

Turning Federated Learning Systems Into Covert Channels

Gabriele Costa*, Fabio Pinelli*, Simone Soderi*, Gabriele Tolomei†

*IMT School for Advanced Studies, Lucca. `firstname.lastname@imtlucca.it`

†Sapienza University of Rome `lastname@di.uniroma1.it`

Abstract—Federated learning (FL) goes beyond traditional, centralized machine learning by distributing model training among a large collection of edge clients. These clients cooperatively train a global, e.g., cloud-hosted, model without disclosing their local, private training data. The global model is then shared among all the participants which use it for local predictions.

In this paper, we put forward a novel attacker model aiming at turning FL systems into covert channels to implement a stealth communication infrastructure. The main intuition is that, during federated training, a malicious sender can poison the global model by submitting purposely crafted examples. Although the effect of the model poisoning is negligible to other participants, and does not alter the overall model performance, it can be observed by a malicious receiver and used to transmit a single bit.

Index Terms—federated learning, adversarial attacks, covert channel.

Please cite this version of the paper:

G. Costa, F. Pinelli, S. Soderi and G. Tolomei “Turning Federated Learning Systems Into Covert Channels” in IEEE Access, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3229124. You may use the following bibtex entry:

```
@ARTICLE{CPST22covertchannel,
  author={Costa, Gabriele and Pinelli,
    Fabio and Soderi, Simone and Tolomei,
    Gabriele},
  journal={IEEE Access},
  title={Turning Federated Learning
    Systems Into Covert Channels},
  year={2022},
  volume={10},
  number={},
  pages={130642-130656},
  doi={10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3229124}}
```

I. INTRODUCTION

Federated learning (FL) [1], [2] recently emerged as the leading technology for implementing distributed, large scale and efficient machine learning (ML) infrastructures. The main idea is that multiple clients connect to the FL system, and collaboratively train a shared, global model. A frequent setting in FL is to have a centralized, e.g., cloud-hosted, server and many edge clients. Clients and server iterate the execution of FL rounds, which consist of the following steps.

- 1) The server sends the current, global model to every client and selects some of them for the next training round.

- 2) Each selected client trains its local model using its own private data starting from the received global model, and sends the resulting local model back to the server.

- 3) The server applies an *aggregation function* to the local models received by clients and updates the global model.

FL allows clients to concurrently train a shared global model, without disclosing private training data. Hence, FL provides great advantages in terms of both scalability and privacy. Since this process smoothly integrates with ubiquitous, distributed infrastructures, it has been widely applied to IoT [3], Fog computing [4], autonomous vehicles [5], smartphones [6], and wearable devices [7]. As a result, nowadays billions of devices are connected to one or more FL systems.

The growing adoption of FL also raises security concerns, in particular, about the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of FL systems. Indeed, several authors considered attack scenarios targeting FL systems. For instance, in the last years some works investigated *data poisoning* attacks, where an adversary pollutes the training set with maliciously crafted examples [8]. A similar scenario is that of *model poisoning*, in which the attacker directly attempts to tamper with the global model parameters [9]. The aim of both these types of attacks is usually to detriment the prediction accuracy of the learned model. Also, a large body of work deals with privacy leakage that may expose the local data of some clients [10].

In this paper, we discuss a new attack scenario: we consider an adversary implementing a *covert channel* [11] over an FL system. Covert channels allow an attacker to establish an illicit communication between two agents (e.g., two devices) that should stay isolated. In theory, since no trust relationship exists among the clients, FL should not be intended to support the creation of covert channels. In practice, being shared among the participants, the global model can be turned into a communication channel. More specifically, two FL clients, i.e., a sender and a receiver, can agree on an aimed poisoning strategy that allows them to transfer one bit.

We start by describing our attacker model and the covert channel implementation strategy. Our attacker only requires limited capabilities and, thus, it appears very realistic. As a matter of fact, communications are established by poisoning the training set of a single client, i.e., the sender. Poisoned examples are crafted by modifying benign input examples through a simple, effective and efficient heuristics.

We explain the implementation strategy behind this attack by considering an FL system, where clients collaboratively

train a global model to recognize handwritten digits of the popular MNIST dataset [12]. In our FL system, private training data is represented by a subset of the MNIST dataset that is randomly assigned to each client. Such an implementation is often given as a template of a generic FL system in official tutorials.¹

The main contributions of this paper are listed below.

- A novel attacker model for FL-based covert channel.
- An implementation strategy working on any FL system.
- A discussion of the main channel features.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the main background concepts used in this work. In Section III, we revise the literature about FL security and application level covert channels. Section IV introduces our attacker model, and Section V details the implementation of the covert channel. In Section VI, we describe the properties of our covert channel. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper.

II. BACKGROUND

In this section, we provide the reader with the essential context needed to understand the subject of this work.

A. Machine & Federated Learning

We consider the *supervised learning* task as the reference example of a typical ML problem. The goal of supervised learning is to estimate a function that maps an input to an output, based on a sample of observed input-output pairs, called *examples*, which is usually referred to as *training set*.

More formally, let $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be a training set of n examples. Each $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a d -dimensional vector of *features* representing the i -th input and $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ is its corresponding output value. Here, we focus on *classification* problems where $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and each y_i is known as the *class label* (as opposed to regression problems where $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$).

