



The Quest to Finding the Best Secure Neural Network Inference

Course code:
5062ABI18Y

No general implementation of an SNNI has been widely accepted to the authors knowledge. Rapid progress in this area has made it hard to get a good overview of technological advances.

Mann et al. (2022) has summarized several proposed approaches for SNNI. However, these approaches are often proof-of-concept and are not thoroughly tested. Moreover, the performance is often only tested on basic measures like efficiency or accuracy.

Other metrics like energy consumption, that could be of relevance, are not researched. This could be of importance because of limitations on the client side. For example when a device is battery powered or in the case of IoT devices that have limited power resources and where the overall energy consumption should be low. Companies, on the other hand, also want to keep energy consumption as low as possible because of budget limitations and thus should not encounter big energy overhead. Another reason to limit the energy consumption is the desire to reduce carbon emission on the fight against climate change.

2 Research question(s)

To contribute to the prior research in this area, I will discuss the energy implications of a suggested, open source implementation of an approach to SNNI. A few of these implementations are ABY2.0 (Patra et al. 2020), Chameleon (Riazi et al. 2018), Cheetah (Huang et al. 2022), CryptFlow2 (Kumar et al. 2019) and Delphi (Mishra et al. 2020). The main research question is of this project is:

RQ: What are the energy implications of open source suggestions of SNNIs?

To help research the implications of the SNNI, I have defined a subset of research questions:

RQa: How do we best measure the energy consumption of a SNNI?

Once we have established a way to measure energy consumption of SNNIs we can start with the experiments of measuring the energy consumption. With these results we know want to see if there is a difference between the energy consumption on the client side of the implementation and the energy consumption on the server side. If there is a difference we shortly want to look at the implications of this difference. This implications could for example have impact on the aforementioned IoT devices, thus resulting in research question *RQb*:

RQb: If there is a difference between energy consumption on the client side and on the server side: what are the implications of the overhead on the client side and what are implications the overhead the server side?

3 Method

To answer these aforementioned questions first I will have to select one implementation of a SNNI to start with. Once the implementation is chosen I will need to get it working on my own setup. Simultaneous to this we will answer question *RQa* with a literature search on how other authors measure energy consumption. There is a possibility that other authors have already researched the energy consumption of an approach to SNNI mentioned in the preceding section, or researched the energy implications of other programs.

Once the implementation is set up and we have answered *RQa* we can start testing the energy consumption of a NN with and without the SNNI. Now we can calculate the overhead of the SNNI. If there is time to set up another implementation I will compare the overhead between these implementations. With the results of this experiment we can answer the first part of *RQb*. The second part of *RQb* can be answered with a small literature search on the implications of energy consumption.

4 Schedule

(On next page)

[illegible]

References

- Dowlin, Nathan, Ran Gilad-Bachrach, Kim Laine, Kristin Lauter, Michael Naehrig, and John Wernsing (2017). “Manual for Using Homomorphic Encryption for Bioinformatics”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE*, pp. 1–16. DOI: 10.1109/jproc.2016.2622218. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/jproc.2016.2622218>.
- Gilad-Bachrach, Ran, Nathan Dowlin, Kim Laine, Kristin Lauter, Michael Naehrig, and John Wernsing (2016). “CryptoNets: Applying Neural Networks to Encrypted Data with High Throughput and Accuracy”. In: *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by Maria Florina Balcan and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Vol. 48. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. New York, New York, USA: PMLR, pp. 201–210.
- He, Kaiming, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun (2015). *Delving Deep into Rectifiers: Surpassing Human-Level Performance on ImageNet Classification*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1502.01852. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.01852>.
- Huang, Zhicong, Wen-jie Lu, Cheng Hong, and Jiansheng Ding (Aug. 2022). “Cheetah: Lean and Fast Secure Two-Party Deep Neural Network Inference”. In: *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*. Boston, MA: USENIX Association, pp. 809–826. ISBN: 978-1-939133-31-1. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/huang-zhicong>.
- Islam, Naveed, William Puech, Khizar Hayat, and Robert Brouzet (Sept. 2011). “Application of homomorphism to secure image sharing”. In: *Optics Communications* 284.19, pp. 4412–4429. DOI: 10.1016/j.optcom.2011.05.079.
- Kumar, Nishant, Mayank Rathee, Nishanth Chandran, Divya Gupta, Aseem Rastogi, and Rahul Sharma (2019). *CrypTFlow: Secure TensorFlow Inference*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1909.07814. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07814>.
- Mann, Zoltán Ádám, Christian Weinert, Daphnee Chabal, and Joppe W. Bos (2022). *Towards Practical Secure Neural Network Inference: The Journey So Far and the Road Ahead*. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2022/1483. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/1483>. URL: <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/1483>.
- Mishra, Pratyush, Ryan Lehmkuhl, Akshayaram Srinivasan, Wenting Zheng, and Raluca Ada Popa (Aug. 2020). “Delphi: A Cryptographic Inference Service for Neural Networks”. In: *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*. USENIX Association, pp. 2505–2522. ISBN: 978-1-939133-17-5. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/mishra>.
- Nasr, Milad, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr (May 2019). “Comprehensive Privacy Analysis of Deep Learning: Passive and Active White-box Inference Attacks against Centralized and Federated Learning”. In: *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE. DOI: 10.1109/sp.2019.00065.
- Patra, Arpita, Thomas Schneider, Ajith Suresh, and Hossein Yalame (2020). *ABY2.0: Improved Mixed-Protocol Secure Two-Party Computation*. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2020/1225. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/1225>. URL: <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/1225>.
- Riazi, M. Sadegh, Christian Weinert, Oleksandr Tkachenko, Ebrahim M. Songhori, Thomas Schneider, and Farinaz Koushanfar (2018). *Chameleon: A Hybrid Secure Computation Framework for Machine Learning Applications*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1801.03239.
