico leaked signing keys [2] via email in 2018, resulting in 23,000 Symantec certificates being compromised. The code-signing keys of Nvidia [3], Samsung [4], and MSI [5] were also leaked in recent years. Also, we notice that at least 13

CVEs can cause the direct exposure of CA’s signing keys. Flawed implementations [6], [7], [8], CA misconfigurations [9], [10], [11], and insecure privileges [12], [13] could all lead to the exposure. Attackers sometimes only need simple exploitation skills, such as conducting keyword searches [14], [15] on GitHub or Docker Hub.

The incidents and vulnerabilities indicate that the protection of these long-term digital keys of CA is actually a weak link in the entire infrastructure, which is error-prone in practice. The mitigation usually fall into two types: **split the key** or **seal the key**. On the one hand, threshold signature [16], [17], [18], [19], [20] can be used to split the signing key. However, the involvement of multiple signers (CA) would increase the management burden, and distributed operations can be time-consuming and unreliable. On the other hand, modern PKI vendors prefer to adopt Hardware Security Modules (HSM) [21] or Trusted Execution Environments (TEE) to seal the keys. However, since not all developers and administrators are security-savvy, attackers can exploit vulnerabilities in HSM SDK [22], system configurations [23] and weak permissions [24] to bypass the protection and extract the keys. Side-channel attacks [25], [26], [27], passive attacks [28], and newly emerged attacks like GhostRace [29] and Gofetch [30] can also deduce the secret bytes.

This ongoing cycle of “**expose-protect-expose again**” reveals that, as long as a digital signing key exists, there is a possibility of it being exposed by a carefully designed attack chain. What’s worse, attackers only need one successful exploitation to acquire the key value, they can issue tons of certificates with almost no limits. This dilemma motivates us to reflect on its very root cause, hence the research question in this paper: *Can we remove the digital signing key for CA in PKI to provide complete resistance against various attacks and more trusted certificate binding?*

In this paper, we propose ARMORED CORE¹, a PKI security enhancement that utilizes Physically Unclonable Function (PUF)-based trusted binding for certification. PUF [31] is a hardware security primitive that leverages random manufacturing variations to map input challenges to unique responses. It has been widely adopted by top semiconductor enterprises including Xilinx [32], NXP [33], Intel [34],

1. Armored Core is a popular video game series developed by From-Software

Samsung [35], Nvidia [36], etc. Our core insight is that PUF provides **independent trust** and **physical authenticity** itself. We treat PUF as a unique keyless physical signing function instead of a key generator as in other works. Unlike TEE, HSM or any other known techniques, PUF enhances security by using its intrinsic structure that internalizes physical randomness, instead of by sealing an artificially provisioned key. Therefore, we can **remove the signing key** for CA by PUF-based certificate operations, which makes key exposure impossible. Various key extraction attacks will be in vain as their target has been fundamentally removed.

However, ensuring compatibility with the current PKI systems while fully leveraging the advantages of PUF is not a trivial task. In ARMORED CORE, we make **minimal modifications** to partial fields of X.509v3 with PUF-based endorsements to ensure interoperability. We design the first PUF transparency logging mechanism that records the PUF invocation entries on append-only loggers. This mechanism can be deployed with Certificate Transparency (CT) to enable monitoring of PUF usage and mitigate potential abuses. ARMORED CORE treats the installed PUF instances in CA as the schedulable units. The resource pooling for PUF can decouple CA's operations with actual hardware, making the system **PUF-agnostic** and deployment-friendly.

Introducing PUF to PKI can effectively end the “attack-defense” loop of signing key exposure. While PUF may bring some potential vulnerabilities, exploiting them is troublesome in practice and less rewarding for attackers since there is no key at all. First, PUF is unclonable and its raw interface is **not accessible** because it is usually integrated into chips or secure modules. The attackers must use PUF on that specific server to generate valid certificates. Second, the modeling attack on a 128/256-bit PUF needs massive challenge-response pairs (CRPs), and the trained model only works for **one** targeted instance. CAs can install many PUF instances due to their cost-efficiency. Besides, they can randomize the PUF usage to disrupt the CRP collection.

ARMORED CORE is systematically designed to be compatible with existing PKI. Its workflow and APIs align with standard systems. Vendors only need to switch to platforms with built-in PUF hardware without reconstructing the whole system. In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- **New Research Question:** We raise and address a novel research question: is it possible to remove the signing key of CA in PKI? The solution to it can help make various key extraction attacks ineffective and establish a more trusted PKI ecosystem.
- **New Security Enhancement for PKI:** We propose ARMORED CORE, the first extended security design of PKI on PUF-based certifications. It enables CAs to endorse public keys based on physically trusted binding, which fundamentally eliminates the risk of signing key exposure.
- **First PUF Transparency Mechanism:** We provide the first PUF transparency logging mechanism in ARMORED CORE. It allows the public audits of PUF usage. It enables efficient certificate validation and

helps to avoid the potential PUF abuse.

- **Complete Open-sourced Prototype:** We implement an open-sourced prototype [37] that is integrated into real-world PKI software including Let's Encrypt Pebble, Certbot, and Google Trillian. We also provide a RISC-V hardware prototype with a built-in PUF module. The results show that ARMORED CORE achieves effective signing key removal for CA and introduces no additional overhead.

Scope. The general mitigation of malicious CAs is out of scope. We only focus on addressing the signing key exposure problem, instead of the misbehaviors, *e.g.*, certificate misissuance, caused by the corruption of entire CA facilities. Note that this work aims to build a compatible security extension on PUF for modern PKI architectures, which is different from the studies on PUF-based protocols.

2. Background & Motivation

2.1. Signing Key Exposure in PKI

The exposure of CA's long-term signing key is one of the worst-case scenarios. A surprising fact is that such serious incidents have occurred from time to time in the past decade.

In the Web PKI, there have been several disclosed signing key exposure incidents including DigiNotar in 2011 [1], CNNIC in 2014 [38], Lenovo Superfish in 2015 [39] and Trustico in 2018 [2]. In the code-signing PKI, vendors sign their digital products for protections. Bit9 [40], D-link [41], Nvidia [3], Samsung [4], MediaTek [42] and MSI [5] have all encountered the exposure of their code-signing keys. There could be more undisclosed incidents as they can harm the business interests of the involved companies.

The reasons of these incidents are not purely technical. Careless operators, sloppy management and even state conflicts can result in the exposure or theft of the signing keys. The technical weakness, on the other side, are rare to be seen today due to the improved security infrastructure. However, they have not disappeared yet. We summarize the CVEs that can cause the *direct* exposure of CA's signing keys in Figure 1. We roughly classify them by the underlying causes.

- **Insecure implementation:** Flawed code logic [6] and uncensored logging output [7] in PKI software or crypto libraries [8] allow attackers to download the key [12], [13].
- **Vulnerable configuration:** Developers erroneously configure the privileges of sensitive directories on PKI servers, making the signing key file publicly readable [9], [10], [11].
- **Insufficient key protection:** PKI vendors fail to adhere to the guidelines of CB/A Forum and store the private signing keys without protections [43].

One can notice that there is **no** relations between these CVEs, even in the same class. For example, CVE-2015-7328 is caused by the Puppet Server's vulnerabilities; CVE-2018-17612 involves writing the private key into a public




Figure 1: PKI/CA Technical Vulnerabilities that lead to the *direct* exposure of CAs’ private signing keys

pem file; CVE-2020-28053 is due to a wrongly configured system command on key exporting.

Given the unrelated nature of the causes of these vulnerabilities, it is difficult to prevent key exposure incidents, no matter whether they are caused by technical or non-technical factors. Moreover, sometimes they can be combined to create more covert attacks. Manually identifying them is impractical and the risk of key exposure in PKI/CA has not diminished. In summary, we give the following observation.

Observation 2.1

As many real incidents and CVEs have shown, the exposure risk of private signing keys of CA continues to persist. Even today, many non-technical and technical reasons can lead to the (in)direct leakage and theft.

2.2. Existing Mitigations and Their limitations

The signing key exposure of CA is a loose cannon that can subvert the security of the whole system. Both academia and industry have developed several mitigations.

Existing Mitigations. Decentralized PKI [44] can prevent the single point of failure, where threshold signature and blockchain are two common techniques [16], [45]. The real-world PKI vendors like Let’s Encrypt, WoSign and Digicert prefer to use HSM or TEE to isolate the key and signing operation. This measure makes it difficult to directly leak the key, which is effective against simple attacks [9], [13] and has been applied in real systems for years. Moreover, the root CAs are offline and unavailable for normal users. It is harder to steal the signing key on an isolated server. These keys seem to have been well protected in technical manners.

Limitations. However, as long as an attacker obtains one signing key of any CA, it will be enough to cause catastrophic results. Unfortunately, not all CAs are offline, *e.g.*, some intermediate CAs, and the protections may become useless when the non-technical weaknesses are exploited. Even with the proposed mitigations, the key exposure incidents can still happen, as Observation 2.1 highlights.

Decentralized PKIs require a complete overhaul of the architecture, which is incompatible and could bring much overhead [44], [46]. HSM and TEE face many real-world attacks [27] such as side-channel attacks [26], [47] and physical attacks [48], [49], [50] on different platforms [25], [30]. Insecure SDK implementations [22], weak permissions [24] and data leaks [23], [51] can all cause the leakage of sealed keys. Attackers could even recover the keys [28] passively only using the signatures.

Dilemma. Modern PKI systems have become increasingly complex with many interdependent components. It is thankless to ensure the permanent security of a signing key across all links. Existing protections reduce but not eliminate the risk since a digital key is **always needed**. The above vulnerabilities, combined with non-technical factors, can be **gadgets** to establish a carefully designed attack vector for a specific PKI system. Besides, the current situation is more favorable for attackers. With a single successful exploitation of exposing the key, they can generate unauthorized certificates almost anywhere. Thus, we have this observation.

Observation 2.2

The existing mitigations are difficult to eliminate the risk of signing key exposure. Attackers can employ targeted attacks to break the defenses using technical or non-technical vulnerabilities. One successful exploitation is enough to freely issue fraudulent certificates.

Signing key protection had been a cliché in the 50 years development of PKI, but it seems never having an effective solution to end the loop of “**expose-protect-expose again**”. The fact that the CA’s long-term signing key is used digitally cause the possibility of its exposure. This motivates us to think: *Can we remove the signing key for CA/PKI? How to ensure the authenticity after the removal? How can the trust be established without relying on a long-term private key?*

3. PUF for PKI: New Way to Build Trust

PUF Basics. PUF is developed from the physical one-way function [31]. It is a hardware primitive that utilizes minor environmental variations in manufacturing and incorporates physical randomness into its structure. For example, Arbiter PUF (APUF) [52] (Figure 2a) compares the arrival delays of competing paths in an arbiter circuit to derive random responses. SRAM PUF [53] leverages the start-up state of SRAM cells (Figure 2b) that exhibit random “0” or “1” values due to the difference in MOSFETs.




Figure 2: Arbiter PUF and SRAM PUF Illustration

PUF can randomly map a given challenge C to a response R by such structures. Therefore, each PUF instance is unique and has a distinct set of CRPs, rendering duplication nearly impossible. PUF can be divided into strong and weak PUF [53], [54] by the number of generated CRPs.

PUF in the real world. Top MCUs manufacturers and FPGA companies have all developed their commercialized PUFs [32], [33] in the last decade. Several PUF-specialized companies also emerged, such as Verayo, Intrinsic-ID [55], ICTK [56] in Korea, and PUFtech in China. PUF has already been quietly integrated in various real-world products, such as Intel SGX [34], IoT [57], medical wearables [58] and USIM [59]. With ongoing standardization efforts [60], [61], PUF are experiencing widespread deployment and becoming a basic component in hardware ecosystems.