Supervised learning assumes the existence of an unknown target function $g : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$ that maps any feature vector to its corresponding output. The goal is therefore to estimate a function m^* , namely a parametric model, that best approximates g on $\mathcal{D}$. More specifically, the optimal parametric model m^* is the one that minimizes the value of a loss function $\mathcal{L}$, which measures the cost of replacing the true g with m^* on the training set. In other words, learning m^* reduces to the following optimization problem, also known as empirical risk minimization (ERM) [13].

$$m^* = \operatorname{argmin}_m \mathcal{L}(m, \mathcal{D}) \quad (1)$$

Depending on the supervised learning task, different loss functions can be adopted. For example, cross-entropy is a commonly used loss function for classification [14], whilst mean squared error is typically employed in regression settings [15].

The standard framework above assumes that the actual training procedure, i.e., the optimizer used to solve (1), runs on a centralized location where the whole dataset $\mathcal{D}$ is stored.

¹For example, see https://www.tensorflow.org/federated/tutorials/federated_learning_for_image_classification.




Fig. 1. Binary memoryless covert channel.

In the case of FL, instead, the learning process is distributed among several clients that collaboratively train a shared, global model with a centralized server acting as orchestrator. Thus, the FL framework consists of a centralized server S and a set of distributed, federated clients $\mathcal{C}$, such that $|\mathcal{C}| = n_c$. Each client $c \in \mathcal{C}$ has access to its own private training set $\mathcal{D}_c$, namely the set of its local labeled examples.

The generic t -th round of FL comprises the following steps.

- 1) S sends the current, global model $m^{(t)}$ to every client and selects a subset $\mathcal{C}^{(t)} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, such that $1 \leq |\mathcal{C}^{(t)}| \leq n_c$.
- 2) Each selected client $c \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}$ trains its local model $m_c^{(t)}$ by optimizing the same objective of (1) on its own private data $\mathcal{D}_c$, starting from $m^{(t)}$; the resulting $m_c^{(t)}$ is thus sent back to S .
- 3) S computes $m^{(t+1)} = \phi(\{m_c^{(t)} \mid c \in \mathcal{C}^{(t)}\})$ as the updated global model, where ϕ is an *aggregation function* (e.g., FedAvg [2] or one of its variants [16]).

At the beginning, $m^{(0)}$ may be randomly initialized. Then, FL rounds as the one described above are iteratively executed until convergence of the global model, i.e., until $t = T$ such that $m^{(T)} = m^*$. In practice, though, many FL models are continuously trained due to the highly dynamic nature of the infrastructure (e.g., new clients joining or leaving the system and fresh local data generated over time).

To simplify the notation, in the following we refer to m as the global model and to m_c as the local model of client c . Furthermore, we call $m(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ (resp., $m_c(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{y}_c \in \mathcal{Y}$) the global (resp., local) model prediction on input $\mathbf{x}$.

B. Channels and communication quality

In this paper, we are interested in *binary memoryless channels* (BMC) [17]. Briefly, an BMC has discrete input b and output b' such that $b, b' \in \{0, 1\}$. We describe the relationship between channel's input and output through the conditional probability $P(b'|b)$, where $\mathbf{b} = \{0, 1\}$. Figure 1 depicts a generic BMC in which $P(1|0) = p_1$ and $P(0|1) = p_2$ are the probabilities for input/output bit inversion errors. Consequently, their complements give the probability of receiving the correct bit, e.g., $P(0|0) = 1 - p_1$. For a BMC, the *channel capacity* C is the maximum communication rate that sender

and receiver can reach over the channel. Following [17], C is computed as follows.

$$C = \max_P \mathbb{I}(x; y) = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbf{b} \\ y \in \mathbf{b}}} P(x)P(y|x) \log \left(\frac{P(y|x)}{P(y)} \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(x; y)$ is the mutual information between the input x and output y . From (2), we obtain the channel capacity as

$$\begin{aligned} C &= 1 + \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{1}{2} (p_i + (1 - p_i) \log_2(1 - p_i)) = \\ &= 1 - \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{H(p_i)}{2} = 1 - \frac{H(p_1)}{2} - \frac{H(p_2)}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where H is the binary Shannon entropy function.

Communication quality is typically measured in terms of *bit error rate* (BER) and *signal-to-noise ratio* (SNR). In general, BER is obtained as the number of bit inversions, e.g., due to channel noise, over the total number of transmitted bits. Instead, SNR is defined as the ratio of signal power to the noise power, i.e., s^2/n^2 , where s is the channel signal and n is the noise. In general, when signal and noise are modeled by means of two random variables, called S and N (respectively), we have that $s^2 = E[S^2]$ and $n^2 = E[N^2]$, where $E[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value. Moreover, when N has zero mean, i.e., $E[N] = 0$, n^2 reduces to $\sigma_n^2 = \text{Var}(N) = E[N^2] - E[N]^2$, that is $E[N^2]$ is equal to the variance of N .

III. RELATED WORK

Our proposal consists of an application level covert channel implemented through an adversarial attack to an FL system. Although some authors reviewed the security challenges of FL, e.g., see [18] for an extensive discussion, we are not aware of papers describing similar, covert channel scenarios. Thus, in the following, we revise some related work about *adversarial attacks to ML*, and *application level covert channels* which are closer to our proposal.

A. Adversarial attacks to ML

There exists a large body of work investigating the security of both traditional, i.e., centralized, and federated ML against so-called *adversarial attacks* [19]–[27]. Adversarial attacks can have different targets. For instance, *model inversion attacks* [28], [29], *membership inference attacks* [30]–[32], and *property inference attacks* [33], [34] aim to violate the *confidentiality* of user's private training/test data. Also, it has been reported that an attacker can compromise the confidentiality/intellectual property of a model provider by stealing its model parameters and hyperparameters [35]–[37].

