Physical (PHY) Layer Features for Device Authentication Bryan Manzi⁺, Gian Claude^{*}, Peter Ekpewoh^{*}, Timothy J. Pierson⁺, Michel Reece-Kornegay^{*} and David Kotz⁺ ⁺ Dartmouth College, ^{*} Morgan State University

Authenticating devices is essential to maintain IoT data integrity

- Many researchers imagine networks of billions of deployed Internet of Things (IoT) devices collecting data about their local environment
- Data from these deployed devices is envisioned to be aggregated and analyzed to yield insight into the behavior of complex systems
- Adversarial devices, operating amongst legitimate devices, may try to masquerade as legitimate devices
- These adversaries may then try to inject inaccurate or misleading data into the network, potentially resulting in an erroneous characterization of the environment
- Reliable device authentication is needed to prevent such impersonation attacks

PHY-layer radio signal features could help authenticate wireless devices

- Currently, authentication is typically done at upper levels of the network stack using cryptography
- Key management and computational complexity can make cryptography difficult to implement and maintain on a large network of small, possibly mobile, computationally constrained IoT devices
- We evaluate radio signal features at the physical (PHY) layer as a complimentary approach to cryptography
- Difficult-to-clone manufacturing imperfections create device-unique PHY-layer signal 'fingerprints'
- These unique fingerprints can be used to identify and authenticate devices, potentially stopping impersonation attacks











1) Develop device signal profile

When devices are first introduced (e.g., paired), devices note the signal 'fingerprint' of the new device Device creates profile of the new device based on signal fingerprint features

2) Create classification models

 Machine learning produces classification models based on signal profile • Models attempts to identify individual devices (e.g., device number 123) • Models may identify device types (e.g.,

3) Identify transmitter

Received signals features are input to classification models to identify the

Preliminary results are promising

We can distinguish between devices from the same manufacturer and between individual devices



We can distinguish between legitimate devices and SDR impersonation attacks



- predictions with low confidence
- confidence of legitimate devices

Process

- Signals features input into trained models
- Device identity predicted

Performance

- Average Precision: 96.9%
- Average Accuracy: 97.7%
- Average Recall: 95.8%
- Average F1: 96.3%
- Average Confidence: 92.3%

Takeaways

- Some devices are easier to classify than others
- Classifier accuracy decreases if there are multiple instances of the same type of device

Replayed signals always result in lower confidence than lowest

National Science Foundation Award CNS-1329686