The most common application of PUF today is key generation. A PUF response can be treat as a root secret to derive a recoverable private key. However, this usage does not provide stronger security guarantees than traditional protections in §2.2. The PUF-based signing key may be deduced [27], [28] since it is still used explicitly. Once the key gets exposed, the entire system still becomes compromised.

Armoring PKI with PUF. The research on PUF in real-world applications has been given attention in recent years [62], [63], [64], [65]. Unlike any other key protection-based techniques, such as HSM and TEE, PUF harnesses the true physical randomness to establish trust **without keys**. Even its manufacturers cannot control or predict how a PUF instance will map a challenge (Figure 2). PUF has potentials to remove the signing keys for CA. However, no previous research have discussed this. We give the following insights to validate the feasibility.

- *Why can PUF remove the signing key for CA?* PUF genuinely binds the digital behaviors to that installed entity. PUF can offer physical authenticity to its responses. Therefore, PUF can perform a **signing-like function**. It ensures the physical binding between the responses and the actual CA, whereas the signature only imply the legitimacy of the key without ensuring **who** holds that key. Note that this does not intend to replace the public key cryptosystem. It provides an alternative to generate trusted endorsement for CAs. Then the traditional signing keys can be removed.

- *Is PUF technically sound in cryptography?* The value of PUF in cryptography has been recognized in many studies [54], [66], [67], [68]. It exhibits a similar style with a random oracle or Pseudo-Random Function (PRF), except that its randomness is from unique structures rather than predetermined keys. PUF has measurable properties like randomness and uniqueness, which are highly desirable in cryptography. PUF can provide a new way to establish cryptographic obfuscations. In other words, PUF itself can be a cryptographic primitive.

- *Does PUF have unified metrics?* Despite there are various PUF designs on different techniques, PUF presents a unified abstract CRP interface. Also, with the international standards for PUF [60], [61] being released, PUF manufacturers are expected to adhere to specific testing requirements.

They must subject their PUFs to regular testing, ensuring compliance with the standards.

In summary, PUF provides a keyless signing functionality on independent physical trust, which has never been achieved by techniques like HSM or TEE. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to offer these deeper insights about PUF, beyond key generation or authentication. In PKI, CAs can use PUF to ensure the authenticity and remove the keys. They can establish the new physical trust without relying a private key.

4. Design Overview

In this paper, we propose ARMORED CORE that armors CA with PUF-based certifications to fully reap the benefits of PUF for PKI. It can narrow the gap between the rising PUF industry and less developed PUF applications.

4.1. Design Challenges

In a nutshell, our work aims to remove the private signing key of CA through PUF. However, the characteristics of PKI systems make it more difficult to design compatible functions using PUF than in other networks. The following challenges immediately arise.

CH1: Non-queryable PUF of CA. CAs are usually offline for clients. The clients cannot interact with CA in a normal PKI workflow. Consequently, the PUF instances installed in a CA are non-queryable for them. And PUF can only be invoked by CA, which is logically equivalent to the private signing key but with stronger physical guarantees. Therefore, the clients cannot challenge the corresponding PUF instance to verify the PUF-based endorsement in certificates. Other participants also cannot know the PUF status, or the legitimacy of PUF calling behaviors for certificate issuance. This leads us to the next design challenge.

CH2: Pre-storage of CRPs on Clients. Considering the non-queryable PUF of CAs, a straightforward way [69] to enable the real-time certificate verification for clients is to have them pre-store sufficient CRPs. They can compare the responses in certificates with the ones locally stored. However, this approach is not suitable for the PKI because clients cannot anticipate which domain they will access or which PUF instance the CA will use. Besides, the storage of excessive CRPs for each certificate can cause large overhead and potential security issues if they get leaked.

CH3: Hardware-bound CA functions. The introduction of PUF to PKI makes the functions of CA tightly coupled with a hardware security primitive. This is different from any other hardware-based techniques like using HSM or TPM for key protection. We understand that this change may impact the usability of our design in practice. Therefore, it is necessary to consider how PUF should be integrated into CA in the design of relevant functions. Also, it may take time for PUF to become adopted by PKI vendors and embedded in the worldwide hardware infrastructure.




Figure 3: Architecture of ARMORED CORE. Colored areas represent the differences from the standard PKI functions.

4.2. System Architecture

The architecture of ARMORED CORE is depicted in Figure 3. It consists of four actors: CA, Domain, Client and Transparency Logger, which aligns with modern PKI systems. In this work, we reuse the loggers in the existing certificate transparency (CT) infrastructure of PKI. CT is a public log system introduced by Google [70], which had been standardized and adopted by most PKI vendors in their systems. It requires certificates to be logged to provide accountability for CAs. These append-only loggers are a group of semi-public servers that are usually maintained by CA vendors² in practice. CAs here are assumed to be equipped with multiple PUF instances. Other actors maintain the same settings as in standard PKI systems.

ARMORED CORE does not introduce new entities or change the main PKI/CA workflows as shown in Figure 3. The key difference lies in that CAs issue certificates (§6.1) using PUF-based operations (§5.1). The clients finish certificate verification (§6.3) with PUF invocation entries in the transparency loggers (§5.2). ARMORED CORE reuses the current infrastructure for smooth integration in various PKIs, such as Web PKI, code-signing PKI and email PKI.

We first introduce the basic components of our design in §5. The steps in Figure 3 are elaborated in §6.

4.3. Threat Model

The following attacks can cover all types of technical exploits that a real-world adversary Adv can launch, even including physical attacks against server machines.

- A1 (Channel attacks)** Perform typical network attacks in the Dolev-Yao model [71]. Specifically, Adv can eavesdrop, intercept, modify and replay messages in the open channel.
- A2 (Remote attacks)** Abuse insecure configurations, flawed implementations and other vulnerabilities of CA servers to dump the signing key.
- A3 ((Semi) invasive physical attacks)** Use (semi) invasive measures including power side-channel analysis, fault injection, and chip delayering to deduce or physically extract the fused secrets.

2. <https://certificate.transparency.dev/logs/>

- A4 (PUF modeling attacks)** Collect a large number of raw PUF CRPs from the messages transmitted in the public network. These CRPs can then be used to train a PUF model by machine learning or deep learning techniques [72], [73], [74].

The objective of Adv is to obtain the signing key of the targeted CA using the partial or all attacks above. This work does not intend to detect or mitigate compromises of the entire CA, as other research has effectively addressed that aspect [75], [76], [77], [78]. Our primary focus is the security of the CA’s signing key itself.

5. Armored Core Components

Before fleshing out ARMORED CORE’s workflow, we first introduce its key components in this section. These components serve as the basis of the PKI functions in §6.

Primitives. We denote $puf(\cdot)$ as the abstract oracle of PUF where $C \leftarrow puf(R), C \in \mathcal{C}, R \in \mathcal{R}$. Here, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R} represent the challenge and response domain, respectively. A detailed definition of $puf(\cdot)$ is given in §7.1. Let $\{0, 1\}^*$ be the set of all bit strings, and $X \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ means the random selection of a string X from $\{0, 1\}^n$. The notation $|X|$ represents the length of X . For $X, Y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $X||Y$ denotes their concatenation, and $X \oplus Y$ is their bitwise XOR result. $H_k(\cdot)$ denotes a keyed cryptographic hash function, i.e., $H(k||\cdot)$.

5.1. PUF-based Certificates

In this work, we assume that a CA with name N_{CA} are installed with a set of PUF $\mathcal{P} = \{puf_i, \dots, puf_n\}$. CA will use one of them to establish physically trusted binding of a domain N_D to its public key in a certificate. Certain fields in an X.509v3 formatted certificate $cert_D$ need to be changed as depicted in Figure 4.

5.1.1. Signature field. Let $cert_D$ be the certificate entries to be signed, including the domain name, public key, issuer name and other fields. The signature field sig_D is usually calculated as $sig_D = \text{SIGN}(cert_D)$ where SIGN is a standard cryptographic signing algorithm. In PUF-based certificates, $sig_D = R_D \oplus H(R_{CA}||h_{cD}||h_{cA})$ where $R_D = puf(h_{cD})$ and $h_{cD} = H(cert_D||ts||N_{CA})$. It means that N_{CA} picks a PUF instance to physically “sign” $cert_D$ with timestamp ts and its name. R_{CA} and h_{cA} are the




Figure 4: PUF-based Certificate Entries

endorsements for N_{CA} from the higher-level CA in the chain of trust, which is detailed in §5.1.4.

This design provides a physically trusted proof for N_{CA} to bind the public key to N_D using PUF. This modified field indicates that it is the CA itself, rather than a signing key holder, has genuinely approved and conducted the issuance.

5.1.2. Public key field. The public key field pk in $Cert_D$ remains unchanged. The domain still uses its own key pair to establish TLS connections with the clients. For $Cert_{CA}$, N_{CA} calculates an XOR-based accumulated proof π_{CA} to set this field where $\pi_{CA} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n puf_i(C_{CA})$, and $puf_{1,\dots,n}$ are its installed PUF instances, C_{CA} is an identity challenge arbitrarily chosen by it. The purpose of π_{CA} is to allow the client to verify whether the instance puf_k used to generate R_D is included in the set of PUFs of N_{CA} . The detailed functions are given in §6.3.

This proof is essentially the “public key” for PUF because it also serve as the unique public information to a private credential (PUF) of the CA, just like a traditional public key. π_{CA} combines the identity response of each PUF instance on that CA in a constant size. CA can easily update it by XORing the corresponding response when there are new instances or removed ones.

5.1.3. Extension field. The X.509v3 format includes an extension field ext to allow PKI developers to customize the certificates. In ARMORED CORE, we utilize this field to store a public response $RP_k = puf_k(C_{CA})$ where puf_k is the PUF instance used by the issuer to generate sig . The complementary part $RP_k^{\sim} = \pi_{CA} \oplus RP_k$ is placed in the puf_k ’s invocation entry (§5.2). The client (verifier) can use RP_k^{\sim} and RP_k to perform the PUF inclusion proof (§6.3).

5.1.4. Certificate chain. We consider a four-level certificate chain with a root CA N_{CA_0} , two intermediate CAs N_{CA_1}, N_{CA_2} and domain N_D . The modified fields of certificates are given in Table 1.

In Table 1, $h_{CA_0} = H(\text{cert}_{CA_0} || \text{ts} || N_{CA_0})$, $R_{CA_0} = puf(h_{CA_0})$, and $h_{CA_1} = H(R_{CA_0} || h_{CA_1} || h_{CA_0})$ and so on. The sig field R_{CA_0} in $Cert_{CA_0}$ is generated using

TABLE 1: Partial Fields in PUF-based Certificate Chain

Name	sig	pk	ext
N_{CA_0}	$R_{CA_0} \oplus h_{CA_0}$	π_{CA_0}	-
N_{CA_1}	$R_{CA_1} \oplus H(R_{CA_0} h_{CA_1} h_{CA_0})$	π_{CA_1}	RP for π_{CA_0}
N_{CA_2}	$R_{CA_2} \oplus H(R_{CA_1} h_{CA_2} h_{CA_1})$	π_{CA_2}	RP for π_{CA_1}
N_D	$R_D \oplus H(R_{CA_2} h_{CD} h_{CA_2})$	pk_D	RP for π_{CA_2}

the root CA’s own PUF instance, which is similar to self-signing in traditional constructions. Here we use PUF and cryptographic hash function to establish the chain of trust instead of signatures. A client can use the root certificate provisioned in their devices to verify the “signed” certificate chain all the way down to $Cert_D$. It will combine the invocation entries to complete the verification (§6.3).