From this perspective, our attacker model belongs to adversarial attacks that tamper with the integrity and the performance of a predictive model [38]. These attacks are classified according to the stage(s) of the ML pipeline in which they occur. In particular, attacks can happen at training time only, both at training and at test time, or at test time only. Those are called *poisoning*, *backdoor*, and *evasion* attacks, respectively.

From another viewpoint, depending on the attacker's goal, adversarial attacks can be further classified as *untargeted* (or random) [8], [39]–[43] or *targeted* [44]–[47]. The former aims to reduce the overall accuracy of the learned model at inference time, regardless of what specific testing examples get incorrectly classified. The latter forces the learned model to output attacker-desired labels for certain testing examples, e.g., predicting spam messages as non-spam, while not altering the output for other examples. Since targeted attacks have to do with a specific goal, they usually require rather strong attacker's capabilities.

In the following we provide a detailed overview of the most prominent adversarial attacks.

a) *Poisoning Attacks*: To compromise the performance of a predictive model, poisoning attacks can target two components of the training stage, i.e., the training dataset and the learning process. The former are known as *data poisoning attacks* [8], [20], [40], [44], [48]. The latter are referred to as *model poisoning attacks* [49], [50].

Data Poisoning. These attacks pollute the training dataset by injecting it with new malicious examples or by corrupting existing ones. There are two main types of data poisoning attacks, called (i) *clean-label* [45] and (ii) *dirty-label* [51], respectively. In clean-label poisoning attacks, the adversary has no control over the labeling process. The attacker simply injects a small number of slightly perturbed examples (whose labels remain correct) into the training set of the victim. These attacks have been proven effective only when the attacker has complete knowledge of the victim's model, i.e., under *white-box* assumption [23]. Such a knowledge is needed to craft the malicious examples [52]. More recently, clean-label poisoning attacks for unknown, i.e., *black-box* [53], deep image classifiers have been also explored [54].

In dirty-label poisoning the adversary can introduce a number of training instances to be misclassified with a specific label in a targeted way. An example of dirty-label poisoning is the *label-flipping* attack [40], [55]. Here, the labels of honest training examples of one class are flipped to another class, while the features of the data are kept unchanged. For instance, a malicious agent can poison the training set of a handwritten digit recognition system by flipping all 1s to 7s.

In the FL setting, it is common to assume that the attacker controls some clients and their training sets. Thus, dirty-label attacks have been more often considered. In [26], the authors study targeted label flipping attacks on FL. They find that poisons injected late in the training process are significantly more effective than those injected early. Other proposals adopt a bi-level optimization approach for poisoning multi-task FL [56] and GAN-generated poisons [57].

Model Poisoning. Differently from data poisoning attacks, these attacks threaten the learning process directly, e.g., by changing some model parameters. Model poisoning is generally perceived as difficult to implement in centralized ML systems as it requires the adversary to access the target model, i.e., assuming either *grey-box* or *white-box* knowledge. On the other hand, model poisoning becomes rather feasible in

the case of FL, where a malicious client has direct influence over the jointly-trained global model via its local parameters updates [49], [50], [58]. As with any poisoning attack, the adversary’s goal is to cause wrong predictions of the FL model. However, she/he aims to force classification errors at inference time and without modifying test examples. In this respect, it is opposed to backdoor and evasion attacks (which are discussed below). In model poisoning, the misclassification results from the adversarial corruption of the training process, which can be achieved either by *gradient* or *learning rule* manipulation. In gradient manipulation, the adversary poisons local model gradients (or model updates), which are then sent to the central server for aggregation, thereby jeopardizing the global model performance [59]. In learning rule manipulation, instead, the attacker corrupts the actual training logic. In some cases, these model poisoning attacks have proven more effective than data poisoning, and an attacker can compromise the global model even when controlling a single client. For instance, in [49] the authors successfully achieve a stealthy targeted model poisoning attack by adding a penalty term to the objective function to minimize the distance between malicious and benign weight update distributions.

b) Backdoor Attacks: Backdoor attacks – also known as trojan attacks – exploit the adversary’s capability of having (limited) access to input examples also at test time [27]. Hence, backdoor attacks exceed poisoning attacks, since the adversary can manipulate both training and test inputs. Therefore, backdoor attacks are often considered more disruptive toward the victim model.

Like for standard poisoning attacks, we can distinguish between backdoor attacks affecting the data or the model. The former are referred to as backdoor data poisoning and consist of adding attacker-chosen examples to the training set. The attacker examples contain a particular *trigger* [60], [61], i.e., a distinguished feature that activates the backdoor. The model learned on such poisoned training set will embed a backdoor, which the attacker exploits at test time by submitting examples that contain the same trigger. Instead, backdoor model poisoning requires a stronger threat model, where the attacker can get direct access to the learning system and change the model’s internals (i.e., parameters and architecture) to embed a backdoor [62], [63].

Interestingly enough, backdoor attacks have been proven ineffective under FL settings [64]. The main obstacle is that aggregation involves many clients and, assuming that the attacker only controls a minority, the effect of the adversarial updates is weakened. To overcome this limitation, the authors of [64] consider a model replacement approach, where the attacker scales up a malicious model update to increase its effect on the aggregation function.

