Privacy Proofs for OpenDP: Clamping

Sílvia Casacuberta

Summer 2021

Contents

1	Algorithm Implementation	1
	1.1 Code in Rust	
	Proof 2.1 Symmetric Distance	2

1 Algorithm Implementation

1.1 Code in Rust

The current OpenDP library contains the make_clamp_vec function implementing the clamping function. This is defined in lines 25-38 of the file manipulation.rs in the Git repository¹ (https://github.com/opendp/opendp/blob/58feb788ec78ce739caaf3cad8471c79fd5e7132/rust/opendp/src/trans/manipulation.rs#L25-L38).

1.2 Pseudocode in Python

We present a simplified Python-like pseudocode of the Rust implementation below. The necessary definitions for the pseudocode can be found at "List of definitions used in the pseudocode".

¹As of June 16, 2021. Since then, the code has been updated to include a more general clampable domain, which is not yet finished.

Preconditions

To ensure the correctness of the output, we require the following preconditions:

- User-specified types:
 - Type T must have trait TotalOrd.²
- input_domain: any vector of elements of type T.
- output_domain: any vector of elements of type T which are contained in the interval [L, U], where L and U are of type T. (silvia) Problem: L and U appear only later in the pseudocode, as discussed on July 13.
- input_metric: symmetric distance.
- output_metric: symmetric distance.

Postconditions

• A Transformation is returned (i.e., if a Transformation cannot be returned successfully, then an error should be returned).

```
def MakeClamp(L: T, U: T):
    if L > U: raise Exception('Invalid parameters')
    def Relation(d_in: u32, d_out: u32) -> bool:
        return d_out >= d_in*1

def function(data: Vec(T)) -> Vec(T):
        def clamp(x: T) -> T:
            return max(min(x, U), L)
        return list(map(clamp, data))

return Transformation(input_domain, output_domain, function, input_metric, output_metric, stability_relation)
```

2 Proof

The necessary definitions for the proof can be found at "List of definitions used in the proofs".

2.1 Symmetric Distance

Theorem 1. For every setting of the input parameters (L, U) to MakeClamp such that the given preconditions hold, the transformation returned by MakeClamp has the following properties:

1. (Appropriate output domain). For every element v in $input_domain$, function(v) is in $output_domain$.

 $^{^2}$ For now, the OpenDP library only implements PartialOrd, but TotalOrd will soon be implemented.

- 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 pair of elements v, w in $input_domain$ and for every pair (d_in, d_out) , where d_in and d_out are of type u32, if v, w are d_{in} -close under $input_metric$ and $Relation(d_in, d_out) = True$, then function(v), function(w) are d_{out} -close under $output_metric$.

Proof. (Appropriate output domain). In the case of MakeClamp, this corresponds to showing that for every vector v of elements of type T, function(v) is a vector of elements of type T which are contained in the interval [L, U]. For that, we need to show two things: first, that function(v) has type Vec(T). Second, that they belong to the interval [L, U].

Firstly, that function(v) has type Vec(T) follows from the assumption that element v is in $input_domain$ and from the type signature of function in line 6 of the pseudocode (Section 1.2), which takes in an element of type Vec(T) and returns an element of type Vec(T). 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.

Secondly, we need to show that the vector entries belong to the interval [L, U]. This follows from the definition of clamp in line 7. According to line 7 in the pseudocode, there are 3 possible cases to consider:

- 1. x > U: then clamp(x) returns U.
- 2. $x \in [L, U]$: then clamp(x) returns x.
- 3. x < L: then clamp(x) returns L.

In all three cases, the returned value of type T is contained in the interval [L, U]. Hence, the vector function(v) returned in line 9 of the pseudocode is an element of output_domain.

Lastly, the necessary condition that $L \leq U$ is checked in line 2 of the pseudocode, hence correctness is guaranteed if no exception is raised. Both L and U have type T by their precondition requirement. Both the definition of IntervalDomain and that of the clamp function (line 7 in the pseudocode, which uses the min and max functions) require that the type of L, U, and of each vector entry in v implements TotalOrd. In the case of T, this holds by the preconditions.

(Domain-metric compatibility). For MakeClamp, both cases correspond to showing that VectorDomain(T) is compatible with symmetric distance. This follows directly from the definition of symmetric distance, as stated in "List of definitions used in the proofs". The appropriate output domain property shown above ensures that output_domain is VectorDomain(T), and hence also compatible with the output_metric symmetric distance.

(Stability guarantee). Throughout the stability guarantee proof, we can assume that function(v) and function(w) are in the correct output domain, by the appropriate output domain property shown above.

Since by assumption $Relation(d_in, d_out) = True$, by the MakeClamp stability relation (as defined in line 3 in the pseudocode), we have that $d_in \leq d_out$. Moreover, v, w

are assumed to be d_in-close. By the definition of the symmetric difference metric, this is equivalent to stating that $d_{Sym}(v, w) = |\text{MultiSet}(v)\Delta \text{MultiSet}(w)| \leq d_{\text{in}}$.

