Privacy Proofs for OpenDP: MakeCount

Sílvia Casacuberta, Grace Tian, Connor Wagaman – wagaman@college.harvard.edu

Version as of August 22, 2022 (UTC)

Contents

	0.1	Versions of definitions documents]
1	Ma	keCount	1
	1.1	Implementation of MakeCount in Rust	1
	1.2	$Implementation \ of \ Make Count \ in \ Python-style \ pseudocode, \ with \ preconditions \ \ldots \ \ldots \ .$	1
2	Pro	pofs for the pseudocode	:

0.1 Versions of definitions documents

When looking for definitions for terms that appear in this document, the following versions of the definitions documents should be used.

- Pseudocode definitions document: This proof file uses the version of the pseudocode definitions document available as of September 23, 2021, which can be found at this link (archived here).
- **Proof definitions document:** This file uses the version of the proof definitions document available as of September 23, 2021, which can be found at this link (archived here).

1 MakeCount

1.1 Implementation of MakeCount in Rust

This proof is based on the code in https://github.com/opendp/opendp/blob/c3b5c3bd9fc50c556362b628f08c5fddea069brust/opendp/src/trans/count.rs#L14-L27 from 12 July 2021. (It is from this pull request.) The Rust code can also be seen below.

1.2 Implementation of MakeCount in Python-style pseudocode, with preconditions

We now use Python-style pseudocode to present a representation of the Rust function.

The use of code-style parameters in the preconditions section below (for example, input_domain) means that this information should be passed along to the Transformation constructor.

Here, we use preconditions to check for traits, and to specify the domains and metrics.

Preconditions

- User-specified types: The make_count function takes two inputs: a generic input type TIA for the Transformation (meaning that the input vector to Transformation is of type Vec(TIA)), and a generic output type TO for the Transformation.
 - TO has traits One, ExactIntCast(usize), and DistanceConstant(IntDistance).

Examples: u32 and i64 have these traits because they have (1) a multiplicative identity element, (2) every value of type usize that falls within the minimum and maximum consecutive integers of type u32 has an exact representation of type u32 (the same applies for i64), and (3) multiplication and division apply to types u32 and i64, values of type u32 and i64 have a partial ordering, and every value of type usize can be inf_casted to a value of type u32 (meaning that the inf_cast will either result in an error or will result in a value of type u32 that is at least as large as the input value of type usize; this also applies for i64).

Currently, the ExactIntCast and DistanceConstant traits are implemented for casting between all numeric types, with the exception of InfCast not being implemented for going to or from usize and isize (and thus DistanceConstant not being implemented). Therefore, usize and isize do not have these traits.

— IntDistance has trait InfCast(TO). (Note that this bullet point is not needed in this proof, but it is needed in the code so a hint can be constructed; otherwise a binary search would be needed to construct the hint.)

Examples: Recall that IntDistance is an alias for the type u32. IntDistance has trait InfCast(u32), because any unsigned 32-bit integer can be converted to an unsigned 32-bit integer (type IntDistance) that is at least as big. On the other hand, IntDistance has trait InfCast(u64), because every value of type u64 can either be infcasted to a value of type u32 that is at least as large, or an error can be returned.

On the other hand, IntDistance does not have trait InfCast(usize) because InfCast is not implemented for going to or from usize.

Postconditions: a valid Transformation must be returned (i.e. if a Transformation cannot be returned successfully, a runtime error should be returned)

```
def MakeCount(TIA, TO):
      input_domain = VectorDomain(AllDomain(TIA))
      output_domain = AllDomain(TO)
      input_metric = SymmetricDistance()
      output_metric = AbsoluteDistance(T0)
      # give the Transformation the following properties
9
      max_value = get_max_consecutive_int(T0)
      def function(data: Vec[TIA]) -> TO:
11
              return exact_int_cast(len(data), T0)
          except FailedCast:
13
               return max_value
14
      def stability_relation(din:IntDistance, dout:T0) -> bool:
15
          return 1 * inf_cast(din,T0) <= dout</pre>
16
17
      # now, return the Transformation
18
      return Transformation(input_domain,output_domain,function,input_metric,output_metric,
19
      stability_relation)
```

2 Proofs for the pseudocode

Theorem 2.1. For every setting of the input parameters TIA, TO for MakeCount such that the given preconditions hold, MakeCount raises an exception (at compile time or run time) or returns a valid Transformation with the following properties:

- 1. (Appropriate output domain). For every vector v in the input_domain, function(v) is in the output_domain.
- 2. (Domain-metric compatibility). The domain input_domain matches one of the possible domains listed in the definition of input_metric, and likewise output_domain matches one of the possible domains listed in the definition of output_metric.
- 3. (Stability guarantee). For every input u, v drawn from the input_domain and for every pair (d_in, d_out), where d_in is of type u32 and d_out is of type TO (see line 15 of the pseudocode), if u, v are d_in-close under the input_metric and stability_relation(din, dout) = True, then function(u), function(v) are d_out-close under the output_metric.

Proof. (Part 1 — appropriate output domain). In line 4 of the pseudocode, we have output_domain = AllDomain(TO), so every value of type TO is in the output_domain, and in line 10 of the Python-style pseudocode, we see that the function is always guaranteed to return a value of type TO. Because Rust employs "type checking", if the Rust code compiles correctly, then the type correctness follows from the definition of the type signature enforced by Rust. Otherwise, the code raises an exception for incorrect input type. Therefore, since our output domain is any value of type TO, we see that function has the appropriate output domain output_domain.

Proof. (Part 2 – domain-metric compatibility).

The input_domain is VectorDomain(AllDomain(TIA)). Because our input_metric of SymmetricDistance is compatible with any domain of the form

VectorDomain(inner_domain), and because VectorDomain(AllDomain(TIA)) is of this form, we see that it is compatible with our input_metric of SymmetricDistance.