In [65], the authors propose distributed backdoor attacks, which better exploit the decentralized nature of FL. Specifically, they decompose the backdoor pattern for the global model into multiple distributed small patterns, and inject them into training sets used by up to 40% adversarial participants at each federated round. Although more effective than global

backdoor trigger injection, this approach comes at the price of controlling a significant subset of the FL clients.

c) Evasion Attacks: Adversarial attacks that occur only at test time are called evasion attacks. Here, the goal of the adversary is still to fool an ML model yet without tampering it at training time. In fact, evasion attacks make use of so-called *adversarial examples* [38], [66], i.e., carefully-crafted (minimal) perturbations of test instances that cause prediction errors (either targeted or untargeted) when input to a legitimately trained model.

Evasion attacks may look similar to backdoor poisoning attacks [67]. However, the key difference between the two is that evasion attacks exploit the decision boundaries learned by an uncorrupted model to construct adversarial examples that are misclassified by the model. In contrast, backdoor attacks intentionally shift these decision boundaries as a result of a jeopardized training process, so that certain examples get eventually misclassified [27].

Several works have explored evasion attacks in the context of computer vision [68], where adversarial examples are obtained by adding random noise to test images. Even though such images look legitimate to a human, they are wrongly classified by the image recognition system. Also, more recent works investigate the applicability of evasion attacks to malware classification [69].

In the FL setting, the global model maintained by the server suffers from the same evasion attacks as in the conventional ML setting when the target model is deployed as a service. Moreover, at each FL training round the global model sent to the federated clients is exposed as a white-box to any malicious participant. Thus, FL requires extra efforts to defend against white-box evasion attacks [24].

In this work, we consider an attack scenario partially related to the one presented in [64]. As a matter of fact, our covert channel is implemented by means of maliciously crafted examples that carry a trigger as in backdoor attacks. In particular, our adversary (*i*) crafts malicious examples carrying a trigger (see Section V-A), and (*ii*) poisons the federated model to transmit one bit through each trigger (see Section V-B).

B. Application level covert channels

In a general sense, a covert channel is any communication channel that is not intended for information transfer [11]. Although we are not aware of FL-based covert channels, some authors already investigated the implementation of covert channels at application level. Most authors considered *encapsulation* of hidden communications in application-layer network protocols. Being the main application level protocol, HTTP is the primary target for covert channel implementations, e.g., see [70]. Nevertheless, the entire TCP/IP ecosystem can be at risk, and we refer the interest reader to [71] for a survey. More recently, also web applications were proposed for the implementation of covert channels. For instance, in [72] the author considers social networks such as Facebook and Twitter. However, since this kind of covert channels rely on already existing communications between devices, in practice,




Fig. 2. Overview of the attacker model.

they usually do not break any sandbox policy.² Also, as the authors of [74] point out, most of these covert channels can be detected and some effective countermeasures exist, e.g., packet inspection can be used to detect illegal traffic. Possibly for these reasons, application level covert channels appear to be less frequently considered in the literature.

Loosely speaking, also our proposal relies on a sort of encapsulation mechanism. However, here we do not wrap information inside protocol messages. Rather, we embed information inside FL models, which prevents standard detection techniques based on traffic inspection.

IV. ATTACKER MODEL

In this section, we present our attacker model. The goal of the attacker is to establish a covert channel between two clients, namely *Sender* and *Receiver*, of an FL infrastructure. In terms of capabilities, our adversary resembles that of [64]. Here, we assume that both Sender and Receiver are controlled by the attacker. For instance, think of Sender as a malware-compromised device and Receiver as the malware command and control server. Although they are compromised, we do not assume that the attacker can tamper with the standard FL infrastructure behavior, i.e., Sender and Receiver follow the FL client protocol. More precisely, Sender is only allowed to poison its local dataset and Receiver can only classify examples using its own local model. In particular, we stress that here we assume the attacker to operate in *black-box* mode, i.e., we assume that Sender and Receiver can neither inspect nor tamper with their local models. It is worth noticing that these assumptions are very general and they apply to most FL systems.

The overall attacker model is schematically depicted in Figure 2. At each federated round, the FL server randomly selects a subset of clients. Selected clients work as expected, i.e., they use their own private datasets to train their local models starting from the last global model received by the

²On the contrary, they are very relevant, for instance, when considering inter-process channels as in [73].




Fig. 3. Communication protocol phases.

server (see Client 1 and Client 2 in Figure 2). Then, FL clients upload their newly trained local models to the server, which aggregates them into an updated global model m through the aggregation function ϕ . At the end of each federated round, *all* the clients receive a copy of m . When selected, Sender (top left of Figure 2) poisons its local model m_s by training it with some malicious, attacker-provided examples. Its goal is to transmit a bit b by inducing a perturbation of the global model that Receiver can test. On the other hand, Receiver (top right of Figure 2) uses m to classify test examples, e.g., the same malicious examples used by Sender. According to the classification outcome, Receiver deduces whether 0 or 1 was sent. Implementing such a covert channel is non-trivial and also depends on the underlying FL system. We discuss the implementation details in the next section.

V. COVERT CHANNEL IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we detail the implementation strategy for creating the previously described covert channel. Without loss of generality, every implementation is based on the abstract protocol schematically depicted in Figure 3.

