Steffan Christ Sølvsten and Anna Mie Hansen

January 2020



Definition (Differential Privacy)

Given parameters $\epsilon \geq 0$ then a probabilistic algorithm $M:A\mapsto B$ is ϵ -differentially private if

$$\forall a_1, a_2 \in A \ \forall O \subset B :$$

$$a_1 \Psi a_2 \implies \Pr[M(a_1) \in O] \le e^{\epsilon} \Pr[M(a_2) \in O] .$$

Randomness Alignment

Consider $q^{(1)}, q^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$, where

$$-1 \le q^{(1)} - q^{(2)} = \hat{q} \le 1$$
.

Randomness Alignment

Consider $q^{(1)}, q^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$, where

$$-1 \le q^{(1)} - q^{(2)} = \hat{q} \le 1$$
 .

If $\eta_1 \sim Lap(1/\epsilon)$ for $q^{(1)}$ we'd like a $\eta_2 \sim Lap(1/\epsilon)$ for $q^{(2)}$ such that

$$\eta_2 = f(\eta_1) = \eta_1 + \hat{q} ,$$

because then

$$q^{(1)} + \eta_1 = q^{(1)} + \eta_1 + \hat{q} = q^{(2)} + \eta_2$$
,

Randomness Alignment

Consider $q^{(1)}, q^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$, where

$$-1 \le q^{(1)} - q^{(2)} = \hat{q} \le 1$$
.

If $\eta_1 \sim Lap(1/\epsilon)$ for $q^{(1)}$ we'd like a $\eta_2 \sim Lap(1/\epsilon)$ for $q^{(2)}$ such that

$$\eta_2 = f(\eta_1) = \eta_1 + \hat{q} ,$$

because then

$$q^{(1)} + \eta_1 = q^{(1)} + \eta_1 + \hat{q} = q^{(2)} + \eta_2$$
,

and then

$$\Pr\left[q^{(1)} + Lap(1/\epsilon) \in O\right] \leq e^{\epsilon} \Pr\left[q^{(2)} + Lap(1/\epsilon) \in O\right]$$
.

Based on the above, Zhang and Kifer '17 propose a type system *LightDP* with dependent types, to prove differential privacy of algorithms.

$$au ::= num_{\mathrm{d}} \mid num_* \mid bool_0 \mid \mathit{list} \ au \mid au_1
ightarrow au_2$$

The number type also contains the numerical distances between the two executions.

A program is differentially private, if

A program is differentially private, if

■ The returned value has distance 0

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathcal{B}_0 \text{ or } \Gamma \vdash e : \textit{list } \mathcal{B}_0 \text{ or } \dots}{\Gamma \vdash \textit{return } e \rightharpoonup \textit{return } e} (\text{T-Return})^1$$

¹These rules are variations of the ones by Zhang and Kifer, to remove the disconnect between the rule and their/our implementation.

A program is differentially private, if

■ The returned value has distance 0

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathcal{B}_0 \text{ or } \Gamma \vdash e : \textit{list } \mathcal{B}_0 \text{ or } \dots}{\Gamma \vdash \textit{return } e \rightharpoonup \textit{return } e} (\text{T-Return})^1$$

■ The privacy budget variable v_{ϵ} is less or equal to ϵ in the *transformed* program on all return paths.

$$\frac{\Gamma(\eta) = \mathit{num}_{\mathrm{d}} \quad e : \mathit{num}_{0}}{\Gamma \vdash \eta := \ \mathit{Lap}(e) \rightharpoonup \mathit{havoc} \ \eta; \ v_{\epsilon} := v_{\epsilon} + |\mathrm{d}|/e} \ (\mathsf{T}\text{-Laplace})^{1}$$

¹These rules are variations of the ones by Zhang and Kifer, to remove the disconnect between the rule and their/our implementation.

Remember, the randomness alignment example from before where $-1 \leq q^{(1)} - q^{(2)} = \hat{q} \leq 1$ and adding $\eta \sim Lap(1/\epsilon)$ to q makes them differentially private.