Compatibility with X.509v3. PUF-based certificates only modify three mentioned fields while adhering to the other specifications of the X.509v3 format. For domains, only one field (sig) is changed from the traditional certificates. ARMORED CORE provides the extra benefit of physical trust through PUF for certificate operations without compromising compatibility with existing systems.

5.2. Transparency Logging of PUF

Transparency Loggers. We reuse the CT loggers to implement the PUF transparency. Each logger (\mathcal{Lgr}) has its own key pair (pk_L, sk_L) . We do not require them to be equipped with PUFs since this would greatly hinders the compatibility. However, if loggers do have PUFs installed, ARMORED CORE welcome this configuration and provides a customized attestation function in §6.2.

PUF Invocation Entry. We design the PUF invocation entry to capture the calling behavior of PUF instances in CA. Specifically, we define the entry as $I = \langle Z, T \rangle$ where the description tuple Z is composed of the CA name N_{CA} , invoking timestamp ts (same as §5.1.1), PUF manufacturer name N_P , and the complementary proof RP^{\sim} , i.e., $Z = \{N_{CA}, N_P, ts, RP^{\sim}\}$. The tag $T = H_R(Z || \text{Cert})$ where R is the PUF response in sig . Each time CA invokes some PUF instance puf_k , it generates an invocation entry I to record this event. Then CA uploads $Cert$ with I to the transparency loggers \mathcal{Lgr} .

\mathcal{Lgr} will perform attestation protocols with CA (§6.2) to verify the entries. After the verification, they arrange these entries by the chaining relations shown in Figure 5. They update each T as $T = H_R(Z || \text{Cert} || T_h)$ where T_h is from the higher-level CA’s PUF entry. This hash chain organizes the entries in the same order as the corresponding certificate chain. \mathcal{Lgr} can compress them to save storage cost since some fields like N_P may be repeated in the same chain.

The transparency logging for PUF is necessary but never proposed by other PUF-based works [79], [80], [81]. It enables the public audits of PUF’s usage and can effectively addresses CH1, CH2 by being integrated into CT. As a result, clients can verify the PUF-based certificates and the inclusion of PUF with minimal extra overhead. The role of




Figure 5: Hash Chain of PUF Invocation Entries

\mathcal{L}_{grs} here extends beyond that in traditional CT, which helps elevating the transparency mechanism in the ecosystem.

Integration into CT. The PUF transparency mechanism described above does not necessitate any modifications to the original workflows. It simply requires the additional storage of PUF invocation entries for CT. To accomplish this, CT loggers can utilize another Merkle Tree to store these entries separately. The integration of this mechanism is expected to be straightforward and does not require extensive modifications to the existing functions.

5.3. PUF Pooling for CA

In practice, a CA can install multiple PUF instances from different vendors. To effectively manage these instances, we propose the concept of abstracting the installed PUFs on the CA as a pool of PUF resources, similar to the pooling mechanism in cloud computing. It can act as a proxy layer between the CA software and the PUF hardware.

CA can treat PUF instances as schedulable resources. Then it can sign multiple certificates for parallelization or randomize the usage of PUF instances for privacy concerns. This mechanism helps decouple the hardware and the CA functions built upon them, thereby addressing CH3. This work is the first to apply the concept of pooling to PUF and we will formalize it in future work.

6. ARMORED CORE Functions

The components above serve as the heart of ARMORED CORE. The actual functions of PKI in Figure 3 are built upon them. We now specify these functions in chronological order including certificate issuance, transparency logging, certificate validation and rotation.

6.1. Certificate Issuance

① **Domain validation.** ARMORED CORE does not modify the domain validation (DV) procedure of the original PKI system. The domain N_D generates a standard certificate signing request (CSR) using its private key sk_D and submits it to the intermediate CA N_{CA_2} . The CA then performs common HTTP-based or DNS-based DV protocols to verify the applicant's authority.

② **Certificate generation.** After N_{CA_2} confirms the identity of N_D , it invokes the PUF interface formed by pooling multiple instances to generate sig_D (§5.1.1) according to the submitted domain public key pk_D and other information. This operation ensures that the issuance is genuinely conducted by the CA itself instead of some entity in possession of that signing key. N_{CA_2} also provides RP in ext_D (§5.1.3) for the inclusion proof π_{CA_2} (§5.1.2) to show which PUF instance is used for sig_D . It then assembles the complete certificate $Cert_D$ for the domain.

Meanwhile, N_{CA_2} generates the corresponding PUF invocation entry I_D (§5.2). It will upload both $Cert_D$ and I_D to a logger \mathcal{L}_{gr} for transparency auditing after the issuance.

6.2. Transparency Logging & CA Attestation

③ **Data logging.** The distributed loggers maintain an append-only log powered by Merkle Trees. They record certificates and PUF entries in separate trees by reusing the same mechanism of CT. Both of them can be indexed by the hash fingerprint of the certificate. We assume that the loggers are synchronized within a rough time window. Note that the only change to the CT functionality is the additional logging of a new data type, *i.e.*, PUF invocation entry.

④ **PUF Attestation.** We design an attestation protocol that enables \mathcal{L}_{grs} to verify the used PUF instances of CA, as illustrated in Figure 6. This protocol is conducted offline with the certificate submission from N_{CA_2} . Loggers can periodically to execute this protocol to ensure PUF's integrity. The steps are described as follows.




Figure 6: Attestation Protocol for the PUF instances of CA.

- N_{CA_2} generates a nonce $n_1 \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ and sends it with the submitted certificate $Cert_D$ and entry I_D .
- \mathcal{L}_{gr} extracts the certificate entries crt_D and ts . It then calculates $hc_D = H(crt_D || ts || N_{CA_2})$, which is equivalent to the challenge used to generate sig_D . \mathcal{L}_{gr} computes $m_1 = H(hc_D || n_1) \oplus R_l$ where $R_l \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$.
- The logger selects $n_2 \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ and sends (m_1, n_2) to N_{CA_2} , along with a signature signed by sk_L .
- After verifying the signature, N_{CA_2} can recover hc_D by itself and uses PUF to re-obtain R_D that is equivalent to the one used in sig_D . It also recovers R_l from m_1 using hc_D, n_1 .

- N_{CA_2} sends $m_2 = H(R_l || I_D || n_2) \oplus R_D$ to $\mathcal{L}gr$. The logger checks I_D and recovers R_D to complete the verification.

This protocol makes CAs re-invoke their PUF instances to prove their integrity to the loggers. Its purpose is to hold CAs accountable for their PUF “signed” certificates. $\mathcal{L}grs$ can retrieve R_D to perform the certificate validation, which will be soon introduced in §6.3.

This protocol can be executed periodically. R_l , which is obtained in the first execution described above, can serve as a *ticket* for future attestation session of Cert_D . It can be used as the nonce n_1 of the next round. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{L}grs$ are also equipped with PUF like CAs, this protocol can be transformed to enable mutual PUF-based attestation for both parties. This version is provided in Appendix A.

6.3. Certificate Validation

We now show how to verify the certificates (and the invocation entries) in ARMORED CORE. This procedure can co-exist with original mechanism as a security enhancement.

⑤ **Verifying the domain certificate.** Since the signature field is changed by PUF-based operations, the verification of certificate chain is accordingly changed. A validator (a client or a logger $\mathcal{L}gr$) will verify the integrity and authenticity of the domain certificate Cert_D combined with the PUF invocation entries stored. It also confirms the inclusion proof of the used PUF instance. The revocations, validity period and other regular constraints are checked as usual.

Algorithm 1 provides pseudocode for the validation process. The validator starts from the root certificates and resolves the “signature” response at each level. It verifies the hash chain all the way down to the domain certificate. The validator also resolves and verify another hash chain in the PUF invocation entries \mathcal{I} . The validation process can only succeed if both hash chains are verified. During this process, the inclusion proofs of PUF are also checked by combing RP and RP^\sim to recover π in CA’s pk field.

Note that we omit the interaction details between clients and domains, such as the verification of signed certificate timestamps (SCT) from CT. Our design only requires the transmission of PUF invocation entries from the domain, which allows clients to conduct the above validation algorithm. The underlying protocols can still use the original methods in CT, such as OCSP Stapling. Our validation process does not introduce additional communication round trips due to the reuse of existing CT infrastructure. The attackers still have to compromise both CAs and loggers to generate a valid PUF-based certificate.

⑥ **Domain certificates confirmed.** Once the validator receives the *valid* result from Algorithm 1, if it is a normal client, it then can establish standard TLS connections with the domain N_D . For a $\mathcal{L}gr$, it then can finish the attestation process (§6.2) for the CA.

Algorithm 1: Certificate Validation

```

Input   : PUF-based certificate chain
            $\text{Cert}_{D,CA_2,CA_1,CA_0}$ ,
           PUF invocation entries  $I_{D,CA_2,CA_1,CA_0}$ 
Output : Validation result (valid or invalid)
1  $\text{Certs} = \{\text{Cert}_{CA_0}, \text{Cert}_{CA_1}, \text{Cert}_{CA_2}, \text{Cert}_D\}$ ;
2  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_{CA_0}, I_{CA_1}, I_{CA_2}, I_D\}$ ;
3 Init  $h_{last}, R_{last}, T_{last}, \pi_{last}$ ;
4 for  $\text{cert}, I$  in  $\text{Certs}, \mathcal{I}$  do
5   if  $\text{ISREVOKE}(\text{cert})$  or  $\text{ISEXPIRED}(\text{cert})$  then
6     return invalid // Regular checks
7   end
8    $Z, T = I.\text{parse}()$ ,  $\text{crt} = \text{cert}.\text{parse}()$ ;
9    $hc = H(\text{crt} || Z.\text{ts} || Z.N_{CA})$ ;
10  if  $\text{cert}.\text{name}$  is “RootCA” then
11     $h = hc$ ;
12     $T_{last} = \text{Null}$ ;
13  else
14     $h = H(R_{last} || hc || h_{last})$ ;
15    if  $RP$  is in  $\text{cert}.\text{ext}$  and  $RP \oplus Z.RP^\sim \neq \pi_{last}$ 
16      then
17        return invalid
18    end
19     $R = \text{cert}.\text{sig} \oplus h$ ; // Resolve the response
20     $T' = H_R(Z || \text{cert} || T_{last})$ ;
21    if  $T' \neq T$  then
22      return invalid
23    end
24    /* The next level of the chain */
25     $h_{last} = h, R_{last} = R, T_{last} = T'$ ;
26     $\pi_{last} = \text{cert}.\text{pk}.\text{extract}()$ ;
27 end
28 return valid;

```

6.4. Certificate Revoke & Renewal

⑦ **Certificate Rotation.** The PUF-based certificates also have defined lifetime for revocation like traditional certificates. The revocation and renewal mechanisms, such as OCSP and CRL, remain unchanged in ARMORED CORE. It is compatible with various certificate rotation techniques commonly used in practice.

These mechanisms may require CAs to sign the revocation messages, where our design is also compatible. CAs can treat these messages as PUF input challenges and the corresponding responses as physical “signatures” on them. Combined with transparency logging of PUF, the set of CA operations we designed in this work (§5.1 and §6.1) are not limited to certificate signing. They can also be used to endorse other data in PKI. They can also be implemented to provide physically trusted binding without signing keys.