A transmission starts with a *calibration* phase during which Receiver observes the global model updates $m^{(1)}, \dots, m^{(f)}$ (for f FL rounds). Eventually, Receiver computes *channel parameters* (see Section V-A) to be shared with Sender. For instance, these parameters can be provided through a secondary channel or hard-coded in Sender before its deployment. Then, Sender and Receiver synchronize on transmission frames of size f to send a bit b . During each frame, when selected, Sender trains its local model according to the channel parameters and the bit to be transmitted. In the meanwhile, Receiver monitors the global model updates and, at the end of the frame, it tests the received bit.

Below, we discuss the implementation of both the calibration and transmission phases.

A. Calibration of channel parameters

The first parameter to be determined is the size of the transmission frame f , i.e., the number of FL rounds necessary




Fig. 4. Linear transformation ψ_e of an example with $\alpha = 0.3$ (middle) and $\alpha = 0.5$ (rightmost).

to transmit a single bit. Assuming that the attacker ignores the internals of the FL server, i.e., current number of clients (n_c) and client selection probability (p_c), Receiver must estimate f . Clearly, a small f decreases the probability for Sender to be selected (which is necessary for the transmission to take place), while large f reduces the transmission rate. Under the assumption that clients are uniformly selected at random, Receiver takes advantage of its selection notifications to estimate f . For instance, it can set f as the number of rounds that it takes to be selected T times (for a constant T).

Another channel parameter to be determined is the crafted example $\tilde{x}$ carrying the trigger that Sender will use to poison its local training set. To generate $\tilde{x}$, Receiver applies a *linear transformation function*³ ψ to a subset of k randomly selected examples from its local training set. Intuitively, $\tilde{x} = \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \alpha)$ means that, starting from $k > 0$ examples $x_1, \dots, x_k$, ψ returns a new example $\tilde{x}$, where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is a parameter that controls the transformation.

To provide an intuition of this process, we put forward an example taken from the MNIST dataset. Consider x to be the representation of a generic MNIST input image, i.e., a 28×28 matrix of pixels flattened into a 784-dimensional vector. We define $\psi_e(x, \alpha)$ as the function erasing, from left to right, a fraction α of a single example image x (i.e., $k = 1$). For instance, when $\alpha = 0.3$, ψ_e sets to 0 the 235 values associated with the leftmost pixels of the target image vector. More formally, $\psi_e(x, \alpha) = x - x^{(\alpha)}$ where $x^{(\alpha)} = [x^1, \dots, x^{\lfloor \alpha \cdot 784 \rfloor}, 0, \dots, 0]$ and x^i is the i -th element of x . The behavior of ψ_e is shown in Figure 4, where we highlighted the erased portion of the original example.

Intuitively, the attacker can select a function ψ which is based on some *semantic* property of the classification domain. For instance, in the previous example ψ_e encodes the simple fact that the right half of an handwritten 8 looks like a 3. Other similar functions can be found, e.g., in [75].

Receiver repeatedly applies ψ to the selected examples until it identifies an *edge* example $\tilde{x}$. Formally, given Receiver's local model m_r and an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, we look for $\tilde{x} = \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{\alpha})$ such that $m_r(\psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{\alpha})) = h$ and $m_r(\psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \bar{\alpha} + \varepsilon)) = l$, where $h, l \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $l \neq h$. Interestingly, given $x_1, \dots, x_k$, Receiver can efficiently

³Although we do not explicitly prove it, the reader can easily check that all the transformation functions presented in the following are linear, since they reduce to finite sums of matrices.

Algorithm 1: Edge example binary search algorithm.

Input: $x_1, \dots, x_k; \varepsilon > 0$
 $\alpha_{\text{high}} := H;$
 $\alpha_{\text{low}} := L;$
repeat
 $x_{\text{high}} := \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \alpha_{\text{high}});$
 $\hat{y}_{\text{high}} := m_r(x_{\text{high}});$
 $x_{\text{low}} := \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \alpha_{\text{low}});$
 $\hat{y}_{\text{low}} := m_r(x_{\text{low}});$
 if $\hat{y}_{\text{high}} = \hat{y}_{\text{low}}$ **then**
 Failure: cannot be equal
 end
 $\alpha_{\text{mid}} := (\alpha_{\text{low}} + \alpha_{\text{high}})/2;$
 $x_{\text{mid}} := \psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, \alpha_{\text{mid}});$
 $\hat{y}_{\text{mid}} := m_r(x_{\text{mid}});$
 if $\hat{y}_{\text{high}} \neq \hat{y}_{\text{mid}}$ **then**
 $\alpha_{\text{low}} := \alpha_{\text{mid}};$
 else
 $\alpha_{\text{high}} := \alpha_{\text{mid}};$
 end
until $\alpha_{\text{low}} - \alpha_{\text{high}} < \varepsilon;$
Output: $\tilde{x} := x_{\text{high}}$, labels $h := \hat{y}_{\text{high}}$ and $l := \hat{y}_{\text{low}}$

compute $\bar{\alpha}$ through the binary search procedure sketched in Algorithm 1.

The search procedure starts from the predefined interval $[H, L]$.⁴ At each iteration, two examples, i.e., x_{high} and x_{low} , are generated and classified with Receiver's model m_r , so obtaining $\hat{y}_{\text{high}}$ and $\hat{y}_{\text{low}}$, respectively. If $\hat{y}_{\text{high}} = \hat{y}_{\text{low}}$, the algorithm terminates with a failure and no edge example is returned. Otherwise, the current search interval is split in half by computing α_{mid} , x_{mid} , and $\hat{y}_{\text{mid}}$. Then, if $\hat{y}_{\text{high}} \neq \hat{y}_{\text{mid}}$, the algorithm iterates on the first half of the current interval. Otherwise, if $\hat{y}_{\text{low}} \neq \hat{y}_{\text{mid}}$, the search procedure continues on the second half. The loop terminates when the interval width goes under a threshold ε , which represents the granularity of a single position in the feature vectors of the example, e.g., a single pixel in the case of Figure 4. Eventually, the algorithm returns the edge example x_{high} , as well as the two class labels h and l associated with the last, smallest interval.