LaplaceMechanism(q: float)

```
LaplaceMechanism(q: float)

{

let eta: float = Lap(1 / epsilon);
```

```
LaplaceMechanism(q: float)

{

let eta: float = Lap(1 / epsilon);

return q + eta;

}
```

```
precondition: -1.0 <= ^q /\ ^q <= 1.0

LaplaceMechanism(q: float[^q], ^q : float[0])

{
    let eta : float = Lap(1 / epsilon);
    return q + eta;
}</pre>
```

```
precondition: -1.0 <= ^q /\ ^q <= 1.0

LaplaceMechanism(q: float[^q], ^q : float[0])

{
    let eta : float[-^q] = Lap(1 / epsilon);
    return q + eta;
}</pre>
```

```
precondition: -1.0 <= ^q /\ ^q <= 1.0

LaplaceMechanism(q: float[*])

{
    let eta : float[-^q] = Lap(1 / epsilon);
    return q + eta;
}</pre>
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism(epsilon: real, q: real, ghost q_hat0: real)
returns (_:real)
requires epsilon > 0.0
requires -1.0 <= q_hat0 && q_hat0 <= 1.0
{
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism(epsilon : real, q : real, ghost q_hat0 : real)
returns (_:real)
requires epsilon > 0.0
requires -1.0 <= q_hat0 && q_hat0 <= 1.0

ghost var v_epsilon : real := 0.0;
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism(epsilon : real, q : real, ghost q_hat0 : real)
returns (_:real)
requires epsilon > 0.0
requires -1.0 <= q_hat0 && q_hat0 <= 1.0

ghost var v_epsilon : real := 0.0;

assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-Laplace
assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes
assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes</pre>
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism(epsilon : real, q : real, ghost q_hat0 : real)
returns (_:real)
requires (_:real)
requires epsilon > 0.0
requires -1.0 <= q_hat0 && q_hat0 <= 1.0

ghost var v_epsilon : real := 0.0;

assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-Laplace
assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes
assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes
var eta :| 0.0 <= eta;
if * { eta := eta; } else { eta := -eta; }</pre>
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism (epsilon : real , q : real , ghost q_hat0 : real)
         returns ( : real)
         requires epsilon > 0.0
4 5
         requires -1.0 \le q hat0 && q hat0 \le 1.0
6
7
8
         ghost var v epsilon : real := 0.0:
         assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-Laplace
         assert 0.0 == 0.0: // T-OTimes
10
         assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes
         var eta : 0.0 \le \text{eta}:
11
         if * { eta := eta; } else { eta := -eta; }
12
         v epsilon := v epsilon + Abs(-q hat0) / ((1 as real) / epsilon);
13
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism (epsilon: real, q: real, ghost q hat0: real)
         returns ( : real)
         requires epsilon > 0.0
4
5
         requires -1.0 \le q hat0 && q hat0 \le 1.0
6
         ghost var v epsilon : real := 0.0:
7
         assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-Laplace
         assert 0.0 == 0.0: // T-OTimes
10
         assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes
         var eta : 0.0 \le \text{eta}:
11
         if * { eta := eta; } else { eta := -eta; }
12
         v epsilon := v epsilon + Abs(-q hat0) / ((1 as real) / epsilon);
13
14
15
         assert q hat0 + -q hat0 == 0.0; // T-Return
         assert v epsilon <= epsilon; // T-Return
16
```

```
method LaplaceMechanism (epsilon: real, q: real, ghost q hat0: real)
         returns ( : real)
         requires epsilon > 0.0
4
5
         requires -1.0 \le q hat0 && q hat0 \le 1.0
6
         ghost var v epsilon : real := 0.0:
8
         assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-Laplace
         assert 0.0 == 0.0: // T-OTimes
10
         assert 0.0 == 0.0; // T-OTimes
         var eta : 0.0 \le \text{eta}:
11
         if * { eta := eta; } else { eta := -eta; }
12
13
         v = psilon := v = psilon + Abs(-q = hat0) / ((1 = as real) / epsilon);
14
15
         assert q hat0 + -q hat0 == 0.0; // T-Return
         assert v epsilon <= epsilon; // T-Return
16
17
         return q + eta:
18
```

Examples

Verified?	Example Program
\checkmark	laplace_mechanism.mldp
\checkmark	sparse_vector.mldp of Zhang and Kifer '17
\checkmark^1	<pre>numerical_sparse_vector.mldp of Zhang and Kifer '17</pre>
\checkmark^1	<pre>gap_sparse_vector.mldp of Wang et. al. '19</pre>
	partial_sum.mldp of Zhang and Kifer '17
	smart_sum.mldp of Zhang and Kifer '17

 $^{^{1}\}mbox{We}$ had to modify the given invariants to make these work.

Comparison

LightDP	MLightDP	Feature
√	✓	DP Type checking
	✓	Output to a Software Verification tool
	✓	Semantic Analysis of distances
		Refinement: Distance inference
	_	Refinement: Mutable Dependency tracking
	_	Free usage of the Laplace
		Automating non-linearity
	_	Other

The Goal of our project is to create a less prototypical experience than their current prototype.

- 1 Create more intuitive typing annotations.
- 2 Be capable of accommodating the complete pipeline.
- 3 Dispense with assumptions of Zhang and Kifer about the input.
- 4 Make their rules of more fine-grained / less conservative.
- 5 Soundly add new operators, functions, and alternative random distributions to the language.