The output_domain is AllDomain(TO). Because our output_metric of AbsoluteDistance(TO) is compatible with any domain of the form AllDomain(T) where T has the trait Sub(Output=T), and because AllDomain(TO) is of this form and TO has the necessary trait, we see that it is compatible with our output_metric of AbsoluteDistance(TO).

Before proceeding with proving the third part of theorem 2.1, we provide a lemma.

Lemma 2.2. For vector v with each element $\ell \in v$ drawn from domain \mathcal{X} , $len(v) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h_v(z)$.

Proof. Every element $\ell \in v$ is drawn from domain \mathcal{X} , so summing over all $z \in \mathcal{X}$ will sum over every element $\ell \in x$. Recall that definition $\ref{eq:local_sum}$ states that $h_v(z)$ will return the number of occurrences of value z in vector v. Therefore, $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h_v(z)$ is the sum of the number of occurrences of each unique value; this is equivalent to the total number of items in the vector. By the definition of len available in the pseudocode definitions document linked in section 0.1, then, $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h_v(z)$ is equivalent to len(v).

Proof. (Part 3 – stability relation). Here, we consider two inputs: a vector \mathbf{u} of elements of type TIA; and a vector \mathbf{v} of elements of type TIA. (This input_domain is specified in the pseudocode in section 1.2.) We prove that if stability_relation(d_in, d_out) = True, then function(u), function(v) are d_out-close.

Assume it is the case that $stability_relation(d_in, d_out) = True$. From the stability relation provided on line 16, this means that $inf_cast(d_in, T0) \le d_out$. From the pseudocode definitions file linked in section 0.1, we know that inf_cast will cast d_in to a value at least as large as d_in , so this assumption that $stability_relation$ is True also means that $d_in \le d_out$. Also assume that u, v are d_in -close under the symmetric distance metric (in accordance with the $input_metric$ specified in the preconditions in section 1.2).

We now refer to the definition of symmetric distance provided in the proof definitions document (a link to this document is available in section 0.1).

Combining the assumptions that $inf_cast(d_in, T0) \leq d_out$, and that u, v are d_in-close under the symmetric distance metric, means that

$$d_{Svm}(u, v) \le d_{-in} \le d_{-out}. \tag{1}$$

Let \mathcal{X} be the domain of all elements of type TIA. Therefore, we see that the symmetric distance between u and v is

$$d_{\mathrm{Sym}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} |h_{\mathbf{u}}(z) - h_{\mathbf{v}}(z)| \le \mathtt{d_in} \le \mathtt{d_out}. \tag{2}$$

We now prove that len(u) and len(v) are d_out-close. By lemma 2.2, we know that len(v) = $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h_v(z)$. Substituting, we have

$$|\mathtt{len(u)} - \mathtt{len(v)}| = |\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h_{\mathtt{u}}(z) - \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h_{\mathtt{v}}(z)| = |\sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \left(h_{\mathtt{u}}(z) - h_{\mathtt{v}}(z)\right)|. \tag{3}$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\left| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \left(h_{\mathbf{u}}(z) - h_{\mathbf{v}}(z) \right) \right| \le \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} |h_{\mathbf{u}}(z) - h_{\mathbf{v}}(z)|. \tag{4}$$

Therefore, combining equation 3 and inequality 4, we have that

$$|\operatorname{len}(\mathbf{u}) - \operatorname{len}(\mathbf{v})| \le \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} |h_{\mathbf{u}}(z) - h_{\mathbf{v}}(z)|. \tag{5}$$

Combining inequalities 5 and 2, we have

$$|len(u) - len(v)| \le d_out,$$
 (6)

so len(u) and len(v) must be d_out-close. This, however, does not complete the proof that the stability relation holds because function(u) does not return len(u), but either exact_cast(len(u),TO) or - in the event exact_cast fails - get_max_consecutive_int(TO).

We now consider the two cases that could occur:

1. (Without loss of generality, exact_cast(len(u),T0) fails - which causes the try-catch statement in line 11 to catch and return max_value - and exact_cast(len(v),T0) succeeds). Because T0 has trait ExactIntCast(usize), if the exact_cast fails for len(u), we then know that len(u) is greater than get_max_consecutive_int(T0). Likewise, if the exact_cast succeeds for len(v), we then know that len(v) is no larger than get_max_consecutive_int(T0). Therefore, because the return value get_max_consecutive_int(T0) for u is smaller than the true length value len(u), the absolute difference between the output for u and the output for v will be smaller than the absolute distance between len(u) and len(v). Since we showed that the len(u) and len(v) are d_out-close in inequality 6, therefore the outputs will still be d_out-close.

Note that if <code>exact_cast</code> fails and causes the try-catch statement in line 11 to catch and return <code>max_value</code> for both <code>len(u)</code> and <code>len(v)</code>, then the output for both <code>u</code> and <code>v</code> is <code>get_max_consecutive_int(TO)</code>, resulting in an absolute distance of 0 between the outputs – the smallest possible absolute distance – so the outputs for <code>u</code> and <code>v</code> must be <code>d_out-close</code>.

2. (Both exact_cast(len(u),T0) and exact_cast(len(v),T0) succeed). Because T0 implements ExactIntCast(usize), we know exact_casts from len(u) to T0 will be exact. Therefore, the returned values will be len(u) and len(v), except the values will now be of type T0. Since we showed that the len(u) and len(v) are d_out-close in inequality 6, therefore the exact_casted lengths will also be d_out-close.

Because the outputs will always be d_out-close for inputs that follow the conditions specified in part 2 of theorem 2.1, we see that the stability guarantee is proven.