It is worth noticing that, since it does not explore the entire feature space, Algorithm 1 might fail to generate an edge examples on some inputs. In general, the effectiveness of this heuristics depends on the choice of ψ .

At the end of the calibration phase, channel parameters generated by Receiver amount to the tuple $(f, \tilde{x}, h, l)$.

B. Bit transmission

The transmission of one bit is based on the variations, during f FL rounds, of $m(\tilde{x})$ between h and l . In particular, by poisoning its local model, Sender drives $m(\tilde{x})$ to assume the desired value, while Receiver monitors it to read the transmitted bit. Transmissions are organized in consecutive

⁴In our experiments we use $H = 0$ and $L = 1/2$.

Algorithm 2: Sender transmission algorithm.

Input: $f, \tilde{x}, h, l$

```

repeat
  if  $r = 1$  then
     $b := \text{nextBit}()$ ;
     $v := m(\tilde{x})$ ;
     $v_{\neg} := \text{if } v = h \text{ then } l \text{ else } h$ ;
  end
  if selected by server for training then
     $v_r := m(\tilde{x})$ ;
    switch  $b$  do
      case 0 do
        if  $v_r \neq v$  then  $\text{train}(m_s, \tilde{x}, v)$ ;
      end
      case 1 do
        if  $v_r \neq v_{\neg}$  then  $\text{train}(m_s, \tilde{x}, v_{\neg})$ ;
      end
    end
    end
    upload( $m_s$ );
  end
   $r := (r \% f) + 1$ ;
until transmission completed;

```

TABLE I
SENDER'S MODEL POISONING CASES.

$b = 0$		$b = 1$	
$v_r = v$	$v_r = v_{\neg}$	$v_r = v$	$v_r = v_{\neg}$
do nothing	$\text{train}(m_s, \tilde{x}, v)$	$\text{train}(m_s, \tilde{x}, v_{\neg})$	do nothing

frames of size f . Sender and Receiver are synchronized through an FL round counter $r \in \{1, \dots, f\}$. Sender follows the procedure given in Algorithm 2.

At the beginning of each transmission frame, i.e., when $r = 1$, Sender sets the next bit to be sent b , and uses the last received global model $m_r = m$ to classify $\tilde{x}$, thus obtaining $v \in \{h, l\}$. Also, Sender sets $v_{\neg} \in \{h, l\}$ so that $v \neq v_{\neg}$. At each round r , if Sender is selected by the FL server, it classifies $\tilde{x}$ with the global model m , so obtaining v_r . Then, depending on the bit to be sent, Sender trains its local model m_s according to Table I.

Intuitively, the purpose of the operation above is to keep the label assigned to $\tilde{x}$ by the global model when sending 0, and to flip it when sending 1. This channel implementation amounts to a Differential Manchester encoding [17]. Eventually, Sender uploads its local model to the FL server.

Concurrently, Receiver executes Algorithm 3. Receiver uses the global model m to classify $\tilde{x}$ both when $r = 1$ and $r = f$, so obtaining v_1 and v_f , respectively. Finally, Receiver reads 0 if $v_1 = v_f$ and 1 otherwise.

In Figure 5, we show as an example the transmission of 10 bits for the MNIST scenario discussed above, using $\tilde{x}$ of Figure 4, $h = 8$, and $l = 3$. The top diagram shows the internal

Algorithm 3: Receiver bit test algorithm.

Input: $f, \tilde{x}, h, l$

```

repeat
  if  $r = 1$  then
     $v_1 := m(\tilde{x})$ ;
  else if  $r = f$  then
     $v_f := m(\tilde{x})$ ;
     $b := \text{if } v_1 = v_f \text{ then } 0 \text{ else } 1$ ;
    received( $b$ );
  end
   $r := (r \% f) + 1$ ;
until transmission completed;

```




Fig. 5. Transmission of bits 0101001110 over a covert channel.

scores assigned by the global model to the edge example $\tilde{x}$ during the transmission. By classifying $\tilde{x}$, Receiver observes the alternation of labels 8 and 3 (center). Then, Receiver interprets it as the sequence of bits 0101001110.

VI. CHANNEL DESCRIPTION

For each edge example, our implementation provides a digital, broadcast channel supporting *half duplex*⁵ transmissions. In principle, an attacker can even create several, parallel channels of this type to enlarge the communication bandwidth. However, parallel channels may generate interference. Below, we detail the features of a single channel.

In terms of capacity, we treat the covert channel as a standard BMC (see, Section II-B). We just notice that the binary input of the channel is m_b , with $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Intuitively, inputs m_b represent Sender's local models m_s uploaded to the FL server. More precisely, we use m_b to distinguish between the two model poisoning cases used to transmit b (see Table I).

⁵Intuitively, Sender and Receiver cannot transmit at the same time, but they can alternate their roles.