Further, applying the histogram notation,³ it follows that

$$d_{Sym}(v,w) = \|h_v - h_w\|_1 = \sum_z |h_v(z) - h_w(z)| \le \mathtt{d_in} \le \mathtt{d_out}.$$

We now consider $\operatorname{MultiSet}(\operatorname{function}(v))$ and $\operatorname{MultiSet}(\operatorname{function}(w))$. For each element $z \in \operatorname{MultiSet}(v) \cup \operatorname{MultiSet}(w)$, where z has type T, if $z \in \operatorname{MultiSet}(v) \Delta \operatorname{MultiSet}(w)$, we will assume wlog that $z \in \operatorname{MultiSet}(v) \setminus \operatorname{MultiSet}(w)$. We consider the following cases:

1. z > U or z < L: then, in the former case, clamp(z) = U. First consider the case when $z \in MultiSet(v) \cup MultiSet(w)$ with the same multiplicity in both multisets. Then, $|h_{function(v)}(z) - h_{function(w)}(z)| = 0$ because we have both $h_{function(v)}(z) = 0$ and $h_{function(w)}(z) = 0$. Thus the sum

$$\sum_{z} |h_{\mathtt{function}(v)}(z) - h_{\mathtt{function}(w)}(z)|$$

remains invariant, because the quantity $|h_v(z) - h_w(z)|$ is added to $|h_{\text{function}(v)}(U) - h_{\text{function}(w)}(U)|$, given that clamp(z) = U.

Suppose z has multiplicity $k_v \geq 0$ in MultiSet(v) and multiplicity $k_w \geq 0$ in MultiSet(w), where $k_v \neq k_w$. After considering z, the value $h_{\mathtt{function}(v)}(\mathtt{U})$ becomes $h_{\mathtt{function}(v)}(\mathtt{U}) + k_v$, and $h_{\mathtt{function}(w)}(\mathtt{U})$ becomes $h_{\mathtt{function}(w)}(\mathtt{U}) + k_w$. Hence the quantity $|h_{\mathtt{function}(v)}(\mathtt{U}) - h_{\mathtt{function}(w)}(\mathtt{U})|$ increases by at most $|h_v(z) - h_w(z)|$, since, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{split} &|(h_{\texttt{function}(v)}(\texttt{U}) + k_v) - (h_{\texttt{function}(w)}(\texttt{U}) + k_w)| \leq \\ &\leq |h_{\texttt{function}(v)}(\texttt{U}) - h_{\texttt{function}(w)}(\texttt{U})| + |k_v - k_w| = \\ &= |h_{\texttt{function}(v)}(\texttt{U}) - h_{\texttt{function}(w)}(\texttt{U})| + |h_v(z) - h_w(z)|. \end{split}$$

The same argument applies whenever z < L.

(silvia) The first subcase discussed here, i.e., when $k_v = k_w$, is also proven by the triangle inequality expression above, but it seemed clean to separate the case where the total sum remains invariant.

2. $z \in (L, U)$: then, $\operatorname{clamp}(z) = z$. Since $h_v(z) = h_{\operatorname{function}(v)}(z)$ and $h_v(w) = h_{\operatorname{function}(w)}(z)$, it follows that $|h_v(z) - h_w(z)| = |h_{\operatorname{function}(v)}(z) - h_{\operatorname{function}(w)}(z)|$. Hence the histogram count, i.e., the quantity

$$\sum_{z} |h_{\mathtt{function}(v)}(z) - h_{\mathtt{function}(w)}(z)|,$$

remains invariant.

³See A Programming Framework for OpenDP, footnote 1 in page 3. Note that there is a bijection between multisets and histograms, which is why the proof can be carried out with either notion. For further details, please consult https://www.overleaf.com/project/60d214e390b337703d200982.

3. z = U or z = L: then, in the former case, clamp(z) = U. If $z \in MultiSet(v) \cup MultiSet(w)$ with the same multiplicity in both multisets, then the histogram count remains invariant under the addition of element z. Otherwise, if $z \in MultiSet(v) \setminus MultiSet(w)$, or if z is in their union but with different multiplicity, then element z can increase the quantity $|h_{function(v)}(U) - h_{function(w)}(U)|$ by at most $|h_v(z) - h_w(z)|$, following the same reasoning with the triangle inequality as in case 2.

The same argument applies whenever z = L.

By aggregating the three cases above, we conclude that

$$\sum_{z} |h_{\texttt{function}(v)}(z) - h_{\texttt{function}(w)}(z)| \leq \sum_{z} |h_v(z) - h_w(z)|.$$

By the initial assumptions, we recall that $d_{in} \leq d_{out}$, and that v, w are d_{in} -close. Then,

$$\sum_z |h_{\texttt{function}(v)}(z) - h_{\texttt{function}(w)}(z)| \leq \sum_z |h_v(z) - h_w(z)| \leq \mathtt{d_in} \leq \mathtt{d_out}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\text{MultiSet}(\text{function}(v))\Delta \text{MultiSet}(\text{function}(w))| \leq d_{\text{out}},$$

as we wanted to show.

(silvia) Maybe add domain of z below the sum?