7. Security

7.1. Security Proof

We first formalize the cryptographic PUF definition.

Definition 1. (Ideal PUF) Let \mathcal{P} be a PUF family where $R = \text{puf}(C)$ for $\forall \text{puf} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $C, R \in \{0, 1\}^n$. \mathcal{P} is ϵ_P -ideal if for any probabilistic polynomial-time (PPT) adversary \mathcal{A} , we have,

- (Pseudorandomness) $\forall \text{puf} \in \mathcal{P}, \forall C \in \{0, 1\}^n$,

$$\left| \Pr \left[\mathcal{A}^{\text{puf}(C)} \Rightarrow 1 \right] - \Pr \left[\mathcal{A}^{\$ (C)} \Rightarrow 1 \right] \right| \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \epsilon(n), \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon(n)$ is some negligible value related to n and $\$$ is a random bits oracle, *i.e.*, $\$: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$.

- (Uniqueness) $\forall \text{puf}_1, \text{puf}_2 \in \mathcal{P}, \forall C \in \{0, 1\}^n$, let $p(C) = \text{puf}_1(C) \oplus \text{puf}_2(C)$,

$$\left| \Pr \left[\mathcal{A}^{p(C)} \Rightarrow 1 \right] - \Pr \left[\mathcal{A}^{\$ (C)} \Rightarrow 1 \right] \right| \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \epsilon(n). \quad (2)$$

- (Almost XOR Universality) $\forall \text{puf} \in \mathcal{P}, c \leftarrow \$ \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\forall C_1, C_2 \in \{0, 1\}^n, C_1 \neq C_2$,

$$\Pr [\text{puf}(C_1) \oplus \text{puf}(C_2) = c] \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \epsilon(n). \quad (3)$$

- (Unclonability and Tamper Resistance) Every $\text{puf} \in \mathcal{P}$ has a unique physical structure. Any invasive measures to evaluate the installed PUF instance in adversarial simulation environments such as hardware debugging and chip delayering would turn it into a different instance.

We give the following theorems to prove that the security of our design is bounded by the security properties of PUF.

Theorem 1. When H is a standard cryptographic hash function with collision resistance and XOR universality, if PUF \mathcal{P} is ϵ_P -ideal PUF family, then for any PPT adversary \mathcal{A} that makes at most q signing queries, its advantage $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{IND}}$ in distinguishing sig field in certificate chain and random strings are negligible.

Theorem 2. If PUF \mathcal{P} is ϵ_P -ideal PUF family, then for any PPT adversary \mathcal{A} that makes at most q certificate issuing queries, its advantage $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{EUF}}$ in the EUF-CMA (Existing Unforgeability under Chosen Message Attack) game is negligible.

The complete proof is given in Appendix B.

7.2. Security Analysis

The main security goal of ARMORED CORE is to eliminate the risk of exposing a CA's signing key. It is the first to achieve this level of security by harnessing the physically trusted binding of PUF in PKI. We now analyze its effectiveness against potential attacks in §4.3.

7.2.1. Remote and Physical Key Exposure Attack. *Adv* can conduct remote exploitation techniques (A1 + A2), not limited to the CVEs in §2, against some CA server to obtain the key. However, it cannot establish an effective attacks vector since the ultimate target, the signing key, is no longer present. Even using physical attacks or side-channel attacks (A3), it will not extract any secrets from the chip because there is no secret at all in our design. The invasive manners could destroy the PUF instances due to the tamper resistance, rendering the hardware falsification useless.

ARMORED CORE can neutralize various key exposure attacks in PKI as the signing key itself no longer exists. It can serve as a security enhancement for CAs. *Adv* generate fraudulent certificates only by certification API abusing or insider attacks, which is out of the scope of our threat model.

7.2.2. PUF Modeling Attack. One of the most common threats to PUF is the modeling attack [65], [73], [74]. *Adv* need to collect plenty of CRPs, *e.g.*, > 100K or even millions, and trains a simulated 256-bit strong PUF model. However, this attack can only break that single instance from which CRPs has been extracted. The trained model is not applicable to other instances, even if they are the same PUF circuit design. CA can construct a dedicated PUF cluster with multiple instances, *e.g.*, hundreds, to blind the usage pattern of PUF in the certificate issuance.

Besides, since the raw interfaces of PUF are usually blocked, it would be quite challenging for *Adv* to quickly acquire enough CRPs without the direct access to that specific PUF instance. Furthermore, our design is PUF-agnostic so vendors can freely choose those PUFs with better modeling resilience [82], [83], [84]. Therefore, the PUF modeling attacks can be mitigated for ARMORED CORE in practice.

7.2.3. Participant Corruption. If an entire CA facility gets compromised, attackers can do anything whether it is key leakage or PUF abusing. The common mitigation of this attack is usually introducing redundancy in the PKI workflow [75], [76], [77]. Therefore, we exclude this type threat of CA from our threat model (§4.3) as our main focus is on the exposure of the signing key.

In our design, transparency loggers are the ones in CT. We do not add new functionalities for them but only require the pending of another type of data, *i.e.*, the PUF invocation entries. Therefore, no new security threats are introduced to the CT. Our design remains the same security posture as CT against the partial logger corruptions.

8. Prototype Implementation

We implemented a prototype of ARMORED CORE with an open-sourced codebase [37]. Table 2 shows the components of this prototype. We have developed and integrated the main PKI functions of ARMORED CORE in Pebble [85]. Pebble is a simplified version of Let's Encrypt CA software. It is suitable to test new features and functions. We also created a browser extension using Mozilla Web Extension API,




Figure 7: Measurement of Elapsed Time of ARMORED CORE Operations

enabling clients to perform customized certificate verification. Our PUF transparency logging mechanism is built upon Trillian [86], which also serves as the back-end for Google CT project. The software part of our prototype can be easily integrated into these mainstream PKI implementations.

TABLE 2: Summary of Prototype Implementation

Used by	Code Base	Language	LoC
CA	Let’s Encrypt Pebble, gRPC	Golang	1.9K
Domain	EFF Certbot, gRPC	Python	0.3K
Logger	Google Trillian, gRPC	Golang	0.3K
Client	Mozilla WebExtension, pbf	Javascript	0.4K

In addition to the components above, we provide a simple open-sourced hardware prototype that integrates IPUF [87] into CVA6, a 6-stage RISC-V CPU running on a Genesys-2 Kintex-7 FPGA board. It offers a native PUF calling instruction, but is still rudimentary with several features yet to be developed. Thus, we will not evaluate it in this work. More details are given in Appendix C

9. Evaluation

In this section, we conduct several evaluation experiments of ARMORED CORE prototype to answer the following questions:

- Q1** : Is ARMORED CORE effective as claimed? What is the overall performance of the prototype?
- Q2** : What is the performance of PUF? How does it compare to the traditional signing primitive?
- Q3** : How much overhead does ARMORED CORE introduce to the original system?
- Q4** : How much does ARMORED CORE and PUF cost for real-world deployment?

Experiment setups. The program of CA, transparency loggers and domain are deployed on a Dell Workstation running Ubuntu LTS 20.04 with 64 GB RAM and Intel Core i7-10700 CPU (2.9 GHz). It is SGX-enabled and SDK version is 2.23.100.2. The client browser extension is tested on a MacBook laptop with 16 GB RAM and Intel Core i5-8279U CPU (2.4 GHz).

9.1. Q1: Microbenchmarks

We first demonstrate a microbenchmark of ARMORED CORE and present the performance of each operation in

terms of elapsed time as shown in Figure 7. In our testbed, Pebble with ARMORED CORE takes about 200~350 ms to generate and construct a complete four-level certificate chain (excluding PUF operations). The elapsed time for other operations are all below 10 ms. CA’s operations account for about 93% of the overall time (Figure 7d). The generation of PUF invocation entry chain takes less than 1.5 ms because the computation is mainly the hash calculation.

The overall system integrated with ARMORED CORE can perform a complete PKI workflow with the Let’s Encrypt CA (Pebble), domain client (Certbot) and the client browser. It is functionally effective and provides stable benchmarks for each operation. The evaluation of PUF is given separately in §9.2 (Q2). Both our design and software implementation treat PUF as a standalone module that can be replaced as needed. In real world deployment, the integration of PUF does cause much overhead to the current implementation and the results can be found in §9.3 and §9.4.

Answer to Q1

ARMORED CORE provides practical PKI functions on real-world PKI software. The prototype requires 200~350 ms to generate the certificate chain and 1 ms to generate the PUF invocation entry chain. It requires < 7 ms and < 15 ms to perform the transparency logger and client operations, respectively.

9.2. Q2: Primitive Comparison

This part of the evaluation aims to demonstrate the performance of PUF and compare it with other primitives in CA. The functions in our design can be compatible with most PUF designs. We present some of them in Table 3 as references for PUF performances.

The selected PUFs here are examples of a wide spectrum of research of PUF circuit designs. We can see that the latency of most FPGA-based PUF designs typically falls in the millisecond range. With a variety of designs available, CA vendors can select those that meet their specific performance and security requirements.

We also compare PUF with other signing primitives in CA as shown in Figure 8. We test RSA 2048, ECDSA-secp256k1 running in TEE and HSM because unprotected cryptographically signing operations are forbidden in the real-world PKI/CA software. They must reside in secure

TABLE 3: Performance of Partial PUF Designs

Designs	Type	Technique	Energy	Latency	Length	Platform
[88]	Weak	Latch	0.7 pJ/b	1 ms	256	Artix-7
[89]	Strong	Arbiter	-	0.8 ms	128	Artix-7
[90]	Weak	RO	-	1.7 ms	1275	Zynq
[87]	Strong	Arbiter	-	5.6 ms	128	Artix-7
[91]	Weak	FeFETs	1.75 fJ/b	0.8 ms	256	ASIC
[92]	Both	ReRAM	3 pJ/b	N/A	128	ASIC
PUF [†] ₇	Strong	-	-	5 ms	256	ASIC [‡]

[†]: We select a representative PUF product in the Chinese PUF market. It has decent performance and has been widely used in practice. It is provided by a company with whom we signed non-disclosure agreements (NDA). We omit specific details to adhere to the agreements and respect its intellectual property. Sufficient information is provided in [37] to prove its usability.

[‡]: The frequency of the crystal oscillator in the chip is 30 MHz.

hardware to be called by other functions. We use Intel SGX and AWS CloudHSM [21] that both have been widely adopted by numerous industries as the testbed.

In Figure 8a, PUF consumes fewer clock cycles than other signing primitives in SGX. The context switch caused by TEE incurs an additional overhead of approximately 30%~40%. PUF only consumes additional cycles for bus communication, which would be far lower than this ratio. In Figure 8b, the operations of signing algorithms per second outperform a single PUF instance only with the help of multithreading (5 threads). Therefore, with the integration of PUF, vendors will not experience a loss in performance.

Answer to Q2

PUF is an efficient security primitive compared with traditional techniques. The integration of PUF into original systems can effectively strengthen the trust basis of CA/PKI and improves the performance as well.


9.3. Q3: Runtime Overhead

We further demonstrate the runtime overhead that ARMORED CORE brings to the original PKI codebases.

Storage. First, we compare the size of PUF-based certificates with the original ones. Table 4 shows that the modified certificates in this design are 20%~27% smaller than the standard ones for each CA. This is because the size of `sig` and `pk` fields are aligned with the PUF response length, *i.e.*, 256 bits here. Also, the (uncompressed) PUF invocation entries of this four-level chain are 579 bytes encoded by ProtoBuf. In summary, for a domain that needs to store all four certificates and entries, our design requires 11% less storage overall.