In terms of communication quality, we consider BER and SNR, as discussed in Section II-B. While BER is straightforward, defining SNR in our context requires more attention. In general, SNR is computed by periodically sampling the channel signal s and noise n at the end of each transmission frame t . Here, defining s and n is non-trivial, since our channel does not rely on a physical medium. Indeed, a covert channel consists of two prediction labels, namely h and l , and a perturbed example $\tilde{x}$. For each label $i \in \{h, l\}$, at time t we can measure the prediction score assigned by the global model to i when classifying $\tilde{x}$ at each frame's end. Also, assuming that prediction scores range within the interval $[Z, -Z]$,⁶ we normalize the prediction scores by linearly scaling them in $[1, -1]$. Thus, for each label i the label signal $z_i(t)$ amounts to the normalized score described above. We define the overall received signal $z(t) = z_h(t) - z_l(t)$, i.e., as the differential, normalized signal.

Since a direct measure of the transmitted signal $s(t)$ cannot be computed, we approximate it to the differential signal that switches its intensity between 1 and -1 . Intuitively, this is equivalent to stating that Sender attempts to transmit 0 by setting $z(t) \cdot z(t+1) = 1$ and 1 by setting $z(t) \cdot z(t+1) = -1$.⁷ Thus, for each frame t , we set

$$s(t) = \frac{1 - 2b}{s(t-1)}, \quad (4)$$

where b is the bit transmitted during frame t , and, by construction, $s(0) = 1$. Then, we define the noise at time t as $n(t) = z(t) - s(t)$.

The overall intuition behind our definitions of $z(t)$, $s(t)$ and $n(t)$ is given in Figure 6. There, red and blue dashed lines denote z_h and z_l signals, i.e., the normalized version of the scores of Figure 5. Instead, the purple line denotes $z(t)$ and the gray line denotes $s(t)$. Also, the vertical arrow shows the value of $n(t)$ at $t = 3$. From this and (4), we define SNR of the covert channel as

$$SNR = \frac{z(t)^2}{\sigma_n^2}, \quad (5)$$

where σ_n is the standard deviation of the *normalized* noise $\bar{n}(t)$ defined as $\bar{n}(t) = \frac{n(t)}{\max_{t'} |n(t')|}$.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced a new covert channel leveraging on FL systems. Our attack allows a malicious agent to establish stealth communications between FL clients that should rather stay isolated. This attack scenario paves the way for several exploits that we plan to investigate in the future. Among them, we are particularly interested in attacks breaking the air gap. These attacks appear realistic since many FL clients feed the training process with sensor-generated examples. Other future directions include (i) measuring the performance of the covert




Fig. 6. Signals and noise for the FL covert channel of Figure 5.

channel, (ii) evaluating whether the channel can be detected, and (iii) investigating possible countermeasures.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. McMahan and D. Ramage, "Federated Learning: Collaborative Machine Learning without Centralized Training Data," <https://ai.googleblog.com/2017/04/federated-learning-collaborative.html>, 2017, accessed: 2017-04-06.
- [2] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and A. y. B. Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," *AISTATS*, pp. 1273–1282, 2017.
- [3] Q. Wu, K. He, and X. Chen, "Personalized Federated Learning for Intelligent IoT Applications: A Cloud-Edge Based Framework," *IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society*, vol. 1, pp. 35–44, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/OJCS.2020.2993259>
- [4] C. Zhou, A. Fu, S. Yu, W. Yang, H. Wang, and Y. Zhang, "Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning in Fog Computing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 10782–10793, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/IJOT.2020.2987958>
- [5] S. R. Pokhrel and J. Choi, "A Decentralized Federated Learning Approach for Connected Autonomous Vehicles," in *2020 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference Workshops (WCNCW)*, 2020, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/WCNCW48565.2020.9124733>
- [6] T. Yang, G. Andrew, H. Eichner, H. Sun, W. Li, N. Kong, D. Ramage, and F. Beaufays, "Applied Federated Learning: Improving Google Keyboard Query Suggestions," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1812.02903, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.02903>
- [7] Y. Chen, X. Qin, J. Wang, C. Yu, and W. Gao, "FedHealth: A Federated Transfer Learning Framework for Wearable Healthcare," *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 83–93, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/MIS.2020.2988604>
- [8] M. Jagielski, A. Oprea, B. Biggio, C. Liu, C. Nita-Rotaru, and B. Li, "Manipulating machine learning: Poisoning attacks and countermeasures for regression learning," in *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2018, pp. 19–35. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2018.00057>
- [9] A. N. Bhagoji, S. Chakraborty, P. Mittal, and S. Calo, "Analyzing Federated Learning through an Adversarial Lens," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, Eds., vol. 97. Long Beach, California, USA: PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019, pp. 634–643.
- [10] L. Melis, C. Song, E. De Cristofaro, and V. Shmatikov, "Exploiting Unintended Feature Leakage in Collaborative Learning," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2019, pp. 691–706. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00029>
- [11] B. W. Lampson, "A note on the confinement problem," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 613–615, Oct. 1973. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1145/362375.362389>
- [12] Y. LeCun and C. Cortes, "MNIST handwritten digit database," 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>

⁶ Z can be esteemed as the maximum score observed during a transmission.

⁷Notice that this assumption is more restrictive w.r.t. the actual implementation, since Receiver only requires $z(t) \cdot z(t+1) < 0$ and $z(t) \cdot z(t+1) > 0$ to read 0 and 1, respectively.

