Fortified-Edge 4.0: A ML-Based Error Correction Framework for Secure Authentication in Collaborative Edge Computing

Presenter: Venkata P. Yanambaka

Seema G. Aarella[1], Venkata P. Yanambaka[2], Saraju P.Mohanty[3], Elias Kougianos[4]

University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203, USA.[1,3,4]

Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX, USA.[2]

Email: Seema.Aarella@unt.edu[1], vyanambaka@twu.edu[2], Saraju.Mohanty@unt.edu[3] and Elias.Kougianos@unt.edu[4]

Outline of the Talk

- Introduction
- Smart Cities and Smart Villages
- Need for Security-by-Design
- Novel Contributions
- Fortified-Edge Ecosystem
- Proposed Fortified-edge 4.0
- Experimental Setup
- Results and Analysis
- Conclusions

Smart Cities Vs Smart Villages



Source: http://edwingarcia.info/2014/04/26/principal/



Source; P. Chanak and I. Banerjee, "Internet of Things-enabled Smart Villages: Recent Advances and Challenges," *IEEE Consumer Electronics Magazine*, DOI: 10.1109/MCE.2020.3013244.

Smart Cities

CPS Types - More
Design Cost - High
Operation Cost – High
Energy Requirement - High

Smart Villages

CPS Types - Less
Design Cost - Low
Operation Cost – Low
Energy Requirement - Low

Challenges of Smart Village



Security-by-Design (SbD)

- Integration of the cybersecurity early in the design phase, not retrofitted
- Device, circuit, and system-level cybersecurity solutions for robust CPS and smart component design



Image Source: https://dataprivacymanager.net/seve-principles-of-privacy-by-design-and-default-what-is-data-protection-by-design-and-default/

Security-by-Design (SbD)



Collaborative Edge Computing (CEC)



Source: D. Puthal, S. P. Mohanty, S. Wilson and U. Choppali, "Collaborative Edge Computing for Smart Villages", *IEEE Consumer Electronics Magazine (MCE)*, Vol. 10, No. 03, May 2021, pp. 68-71.

Collaborative Edge Computing is Cost Effective Sustainable Computing for Smart Villages



Collaborative edge computing connects the IoT-edges of multiple organizations that can be near or far from each other

→ Providing bigger computational capability at the edge with lower design and operation cost.

Source: D. Puthal, M. S. Obaidat, P. Nanda, M. Prasad, S. P. Mohanty, and A. Y. Zomaya, "Secure and Sustainable Load Balancing of Edge Data Centers in Fog Computing", *IEEE Communications Mag*, Vol. 56, No 5, May 2018, pp. 60--65.

Collaborative Edge Computing (CEC)

- Collaborative Edge Computing is a distributed processing environment
- CEC is a collaboration of distributed edge
- Smart control of heterogenous network
- Reduced Bandwidth and Transmission costs
- CEC enables seamless processing through load balancing



Secure Authentication of EDC in CEC

Load Balancing in Collaborative Edge Computing



Edge Intelligent Device Layer

Edge Infrastructure

Cloud Infrastructure

Long-term Vision

Cybersecurity for smart villages based on the SbD principles for secure resource sharing in the CEC environment



AI/ML for Cybersecurity in Smart Villages

Our Fortified-Edge: The Key Idea

- A lightweight and Secure Authentication scheme for EDCs during load balancing in the CEC environment of smart villages



Fortified-Edge 1.0 - The Idea

- CEC enables applications in smart villages through load balancing
- To develop a secure authentication protocol for Load balancing
- Suitable for a smart village environment
- Incorporate Security-by-Design for smart and sustainable security



Source: S. G. Aarella, **S. P. Mohanty**, E. Kougianos, and D. Puthal, "Fortified-Edge: Secure PUF Certificate Authentication Mechanism for Edge Data Centers in Collaborative Edge Computing", in *Proceedings of the ACM Great Lakes Symposium on VLSI (GLSVLSI)*, 2023, pp. 249--254, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3583781.3590249

Fortified-Edge 2.0 - The Idea



Features

- Secure, Low Latency Authentication
- Device identification
- Intrusion detection
- Attack Prevention
- EDC Monitoring
- Resilient against malicious Requests
- ML model suitable for a smaller dataset

Fortified Edge 3.0 Machine Learning for Edge





Fortified- Edge 4.0 - Motivation

- Environmental effects on PUF
- Bit flipping in PUF response affects the performance
- Bit errors reduce the reliability
- Security applications need reliable PUF



PUF Security Model for Bit Error Correction



Related Prior Research

Research	Year	ML Algorithm	Application
Upadhyaya et. al. [20]	2019	Natural Redundancy decoders based on Machine Learning	Error Correction
Suragani et. al. [19]	2022	Proof-of-Concept using CNN	Classification of corrupted PUF responses
Chatterjee et. al. [5]	2020	Random Forest based PUF Calibration scheme	Validate sensor data
Najafi et. al. [14]	2021	Deep CNN	Recognize PUF responses under error conditions
Wen et. al. [21]	2017	Fuzzy Extractor	PUF reliability
Current Research Fortified-Edge 4.0	**2024**	**K-mer Sequence**	**PUF bit error correction**

Novel Contributions of Current Research

- Novel machine learning method for bit error detection and correction
- Data preprocessing done through visualization, data cleaning
- Sequencing methods used in DNA sequencing and Natural Language Processing (NLP)
- Vectorization of the sequences
- MultinomialNB for classification
- A deployable working model that can predict the correct response from the response with an error