Computation. Figure 9 compares the end-to-end runtime performance of the implementation with and without the integration of our design. Surprisingly, the one implementing ARMORED CORE functions outperforms the

2. See <https://github.com/niclabs/tcsrca> and <https://github.com/bnb-chain/tss-lib>



(a) Used Clock Cycles

(b) Operations per Sec.

Figure 8: Performance Comparison of CA Signing Primitives. The RSA and ECDSA implementations used in SGX are ported from OpenSSL-1.1.1t. The threshold signature implementations are from two real-world Golang libs³. The number of signers is set to 3 and the threshold is set to 2. The HSM signing performance is benchmarked using the AWS official tool `pkpspeed` for one HSM instance.

TABLE 4: Comparison of Certificate Size (bytes)

Fields	Root CA		Intermediate CAs		Domain	
	before	after	before	after	before	after
<code>sig</code>	256	32	256	32	256	32
<code>pk</code>	256	32	256	32	-	-
<code>ext</code>	-	-	-	+32	-	+32
Overall	1.2K	883	2.4K	1.9K	952	688

original code, even considering the PUF operations. The results indicate that, by eliminating expensive signing operations, our prototype can achieve >4.9% computational improvement, even though it is not optimized yet.

Communication. Our prototype currently has not yet been adapted to real-world network settings, *e.g.*, load balancing or multi-processing. However, the reduced storage requirement can lead to a smaller packet size for the domain’s TLS handshake. Plus, we do not add extra communication roundtrips. Therefore, the clients and domains will experience lower network latency due to smaller certificates.

Answer to Q3

The implementations of ARMORED CORE do not introduce any additional overhead to the original PKI system, but instead slightly improves the performance. The elapsed time of PUF operations takes up < 5% of the entire Pebble CA workflow.

The above results confirm that ARMORED CORE eliminates the trade-off between security and efficiency, instead enhancing both simultaneously. The only overhead is from the PUF integration, which will be evaluated next.

9.4. Q4: Real-world Deployment Cost

ARMORED CORE does not require a “flag day” when vendors deploy it in new systems. The software aspect of the implementation can drop seamlessly into existing




Figure 9: Runtime Overhead on Modified PKI Codebases

platforms. It can be installed through remote updates as an enhanced extension co-existing with the original code. It offers incremental deployment but the introduction of PUF will incur extra cost on equipment updates. We estimate it for a hypothetical PKI vendor as shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Hardware Deployment Cost Estimation

Estimation	PUF*	HSM*	TEE*
Power (W)	30 mW~1 W	150 mW~140 W	65 W~300 W
Energy (kWh)†	0.02~0.72	0.1~101	47~216
Acquisition (USD)	< 10	950~20K	400~8K
Expense (USD) †	< 200	19K~400K	-

*: For PUF, the data is from Table 3 and the sales statistics of PUF companies. For HSM, we checked Yubico HSM, LunaHSM, BlackVault HSM, SafeNet HSM. For TEE, we checked common Intel® products of CPU processors enabling SGX.

†: We assume that there are 20 instances running for one month.

PUF offers low power consumption and cost efficiency compared with TEE or HSM. It significantly decreases energy cost for cloud servers and benefits green computing in PKI. Also, it is directly composed of common electronic units such as memory cells, gates, capacitors and so on. This distinct way of establishing physical trust enables PUF to provide novel security functionality at a much lower cost than HSM or TEE.

Answer to Q4

ARMORED CORE offers a cost-effective solution and can scale to the global PKI infrastructure. It can be deployed with more reasonable financial and energy cost in real-world systems than HSM or TEE.

10. Discussion

10.1. Soundness of Using PUF in PKI/CA

PUF interface control. Once the private key is removed, the PUF’s invoking interfaces become the primary target for various attacks in PKI. However, in real-world products, PUF is typically integrated into chip circuitry as IP cores [33], [34], [55]. A standalone PUF instance with exposed raw CRP interface does not occur in practice. Therefore, it is highly unlikely for attackers to directly access the PUF itself without invasive methods. However, hardware invasive attacks such as FIB or LVP would permanently destroy the PUF instance according the tamper resistance property.

Reduced post-compromise damages. Attackers can target the software APIs or SDKs of PUF, as they attack the HSM SDK [22], [23] in §2. They may exploit the software flaws to generate unauthorized certificates remotely. However, since these functions rely on the PUF hardware, attackers have to continually reside in the exact server even after the success of exploitation. This greatly limits the attackers. CA operators only need to monitor suspicious PUF calling behaviors to mitigate the attack. In contrast, for traditional protections like HSM or TEE, attackers can generate fake data anywhere once they know the byte value of the private key, making defenses useless and the attack difficult to be identified.

Additionally, attackers cannot predict the new CRPs of the PUF instance even if they have already abused it. Thanks to the inherent randomness and uniqueness of PUF, the newly issued certificates are statistically independent of those generated by attackers. Therefore, PUF can significantly reduce the post-compromise damage.

Potential solution for weak key issue. Current PKI vendors may use unsafe random source, making the generated keys and signatures vulnerable to algebraic analysis [93]. This weak key issue has been widely identified in the past decade [93], [94], [95]. In our work, the burden of key generation is shifted from CA developers to the PUF manufacturers. Fortunately, according to the standards [60], [61], the randomness, uniqueness, reliability and other properties must pass the required standard tests like NIST SP 800-90B [96]. It is mandatory for manufacturers to conduct such evaluation. Therefore, PUFs for commercial use are expected to offer guaranteed performance metrics. Even if one instance is defective, the risks are significantly lower compared to using a weak private signing key.

10.2. PUF as a Service

The PUF pooling layer proposed in this work turn the PUF instances from physical units to schedulable resources that can be rearranged to accommodate the application needs. Furthermore, it can be packaged and exposed as a remote service, *i.e.*, PUF as a Service (PaaS). Vendors can rent PUF for users who require physically trusted proof for their code. PaaS serve as a trusted physical anchor to prove that the users’ code is genuinely running on the expected platforms. The CRPs are regarded as the commitments for proof verification. PaaS can be applied in cloud computing and various general businesses.

Treating physical widgets as an abstract service is not a new concept. Cloud-based HSM [21] has been commercialized a few years ago, allowing users to manage private keys or process sensitive information using rented servers. In comparison, PUF clusters in PaaS are more lightweight in terms of their interfaces and manufacturing costs. They have the potential to offer the same functions as HSM, such as key generation [53], data encryption [97], and certificate issuance in this work.

10.3. Limitations

Hardware modification hinders the instant deployment.

The advantage of our work actually yields its limitation. Servers are required to installed PUF. This hardware modification hinders instant deployment in practice. PKI vendors need specific equipment for immediate use. To alleviate this limitation, we designed ARMORED CORE’s functions to only require incremental changes. As demonstrated in §3 and our hardware prototype in §C, one can envision that this limitation can be gradually resolved.

PUF is only used for certificate operations on the CA side.

The core idea of our design is to armor CA with PUF-based certificate operations to address the signing key exposure problem. The benefits of PUF are only for CA. However, PUF actually plays a broader role on clients or domains to defend various attacks [98]. We plan to address this limitation in future work: a truly PUF-based PKI system where PUF is used for all certificate operations.

11. Related Work

In the past decade, a substantial body of studies [98], [99], [100], [101] have contributed to the improved design for PKI security.

Enhanced design of PKI/CA. ARPKI [75] is an attack-resilient PKI with accountable operations against participant corruption. It introduces an extra CA and a log server for on-line validation. DTKI [102] defines a cross-signed certificate validation mechanism where clients only accept specified key-signed certificates. IKP [103] use blockchain to capture CAs’ misbehaviors and incentivize the automatic detection. Let’s Encrypt [104], [105] has provided millions of free and automated TLS certificates. The heart of it is the ACME protocol that provides automatic CA operations over a challenge-response process. However, it is not developed for CA-side security issues. CAPS [76] has a signaling mechanism based on deterministic finite automaton to promptly inform clients about legitimate domains. It can defend against malicious CA without making significant modifications to existing architectures. V’CER [106] enables efficient certificate validation in constrained networks. It utilizes a compact data structure called validation forest that allows updated devices to propagate the revocation information for peers. F-PKI [77] provides flexible certificate policies to enable domains to define their trust preferences of CAs. It introduces a map server with global certificates and policies maintained by sparse Merkle trees. Clients can verify certificates based on different trust levels.

We notice that some research on DNS security share common interests with our focus in a broad sense. Brandt *et al.* propose DV (Domain Validation) ++ [107]. It transforms the centralized validation into a multi-vantage points approach, which prevents attackers from conducting DNS poisoning attacks. Duan *et al.* propose RHINE [78], an authenticated naming system for end-to-end DNS record verification. RHINE uses delegation transparency to formalize the hierarchical relationships among zones. Compared to

DNSSEC, it offers robust authentication functionality and resistance against partial CA and logger compromises.

Furthermore, some work use blockchain to design a decentralized PKI where users do not need an oligopolistic CA to build trust. Fromknecht *et al.* [108] propose using Namecoin [109] to uniquely bind a public key to an entity. Toorani *et al.* [110] employ PBFT consensus algorithm to confirm the proof of domain certificates. CertLedger [44] formalizes a blockchain-based bulletin board model for public transparency. However, these designs may require excessive modifications to the existing PKI infrastructure, and highly reliable network communications.

PUF-based Security Scheme. PUF has been used as a security primitive in many applications [111], [112]. Chatterjee *et al.* [79] design a PUF-based anonymous authentication protocol using identity-based encryption to eliminate the need for explicit storage of CRPs on endpoint devices. Gope *et al.* [113] and Chatterjee *et al.* [114] respectively design a PUF-based anonymous attestation protocol with formal proofs. PUF-RAKE [115] is a key exchange protocol with a CRP obfuscation mechanism to establish PUF keys quickly between multiple nodes. Zheng *et al.* [80] propose a provably secure PUF-based authentication protocol for lightweight peer-to-peer communication. SPEAR [97] is the first PUF-based authenticated encryption algorithm.

PUF can also serve as the system RoT. It was introduced into remote attestation first in [116], [117], [118]. PAtt [63] adopts the concepts of PUF on programmable controllers for attestation. Xia *et al.* [62] design a PUF-based attestation protocol for CPU-FPGA heterogeneous environment. Janus [81] introduces PUF into TEE to provide intrinsic trust and nested measurements. Until now, there has been no study yet on leveraging PUF into redesigning PKI/CA.

Transparency Log Designs. Some research focus on improving the efficiency and security of transparency logs. CONIKS [119] utilizes verifiable unpredictable functions to compute the storage index privately. AAD [120] is an authenticated transparency log based on bilinear accumulators. Merkle² [121] is a nested data structure for lightweight auditing. It places prefix trees into a Merkle tree in chronological order. TAP [122] combines the several aforementioned designs and realizes zero-knowledge range proofs for independent audits. The PUF transparency in this work can be a extended functionality for CT. It can be potentially combined with the above designs.

12. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose ARMORED CORE, a security enhancement for PKI that removes CA’s signing keys using PUF. It can co-exist with traditional signature-based PKI functions and workflows. It enables PUF-based domain public key endorsement with modified TLS certificate fields. Its PUF transparency logging mechanism ensures the auditability of PUF invocations of CA. We have integrated ARMORED CORE’s functions into real-world PKI software including Pebble and Certbot. The evaluation results show that it is fully compatible with the original workflow to

provide enhanced PKI functions without relying on CA's signing key. Also, this integration incurs no extra overhead and, in fact, offers minor performance improvements on both computation and storage. In conclusion, ARMORED CORE is an efficient and secure PKI enhancement that can be used in security-intensive scenarios to eliminate the security risk of CA's signing key exposure.

For future work, we plan to further explore the use of PUF in PKI. It can be divided into two directions. First, to address the "hidden root" issue [98], we aim to build a PUF-based certificate root store mechanism to offer unified and physically trusted protection for various platforms. Second, we can design and implement an optimized PUF pooling mechanism for CA mentioned before, which is also a validation of PUF-as-a-Service concept.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the reviewers and committee for their work.

References

- [1] T. H. Hoogstraaten, D. Niggebrugge, D. Heppener, F. Groenewegen, J. Wettinck, K. Strooy, P. Arends, P. Pols, R. Koupric, S. Moorrees *et al.*, "Black tulip," Tech. Rep.(Fox-IT BV, 2012), Tech. Rep., 8 2012.
- [2] Leyden, John, "23,000 HTTPS certs will be axed in next 24 hours after private keys leak," https://www.theregister.com/2018/03/01/trustico_digicert_symantec_spat/, 2018.
- [3] Corfield, Gareth, "Leaked stolen Nvidia key can sign Windows malware," https://www.theregister.com/2022/03/05/nvidia_stolen_certificate/, 2022.
- [4] Amadeo, Ron, "Samsung's Android app-signing key has leaked, is being used to sign malware," <https://arstechnica.com/gadgets/2022/12/samsungs-android-app-signing-key-has-leaked-is-being-used-to-sign-malware/>, 2022.
- [5] Goodin, Dan, "Leak of MSI UEFI signing keys stokes fears of "doomsday" supply chain attack," <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/05/leak-of-msi-uefi-signing-keys-stokes-concerns-of-doomsday-supply-chain-attack/>, 2023.
- [6] NIST, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2011-4197>, 2011.
- [7] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2021-29792>, 2021.
- [8] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2023-47640>, 2023.
- [9] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2015-7328>, 2015.
- [10] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2018-17612>, 2018.
- [11] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2020-28053>, 2020.
- [12] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2022-23716>, 2022.
- [13] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2017-6339>, 2017.
- [14] E. Wen, J. Wang, and J. Dietrich, "SecretHunter: A large-scale secret scanner for public git repositories," in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 123–130.
- [15] M. Dahlmanns, C. Sander, R. Decker, and K. Wehrle, "Secrets revealed in container images: An internet-wide study on occurrence and impact," in *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2023, p. 797–811.
- [16] M. Y. Kubilay, M. S. Kiraz, and H. A. Mantar, "KORGAN: an efficient PKI architecture based on PBFT through dynamic threshold signatures," *Computer Journal*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 564–574, 2021.
- [17] K. Shrishak and H. Shulman, "Privacy preserving and resilient rpki," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2021 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [18] E. Kokoris Kogias, D. Malkhi, and A. Spiegelman, "Asynchronous distributed key generation for computationally-secure randomness, consensus, and threshold signatures," in *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2020, p. 1751–1767.
- [19] S. Das, P. Camacho, Z. Xiang, J. Nieto, B. Bünz, and L. Ren, "Threshold signatures from inner product argument: Succinct, weighted, and multi-threshold," in *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2023, p. 356–370.
- [20] A. P. K. Dalskov, C. Orlandi, M. Keller, K. Shrishak, and H. Schulmann, "Securing DNSSEC keys via threshold ECDSA from generic MPC," in *Computer Security ESORICS 2020 - 25th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, vol. 12309. Springer, 2020, pp. 654–673.
- [21] Amazon, "AWS CloudHSM," <https://aws.amazon.com/cn/cloudhsm/>, 2024.
- [22] NIST, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2023-2197>, 2023.
- [23] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2022-28859>, 2022.
- [24] —, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2020-25256>, 2020.
- [25] M. Lipp, D. Gruss, R. Spreitzer, C. Maurice, and S. Mangard, "ARMageddon: Cache Attacks on Mobile Devices," in *25th USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association, 2016, pp. 549–564.
- [26] T. Roche, V. Lomné, C. Mutschler, and L. Imbert, "A side journey to titan," in *30th USENIX Security Symposium*, 2021, pp. 231–248.
- [27] S. van Schaik, A. Kwong, D. Genkin, and Y. Yarom, "SGAxe: How SGX Fails in Practice," <https://sgaxe.com/files/SGAxe.pdf>, 2021.
- [28] K. Ryan, K. He, G. A. Sullivan, and N. Heninger, "Passive SSH key compromise via lattices," in *2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2023, pp. 2886–2900.
- [29] NIST, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2024-2193>, 2024.
- [30] Boru Chen and Yingchen Wang and Pradyumna Shome and Christopher W. Fletcher and David Kohlbrenner and Riccardo Paccagnella and Daniel Genkin, "GoFetch: Breaking Constant-Time Cryptographic Implementations Using Data Memory-Dependent Prefetchers," <https://gofetch.fail/>, 2024.
- [31] R. Pappu, "Physical One-Way Functions," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sep. 2002.
- [32] AMD Xilinx, "Physically Unclonable Function," <https://docs.xilinx.com/t/en-US/am011-versal-acap-trm/Physically-Unclonable-Function?tocId=8Lcvsmt7Vkdglr~m8UuUeg>, 2022.
- [33] NXP, "LPC5500 Series," https://www.nxp.com/products/processors-and-microcontrollers/arm-microcontrollers/general-purpose-mcus/lpc5500-arm-cortex-m33:LPC5500_SERIES, 2021.
- [34] Intel Agilex Device Security User Guide, "Intrinsic ID Physically Unclonable Function (PUF)," <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/docs/programmable/683823/21-3/intrinsic-id-physically-unclonable-function.html>, 2021.
- [35] Y. Lee, B. Karpinsky, Y. Choi, K. Ahn, Y. Kim, J. Park, S. Noh, J. Kang, J. Shin, J. Park, Y. Chung, and J. Shin, "Samsung physically unclonable function (samPUF™) and its integration with samsung security system," in *IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference, CICC*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–7.

- [36] S. S. Kudva, M. E. Sinangil, S. G. Tell, N. Nedovic, S. Song, B. Zimmer, and C. T. Gray, "16.4 high-density and low-power PUF designs in 5nm achieving 23x and 39x BER reduction after unstable bit detection and masking," in *IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference, ISSCC*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 302–304.
- [37] Github, "Armored Core PKI," <https://github.com/ArmoredCorePKI>.
- [38] Protalinski, Emil, "Google and Mozilla decide to ban Chinese certificate authority CNIC from Chrome and Firefox," <https://venturebeat.com/security/google-and-mozilla-decide-to-ban-chinese-certificate-authority-cnic-from-chrome-and-firefox/>, 2014.
- [39] Cybersecurity and I. S. Agency. Lenovo superfish adware vulnerable to https spoofing. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cisa.gov/news-events/alerts/2015/02/20/lenovo-superfish-adware-vulnerable-https-spoofing>
- [40] Krebson Security, "Security Firm Bit9 Hacked, Used to Spread Malware," <https://krebsonsecurity.com/2013/02/security-firm-bit9-hacked-used-to-spread-malware/>, 2013.
- [41] Mimoso, Michael, "D-Link Accidentally Leaks Private Code-Signing Keys," <https://threatpost.com/d-link-accidentally-leaks-private-code-signing-keys/1147271>, 2015.
- [42] Schneier, Ron, "Leaked Signing Keys Are Being Used to Sign Malware," <https://www.schneier.com/blog/archives/2022/12/leaked-signing-keys-are-being-used-to-sign-malware.html>, 2022.
- [43] NIST, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2012-3037>, 2012.
- [44] M. Y. Kubilay, M. S. Kiraz, and H. A. Mantar, "CertLedger: A new PKI model with certificate transparency based on blockchain," *Computer & Security*, vol. 85, pp. 333–352, 2019.
- [45] M. Toorani and C. Gehrman, "A decentralized dynamic PKI based on blockchain," in *The 36th ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, 2021, pp. 1646–1655.
- [46] T. Sermpinis, G. Vlahavas, K. Karasavvas, and A. Vakali, "DeTRACT: a decentralized, transparent, immutable and open PKI certificate framework," *International Journal of Information Security*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 553–570, 2021.
- [47] K. Ryan, "Hardware-backed heist: Extracting ECDSA keys from qualcomm's trustzone," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2019, pp. 181–194.
- [48] K. Mus, Y. Doröz, M. C. Tol, K. Rahman, and B. Sunar, "Jolt: Recovering TLS signing keys via rowhammer faults," in *44th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2023*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1719–1736.
- [49] J. S. Götte and B. Scheuermann, "Can't touch this: Inertial hsm's thwart advanced physical attacks," *IACR Trans. Cryptogr. Hardw. Embed. Syst.*, vol. 2022, no. 1, pp. 69–93, 2022.
- [50] G. Campana and J.-B. Bédrupe, "Everybody be Cool, This is a Robbery!" 2019, <https://www.blackhat.com/us-19/briefings/schedule/#everybody-be-cool-this-is-a-robbery-16233>.
- [51] NIST, <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2023-39908>, 2023.
- [52] J. W. Lee, D. Lim, B. Gassend, G. E. Suh, M. Van Dijk, and S. Devadas, "A technique to build a secret key in integrated circuits for identification and authentication applications," in *2004 Symposium on VLSI Circuits. Digest of Technical Papers (IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37525)*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 176–179.
- [53] J. Guajardo, S. S. Kumar, G. J. Schrijen, and P. Tuyls, "FPGA intrinsic PUFs and their use for IP protection," in *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems CHES*, vol. 4727. Springer, 2007, pp. 63–80.
- [54] U. Rührmair and M. van Dijk, "Pufs in security protocols: Attack models and security evaluations," in *2013 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2013*. IEEE Computer Society, 2013, pp. 286–300.
- [55] Intrinsic-ID, "QuiddiKey 300, The First Root-of-Trust IP Certified Against Physical Attacks," <https://www.intrinsic-id.com/products/quiddikey-300/>, 2022.
- [56] ICTK, "ICTK Technology," <https://ictk.com/Service-Plan>, 2022.
- [57] Lee, Teddy Kyung, "Via PUF Technology as a Root of Trust in IoT Supply Chain," <https://www.gsaglobal.org/forums/via-puf-technology-as-a-root-of-trust-in-iot-supply-chain/>, 2023.
- [58] Intrinsic ID, "Health and Wellness Start with Trust," <https://www.intrinsic-id.com/markets/medical/>, 2020.
- [59] Lee, Teddy Kyung, "Industry's first debut of PUF-USIM chip," <https://www.gsaglobal.org/forums/industrys-first-debut-of-puf-usim-chip/>, 2023.
- [60] "Information security, cybersecurity and privacy protection — Physically unclonable functions — Part 1: Security requirements," International Organization for Standardization, Standard, Dec. 2020.
- [61] "Information security, cybersecurity and privacy protection — Physically unclonable functions — Part 2: Test and evaluation methods," International Organization for Standardization, Standard, May 2022.
- [62] K. Xia, Y. Luo, X. Xu, and S. Wei, "SGX-FPGA: trusted execution environment for CPU-FPGA heterogeneous architecture," in *58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference, DAC 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 301–306.
- [63] H. R. Ghaeini, M. Chan, R. Bahmani, F. Brassler, L. Garcia, J. Zhou, A.-R. Sadeghi, N. O. Tippenhauer, and S. Zonouz, "PAtt: Physics-based Attestation of Control Systems," in *International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses*, 2019, pp. 165–180.
- [64] J. Mahmood and M. Hicks, "Untrustzone: Systematic accelerated aging to expose on-chip secrets," in *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2024, pp. 68–68.
- [65] Y. Xiao, Y. He, X. Zhang, Q. Wang, R. Xie, K. Sun, K. Xu, and Q. Li, "From hardware fingerprint to access token: Enhancing the authentication on iot devices," in *Proceedings 2024 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*. Internet Society, 2024.
- [66] C. Brzuska, M. Fischlin, H. Schröder, and S. Katzenbeisser, "Physically uncloneable functions in the universal composition framework," in *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2011*, vol. 6841. Springer, 2011, pp. 51–70.
- [67] F. Armknecht, R. Maes, A. Sadeghi, F. Standaert, and C. Wachsmann, "A formalization of the security features of physical functions," in *32nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2011*. IEEE Computer Society, 2011, pp. 397–412.
- [68] M. van Dijk and C. Jin, "A theoretical framework for the analysis of physical unclonable function interfaces and its relation to the random oracle model," *Journal of Cryptology*, vol. 36, no. 4, p. 35, 2023.
- [69] J. Delvaux, "Security analysis of PUF-based key generation and entity authentication," Ph.D. dissertation, KU Leuven, 2017.
- [70] B. Laurie, A. Langley, and E. Kasper, "Certificate Transparency," RFC 6962, Jun. 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6962>
- [71] D. Dolev and A. C. Yao, "On the security of public key protocols," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 198–207, 1983.
- [72] U. Rührmair, J. Sölter, F. Sehnke, X. Xu, A. Mahmoud, V. Stoyanova, G. Dror, J. Schmidhuber, W. P. Burleson, and S. Devadas, "PUF modeling attacks on simulated and silicon data," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 1876–1891, 2013.
- [73] M. Khalafalla, M. A. Elmohr, and C. H. Gebotys, "Going deep: Using deep learning techniques with simplified mathematical models against XOR BR and TBR pufs," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 80–90.