Problems Addressed and Solutions Proposed

Problems Addressed

- Area overhead added by the bit error correction module
- Computational overhead
- Extensive error correction schemes do not suit the lightweight aspect of the security system
- Data leakage issues related to helper data in schemes that use helper bits
- Secure storage of the helper data, an added feature making the design complex

Solutions Proposed

- ✓ The area overhead and computational overhead are low as the trained model is used at the device end
- ✓ There is no need to store the helper data
- ✓ Helper data leakage is not an issue as the trained model is deployed at the device end
- ✓ The ML model is highly accurate in correcting the erroneous response bits

Fortified-Edge Research

Research	Algorithm	Application	Accuracy
Fortified-Edge 1.0 [4]	SRAM PUF-based Certificate	EDC Authentication	NA
Fortified-Edge 2.0[3]	SVM	ML-based Authentication & Monitoring	100.0
Fortified-Edge 3.0[1]	Lightweight ML models	Anomaly & Intrusion detection	99.33
Current Research Fortified-Edge 4.0	**K-mer Sequence**	**PUF Response Bit Error Correction**	**99.74**

PROPOSED FORTIFIED-EDGE 4.0



Experimental Setup



- This research uses the 64-bit Arbiter PUF architecture
- PUFs. PYNQ™ Z2 FPGA which is based on Xilinx Zynq C7Z020 SoC used for PUF implementation
- Xilinx BASYS3 FPGA used to build PUF
- Raspberry Pi 4 to test the trained model
- Uniqueness, Randomness, and Hamming Distance are used to measure the performance of PUF
- Precision, Recall, Accuracy, and F-1 Score are the metrics used for the performance of the ML model

Process Flow

- The performance of the arbiter PUF - 49.52% Uniqueness, 86.85% Randomness, and 45.67% inter-HD
- Dataset – 100K Responses, 1000 Challenges, 100 Responses for each Challenge
- Dataset includes responses with error, 80% training set, 20% testing set



Experimental Results

- K-mers size of 6 applied on string data generates 51 unique sequences
- 511 features are generated from 100K data
- The visual representation of the K-mer sequences helps to study the pattern distribution
- Examine bit positions for diversity, consistency, and other structural information



Experimental Results



- 100K data initialized as string
- The algorithm identifies 100 classes
- Group the responses into unique classes

[1000 rows x 1000 columns]

Actual	554	958	47	164	309	397	498	883	24	118
Actual										
554	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
958	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
164	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
309	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0
397	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0
498	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0
883	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0
118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Experimental Results

```
Input Response:      1100100110000010101111000011101000110111110000111100010
Predicted Class: 293
************************************************************
Actual Class:  293
Corrected Response:  1100100110000010101111000011101000110111110000111100010
```

The result of the algorithm shows the input response and corrected response

Predicted ID: 293

	ID	Challenge	Corresponding_Response
0	293	1001000111011101011111100001111111010010011100...	1100100110000010101111000011101000110111110000...

The result shows the corresponding challenge to the corrected response

Analysis of Results

- The trained model is deployed on Raspberry Pi 4 and both training and prediction analysis are done
- The algorithm is evaluated for accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score, for each of the metrics it gives 100% results
- Coverage Rate - gives insights into the percentage of unique K-mers in the dataset, increasing the size of the K-mers it was observed that the coverage rate increases significantly
- Test for overfitting - KFold cross-validation was done
- The cross-validation scores - 99.78%, 99.74%, 99.70%, 99.75%, 99.73%, with a mean accuracy of 99.74%

Analysis of Results

- The process of training and prediction of new data is analyzed for time and power consumed
- Raspberry Pi 4 used as an edge device for training and prediction
- Processing speed – 13.15 sequences per second
- Processing Power – 0.28 sequences per character
- Idle Power of Raspberry Pi 4 – 3.4-3.6 Watts

	Time(s)	Power (W)
Training	30.63	4.6-4.7
Prediction	0.08	4.1

Comparative Table for State-of-the-Art Literature

Research	Year	Algorithm	Accuracy
Upadhyaya et. al. [20]	2019	Natural Redundancy decoders based on Machine Learning	NA
Suragani et. al. [19]	2022	Proof-of-Concept using CNN	97.34
Chatterjee et. al. [5]	2020	Random Forest based PUF Calibration scheme	90.00
Najafi et. al. [14]	2021	Deep CNN	94.90
Wen et. al. [21]	2017	Fuzzy Extractor	98.00
Current Research Fortified-Edge 4.0	**2024**	**K-mer Sequence**	**99.74**

Conclusion

- This research proposes a novel K-mer sequence-based bit error detection and correction algorithm for correcting the PUF responses
- The stability of the PUF response increases the reliability of the PUF when employing it in security and cryptographic applications
- The power and time analysis proves that the ML model is low power consuming, and faster in processing
- Suitable for EDC Authentication in resource-constrained environments at the edge
- The multinomialNB classifier used is fast and computationally efficient

Future Research

- For future research, we are considering using this reliable PUF architecture for deepfake detection or prevention
- This PUF module can be used as a device authenticator if installed in the camera module to identify the device
- The machine learning model can be used as a verifier for the images generated from the authorized device

Thank you!