- [74] N. Wisiol, B. Thapaliya, K. T. Mursi, J. Seifert, and Y. Zhuang, "Neural network modeling attacks on arbiter-puf-based designs," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 2719–2731, 2022.
- [75] D. A. Basin, C. Cremers, T. H. Kim, A. Perrig, R. Sasse, and P. Szalachowski, "ARPKI: attack resilient public-key infrastructure," in *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2014, pp. 382–393.
- [76] S. Matsumoto, J. H. Bosamiya, Y. Dai, P. C. van Oorschot, and B. Parno, "CAPS: smoothly transitioning to a more resilient web PKI," in *ACSAC '20: Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, 2020, pp. 655–668.
- [77] L. Chuat, C. Krähenbühl, P. Mittal, and A. Perrig, "F-PKI: enabling innovation and trust flexibility in the HTTPS public-key infrastructure," in *Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, 2022.
- [78] H. Duan, R. Fischer, J. Lou, S. Liu, D. A. Basin, and A. Perrig, "RHINE: robust and high-performance internet naming with E2E authenticity," in *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, 2023, pp. 531–553.
- [79] U. Chatterjee, V. Govindan, R. Sadhukhan, D. Mukhopadhyay, R. S. Chakraborty, D. Mahata, and M. M. Prabhu, "Building PUF Based Authentication and Key Exchange Protocol for IoT without Explicit CRPs in Verifier Database," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 424–437, May 2019.
- [80] Y. Zheng, W. Liu, C. Gu, and C. Chang, "PUF-based Mutual Authentication and Key Exchange Protocol for Peer-to-Peer IoT Applications," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 3299–3316, 2023.
- [81] X. Zhang, K. Qin, S. Qu, T. Wang, C. Zhang, and D. Gu, "Teamwork makes tee work: Open and resilient remote attestation on decentralized trust," 2024.
- [82] C. Xu, J. Zhang, M. Law, X. Zhao, P. Mak, and R. P. Martins, "Transfer-path-based hardware-reuse strong PUF achieving modeling attack resilience with 200 million training crps," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 2188–2203, 2023.
- [83] H. Nassar, L. Bauer, and J. Henkel, "ANV-PUF: machine-learning-resilient nvm-based arbiter PUF," *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, vol. 22, no. 5s, pp. 133:1–133:23, 2023.
- [84] H. Lin, H. Zuo, Q. Peng, and X. Zhao, "A 690fj/bit ml-attack-resilient strong PUF based on subthreshold voltage attenuator ring with closed-loop feedback," in *IEEE European Solid State Circuits Conference, ESSCIRC*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 113–116.
- [85] Github, "Let's Encrypt Pebble," <https://github.com/letsencrypt/pebble>, 2024.
- [86] —, "Trillian: General Transparency," <https://github.com/google/trillian>, 2024.
- [87] P. H. Nguyen, D. P. Sahoo, C. Jin, K. Mahmood, U. Rührmair, and M. van Dijk, "The interpose PUF: secure PUF design against state-of-the-art machine learning attacks," *IACR Transactions on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems (CHES)*, vol. 2019, no. 4, pp. 243–290, 2019.
- [88] N. N. Anandakumar, M. S. Hashmi, and S. K. Sanadhya, "Design and analysis of fpga-based pufs with enhanced performance for hardware-oriented security," *ACM Journal on Emerging Technologies in Computing Systems*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 72:1–72:26, 2022.
- [89] H. Boyapally, D. Chatterjee, K. Pratihari, S. Saha, and D. Mukhopadhyay, "PUF-COTE: A PUF construction with challenge obfuscation and throughput enhancement," 2022, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/1005>.
- [90] O. Günlü, T. Kernetzky, O. Iscan, V. Sidorenko, G. Kramer, and R. F. Schaefer, "Secure and reliable key agreement with physical unclonable functions," *Entropy*, vol. 20, no. 5, p. 340, 2018.
- [91] X. Guo, X. Ma, F. Müller, R. Olivo, J. Wu, K. Ni, T. Kämpfe, Y. Liu, H. Yang, and X. Li, "Exploiting fefet switching stochasticity for low-power reconfigurable physical unclonable function," in *47th ESSCIRC 2021 - European Solid State Circuits Conference*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 119–122.
- [92] Y. Pang, B. Gao, D. Wu, S. Yi, Q. Liu, W. Chen, T. Chang, W. Lin, X. Sun, S. Yu, H. Qian, M. Chang, and H. Wu, "A reconfigurable RRAM physically unclonable function utilizing post-process randomness source with $<6 \times 10^{-6}$ native bit error rate," in *IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference, ISSCC 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 402–404.
- [93] A. Chi, B. Enright, and D. McGrew, "Detecting weak keys in manufacturing certificates: A case study," in *Proceedings of Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, 2023, pp. 759–771.
- [94] N. Heninger, Z. Durumeric, E. Wustrow, and J. A. Halderman, "Mining your ps and qs: Detection of widespread weak keys in network devices," in *21st USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association, 2012, pp. 205–220.
- [95] S. Hebrok, S. Nachtigall, M. Maehren, N. Erinola, R. Merget, J. Somorovsky, and J. Schwenk, "We really need to talk about session tickets: A {Large-Scale} analysis of cryptographic dangers with {TLS} session tickets," in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. USENIX Association, 2023, pp. 4877–4894.
- [96] M. S. Turan, E. Barker, J. Kelsey, K. A. McKay, M. L. Baish, M. Boyle *et al.*, "Recommendation for the entropy sources used for random bit generation," *NIST Special Publication*, vol. 800, no. 90B, p. 102, 2018.
- [97] X. Zhang, D. Gu, T. Wang, and Y. Huang, "Old School, New Primitive: Toward Scalable PUF-Based Authenticated Encryption Scheme in IoT," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 42, no. 12, pp. 4569–4582, 2023.
- [98] Y. Zhang, B. Liu, C. Lu, Z. Li, H. Duan, J. Li, and Z. Zhang, "Rusted anchors: A national client-side view of hidden root cas in the web PKI ecosystem," in *2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2021, pp. 1373–1387.
- [99] S. Y. Chau, O. Chowdhury, E. Hoque, H. Ge, A. Kate, C. Nita-Rotaru, and N. Li, "SymCerts: Practical Symbolic Execution for Exposing Noncompliance in X.509 Certificate Validation Implementations," in *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2017, pp. 503–520.
- [100] M. Yahyazadeh, S. Y. Chau, L. Li, M. H. Hue, J. Debnath, S. C. Ip, C. N. Li, M. E. Hoque, and O. Chowdhury, "Morpheus: Bringing the (PKCS) one to meet the oracle," in *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2021, pp. 2474–2496.
- [101] J. Larisch, W. Aqeel, M. Lum, Y. Goldschlag, L. Kannan, K. Torshizi, Y. Wang, T. Chung, D. Levin, B. M. Maggs, A. Mislove, B. Parno, and C. Wilson, "Hammurabi: A framework for pluggable, logic-based X.509 certificate validation policies," in *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2022, pp. 1857–1870.
- [102] J. Yu, V. Cheval, and M. Ryan, "DTKI: A new formalized PKI with verifiable trusted parties," *Computer Journal*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 1695–1713, 2016.
- [103] S. Matsumoto and R. M. Reischuk, "IKP: turning a PKI around with decentralized automated incentives," in *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, S&P*. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 410–426.
- [104] Let's Encrypt, "A nonprofit Certificate Authority providing TLS certificates to 363 million websites." <https://letsencrypt.org/>, 2024.
- [105] J. Aas, R. Barnes, B. Case, Z. Durumeric, P. Eckersley, A. Flores-López, S. D. Schoen, and B. Warren, "Let's encrypt: An automated certificate authority to encrypt the entire web," in *Proceedings of ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2019, pp. 2473–2487.

- [106] D. Koisser, P. Jauernig, G. Tsudik, and A. Sadeghi, “V’CER: Efficient certificate validation in constrained networks,” in *31st USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association, 2022, pp. 4491–4508.
- [107] M. Brandt, T. Dai, A. Klein, H. Shulman, and M. Waidner, “Domain Validation++ For MitM-Resilient PKI,” in *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2018, pp. 2060–2076.
- [108] C. Fromknecht, D. Velicanu, and S. Yakubov, “A decentralized public key infrastructure with identity retention,” *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2014.
- [109] Namecoin, “Decentralized secure names,” <https://www.namecoin.org/>, 2024.
- [110] M. Toorani and C. Gehrman, “A decentralized dynamic PKI based on blockchain,” in *Proceedings Of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium On Applied Computing*. ACM, 2021, pp. 1646–1655.
- [111] M. Umar, S. H. Islam, K. Mahmood, S. Ahmed, Z. Ghaffar, and M. A. Saleem, “Provable Secure Identity-Based Anonymous and Privacy-Preserving Inter-Vehicular Authentication Protocol for VANETS Using PUF,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 12 158–12 167, 2021.
- [112] T. Alladi, Naren, G. Bansal, V. Chamola, and M. Guizani, “Secauthuv: A novel authentication scheme for UAV-ground station and UAV-UAV communication,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 15 068–15 077, 2020.
- [113] P. Gope, J. Lee, and T. Q. S. Quek, “Lightweight and Practical Anonymous Authentication Protocol for RFID Systems Using Physically Unclonable Functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 2831–2843, 2018.
- [114] U. Chatterjee, D. Mukhopadhyay, and R. S. Chakraborty, “3PAA: A Private PUF Protocol for Anonymous Authentication,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 756–769, 2021.
- [115] M. A. Qureshi and A. Munir, “PUF-RAKE: A PUF-Based Robust and Lightweight Authentication and Key Establishment Protocol,” *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 2457–2475, Jul. 2022.
- [116] S. Schulz, A.-R. Sadeghi, and C. Wachsmann, “Short paper: Lightweight remote attestation using physical functions,” in *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM Conference on Wireless Network Security*, 2011, pp. 109–114.
- [117] Ü. Kocabas, A. R. Sadeghi, C. Wachsmann, and S. Schulz, “Poster: Practical embedded remote attestation using physically unclonable functions,” in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2011, pp. 797–800.
- [118] J. Kong, F. Koushanfar, P. K. Pendyala, A.-R. Sadeghi, and C. Wachsmann, “PUFatt: Embedded Platform Attestation Based on Novel Processor-Based PUFs,” in *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Design Automation Conference*, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- [119] M. S. Melara, A. Blankstein, J. Bonneau, E. W. Felten, and M. J. Freedman, “CONIKS: bringing key transparency to end users,” in *24th USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association, 2015, pp. 383–398.
- [120] A. Tomescu, V. Bhupatiraju, D. Papadopoulos, C. Papamanthou, N. Triandopoulos, and S. Devadas, “Transparency logs via append-only authenticated dictionaries,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2019, pp. 1299–1316.
- [121] Y. Hu, K. Hooshmand, H. Kalidhindi, S. J. Yang, and R. A. Popa, “Merkle²: A low-latency transparency log system,” in *42nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2021, pp. 285–303.
- [122] D. Reijbergen, A. Maw, Z. Yang, T. T. A. Dinh, and J. Zhou, “TAP: transparent and privacy-preserving data services,” in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium*. USENIX Association, 2023, pp. 6489–6506.

Appendix A. PUF-based Attestation Protocol

The following PUF-based protocol can be employed when both CAs and loggers are equipped with PUF instances. It shares a similar procedure with the one in §6.2. This protocol enables mutual verification of the legitimacy of PUF instances by both parties.

- N_{CA_2} generates $n_1 \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ and sends it with the Cert_D , which remains the same as before.
- \mathcal{Lgr} extracts crt_D and ts from Cert_D . It calculates the challenge $hc_D = H(\text{crt}_D || \text{ts} || N_{CA_2})$. \mathcal{Lgr} then uses its own PUF instance to generate $R_l = \text{puf}(hc_D)$ and obtains $m_1 = H(hc_D || I_l || n_1) \oplus R_l$, where I_l is the PUF invocation entry of R_l generated by \mathcal{Lgr} .
- The logger selects $n_2 \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ and sends (m_1, I_l, n_2) to N_{CA_2} , along with a signature using sk_L .
- After verifying the signature, N_{CA_2} recover hc_D by itself and uses PUF to re-obtain R_D . It then confirms the validity of the entry I_l and recovers R_l from m_1 using hc_D, I_l, n_1 .
- N_{CA_2} sends $m_2 = H(R_l || I_D || n_2) \oplus R_D$ and I_D to \mathcal{Lgr} , where I_D is the entry for R_D . The logger recovers R_D to verify the certificate and completes the attestation.

Appendix B. Security Proof Details

We first formalize the security properties of a keyed cryptographic hash function $H_k(\cdot)$.

Definition 2 (AXU Hash). H is an ϵ_H -almost XOR universal (ϵ_H -AXU) hash function, if $\forall M, M' \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $M \neq M'$ and $\forall c \in \{0, 1\}^n$,

$$\Pr \left[H_k(M) \oplus H_k(M') = c \mid k \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n \right] \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \epsilon_H. \quad (4)$$

The AXU definition is another way of expressing the collision resistance of H when $c = 0$. Thus, an AXU hash function is necessarily collision-resistant.

We adopt the classic reduction-based proof technique to derive the probability upper bound of \mathcal{A} winning the security games. As stated in §7, \mathcal{A} is a PPT adversary whose operations are bound in polynomial time and size constraints.

B.1. Security Proof of Theorem 1

In Theorem 1, \mathcal{A} 's goal is to distinguish the output of the certificate issuing oracle \mathcal{O}_I of ARMORED CORE between the output of a random bit oracle $\$(n)$. It is allowed to make at most q queries to obtain the signed certificates with submitting certificate entries to \mathcal{O}_I . Also, we assume that the length of submitted certificate chains during the queries is at most l_M .

Proof To prove the distinguishing advantage of \mathcal{A} , we now define two games G_1 and G_2 , where G_1 is the actual certificate issuing oracle of ARMORED CORE. G_2 is identical to G_1 except that the invocation of PUF is replaced with the collision-free random sampling of $\$(n)$.

The purpose of G_1 and G_2 is to isolate the observation on PUF operations, thereby reducing the overall security of the design to the PUF primitive. When the adversary is interacting with \mathcal{O}_I or $\$(n)$, its distinguishing advantage $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{IND}$ cannot exceed the probability of collisions of PUF responses. That is, if the generated responses do not collide, \mathcal{A} cannot distinguish whether it is interacting with a real ARMORED CORE oracle or the random bit oracle.

Therefore, for all q queries, we have this relation by Definition 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{IND} &\leq \binom{ql_M}{2} \cdot \epsilon_P \\ &= \frac{ql_M(ql_M + 1)}{2^{n+1}} \cdot \epsilon_P \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

When ϵ_P is negligible, the advantage of $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{IND}$ is also negligible. \square

B.2. Security Proof of Theorem 2

In Theorem 2, \mathcal{A} 's goal is to output a valid pair of certificate chain and the signatures after making at most q queries to an issuing oracle.

Proof We can deduce the following statement from the contrapositive of the original theorem: If \mathcal{A} wins the EUF-CMA game, then there exists a PPT adversary \mathcal{B} who can use \mathcal{A} as a subroutine to break the security assumptions of \mathcal{P} . Hence, we can analyze the adversarial advantages by constructing \mathcal{B} based on \mathcal{A} .

In this proof, we fix the length of certificate chains in this proof to l . For the i -th issuing query and $1 \leq j \leq l$, \mathcal{A} generates $M_{i,j} = \{\text{crt}_i, \text{ts}_{i,j}, \text{N}_{i,j}\}$ and sends $M_{i,j}$ to the issuing oracle that is simulated by \mathcal{B} . \mathcal{B} calculates $hc_{i,j}$ as in the original design and sends $hc_{i,j}$ to a PUF oracle \mathcal{O}_P . \mathcal{O}_P returns a PUF response $R_{i,j}$ to \mathcal{B} . It then locally calculates $\text{sig}_{i,j}$ and returns it to \mathcal{A} as the signature.

In each query, $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{O}_P$ would make such interaction l times to construct the complete certificate chain \mathcal{L}_i . During this procedure, \mathcal{B} genuinely constructs a simulated interactive environment for \mathcal{A} to make it seem to engage with the real algorithm oracle of ARMORED CORE. After q queries, let $out_{\mathcal{A}}$ represent the final output of \mathcal{A} in the EUF-CMA game, where $out_{\mathcal{A}}$ contains a set of M_j^* with the corresponding signatures sig_j^* where $1 \leq j \leq l$. A verification oracle \mathcal{O}_V will capture the result and output the flag bit (1 for success and 0 for failure). \mathcal{B} will generate $out_{\mathcal{B}}$ according to $out_{\mathcal{A}}$. The final output of \mathcal{B} determines whether \mathcal{B} succeeds by utilizing \mathcal{A} 's result.

Now we analyze the probability of \mathcal{B} failing in this game. \mathcal{B} will be considered to have failed the attack in the following three cases.

- **Case (1):** \mathcal{A} fails, *i.e.*, \mathcal{V} outputs 0;

- **Case (2):** $out_{\mathcal{A}}$ is invalid. At least one of the generated M^* cause the collision of H . That is, $\exists i \in [1, q], j' \in [1, l]$ such that $hc_{i,j'} = hc_j^*$;
- **Case (3):** \mathcal{A} succeeds and \mathcal{V} outputs 1, but $out_{\mathcal{B}}$ is invalid.

The probability of \mathcal{B} 's failure is at most the sum of the probabilities of these three cases:

$$\Pr[\mathcal{B} \text{ fails}] \leq \Pr[\text{Case(1)}] + \Pr[\text{Case(2)}] + \Pr[\text{Case(3)}], \quad (6)$$

where $\Pr[\text{Case(1)}] = 1 - \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{EUF}$, $\Pr[\text{Case(2)}] = ql^2 \cdot \epsilon_H / 2^n$. For Case (3), it suggests that \mathcal{A} does not create a hash collision but manages to generate a valid `sig` field. Therefore, we have,

$$\left(1 - \frac{ql^2 \epsilon_P}{2^n}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{ql^2 \epsilon_H}{2^n}\right) \leq \left(1 - \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{EUF}\right) + \frac{ql^2 \epsilon_H}{2^n} + \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{EUF} \cdot \frac{ql^2 \cdot \epsilon_H}{2^n}. \quad (7)$$

Then we can derive the advantage upper bound for \mathcal{A} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{EUF} &\leq \frac{\frac{ql^2(\epsilon_H + \epsilon_P)}{2^n} + \frac{ql^2 \epsilon_H}{2^n} - \frac{q^2 l^4 \epsilon_P \cdot \epsilon_H}{2^{2n}}}{1 - \frac{ql^2 \epsilon_H}{2^n}} \\ &\leq \frac{\frac{l^2(\epsilon_H + \epsilon_P)}{2^n} + \frac{l^2 \epsilon_H}{2^n}}{1 - \frac{l^2 \epsilon_H}{2^n}} \\ &= \frac{l^2(2\epsilon_H + \epsilon_P)}{2^n - l^2 \cdot \epsilon_H} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Therefore, if the consumption holds (ϵ_P and ϵ_H are negligible values), then the adversarial advantage of forging valid certificates and signatures will also be negligible. \square

Appendix C.

RISC-V CPU Prototype with Built-in PUF

We provide a preliminary hardware prototype [37] to prove that current computing infrastructure can satisfy the hardware requirements of ARMORED CORE. This prototype integrates PUF into the generic CPU on RISC-V platform to offer the built-in PUF functions. We choose CVA6⁴, a well-known RISC-V 64-bit CPU project with 6-stage pipeline and single issue, in-order execution. It supports the 64-bit RISC-V instruction set and exhibits good scalability. We can modify or extend some of its components, *e.g.*, adding an FPGA-based PUF module into the CPU, as shown in Figure 10.

The PUF-enhanced CVA6 processor is running on a Genesys 2 FPGA board. As illustrated in Figure 10, the prototype integrates PUF directly into the CPU core, alongside functional units such as the arithmetic logic unit, branch predictor, and multiplier/divider, as a new functional unit in the pipeline execution phase.

Considering the demand for expanding the number of PUFs and the fact that PUF operations may require multiple CPU cycles, we have designed a PUF wrapper `puf_wrap`

4. <https://github.com/openhwgroup/cva6>




Figure 10: Integration of PUF in RISC-V SoC

to encapsulate PUF instances. The `puf_wrap` is designed as a finite state machine to control how the module responds to input signals and manages the internal process flow. In our experiment, we instantiated one IPUF [87] within the PUF wrapper, and the `puf_wrap` itself was instantiated within the execute stage module.

Moreover, we designed a custom instruction, `pufc` (short for “PUF challenging”), to utilize the PUF components. This involved modifications to the instruction decode, issue, and commit stages of the CVA6 processor.