- [13] V. Vapnik, "Principles of risk minimization for learning theory," in *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'91. San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1991, p. 831–838.
- [14] K. P. Murphy, *Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective*. The MIT Press, 2012, ISBN: 0262018020.
- [15] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman, *The Elements of Statistical Learning*, ser. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY, USA: Springer New York Inc., 2001, ISBN: 0387848576.
- [16] Y. Lu and L. Fan, "An efficient and robust aggregation algorithm for learning federated cnn," in *Proceedings of the 2020 3rd International Conference on Signal Processing and Machine Learning*, ser. SPML 2020. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 1–7. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3432291.3432303>
- [17] P. Massoud Salehi and J. Proakis, *Digital Communications*. McGraw-Hill Education, 2007, ISBN: 9780072957167.
- [18] P. Kairouz, H. B. McMahan, B. Avent, A. Bellet, M. Bennis, A. N. Bhagoji, K. Bonawitz, Z. Charles, G. Cormode, R. Cummings, R. G. D'Oliveira, H. Eichner, S. E. Rouayheb, D. Evans, J. Gardner, Z. Garrett, A. Gascón, B. Ghazi, P. B. Gibbons, M. Gruteser, Z. Harchaoui, C. He, L. He, Z. Huo, B. Hutchinson, J. Hsu, M. Jaggi, T. Javidi, G. Joshi, M. Khodak, J. Konečný, A. Korolova, F. Koushanfar, S. Koyejo, T. Lepoint, Y. Liu, P. Mittal, M. Mohri, R. Nock, A. Özgür, R. Pagh, M. Raykova, H. Qi, D. Ramage, R. Raskar, D. Song, W. Song, S. U. Stich, Z. Sun, A. T. Suresh, F. Tramèr, P. Vepakomma, J. Wang, L. Xiong, Z. Xu, Q. Yang, F. X. Yu, H. Yu, and S. Zhao, "Advances and Open Problems in Federated Learning," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/22000000083>
- [19] N. N. Dalvi, P. M. Domingos, Mausam, S. K. Sanghai, and D. Verma, "Adversarial classification," in *SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. ACM, 2004, pp. 99–108. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1014052.1014066>
- [20] L. Huang, A. D. Joseph, B. Nelson, B. I. Rubinstein, and J. D. Tygar, "Adversarial machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Workshop on Security and Artificial Intelligence*, ser. AISec '11. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011, p. 43–58. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2046684.2046692>
- [21] B. Biggio and F. Roli, "Wild patterns: Ten years after the rise of adversarial machine learning," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 84, pp. 317 – 331, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031320318302565>
- [22] M. Nasr, R. Shokri, and A. Houmansadr, "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 2019, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 19-23, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 739–753. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00065>
- [23] N. Pitropakis, E. Panaousis, T. Giannetsos, E. Anastasiadis, and G. Loukas, "A taxonomy and survey of attacks against machine learning," *Computer Science Review*, vol. 34, p. 100199, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1574013718303289>
- [24] L. Lyu, H. Yu, and Q. Yang, "Threats to Federated Learning: A Survey," *arXiv e-prints*, Mar. 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2020arXiv200302133L>
- [25] M. S. Jere, T. Farnan, and F. Koushanfar, "A taxonomy of attacks on federated learning," *IEEE Security Privacy*, pp. 0–0, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/MSEC.2020.3039941>
- [26] V. Tolpegin, S. Truex, M. E. Gursoy, and L. Liu, "Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.08432>
- [27] M. Goldblum, D. Tsipras, C. Xie, X. Chen, A. Schwarzschild, D. Song, A. Madry, B. Li, and T. Goldstein, "Dataset Security for Machine Learning: Data Poisoning, Backdoor Attacks, and Defenses," *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2012.10544, Dec. 2020.
- [28] M. Fredrikson, E. Lantz, S. Jha, S. Lin, D. Page, and T. Ristenpart, "Privacy in pharmacogenetics: An end-to-end case study of personalized warfarin dosing," in *23rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 14)*. San Diego, CA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2014, pp. 17–32. [Online]. Available: https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity14/technical-sessions/presentation/fredrikson_matthew
- [29] M. Fredrikson, S. Jha, and T. Ristenpart, "Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, p. 1322–1333. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2810103.2813677>
- [30] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov, "Membership inference attacks against machine learning models," in *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2017, pp. 3–18.
- [31] A. Pyrgelis, C. Troncoso, and E. D. Cristofaro, "Knock knock, who's there? membership inference on aggregate location data," in *25th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2018, San Diego, California, USA*. The Internet Society, 2018.
- [32] L. Melis, C. Song, E. De Cristofaro, and V. Shmatikov, "Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2019, pp. 691–706. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.acm.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00029>
- [33] G. Ateniese, L. V. Mancini, A. Spognardi, A. Villani, D. Vitali, and G. Felici, "Hacking smart machines with smarter ones: How to extract meaningful data from machine learning classifiers," *International Journal of Security and Networks*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. 137–150, Sep. 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSN.2015.071829>
- [34] K. Ganju, Q. Wang, W. Yang, C. A. Gunter, and N. Borisov, "Property inference attacks on fully connected neural networks using permutation invariant representations," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 619–633. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3243734.3243834>
- [35] B. Liang, M. Su, W. You, W. Shi, and G. Yang, "Cracking classifiers for evasion: A case study on the google's phishing pages filter," in *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*, ser. WWW '16. Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE: International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2016, p. 345–356. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883060>
- [36] F. Tramèr, F. Zhang, A. Juels, M. K. Reiter, and T. Ristenpart, "Stealing machine learning models via prediction apis," in *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium*, ser. SEC '16. USA: USENIX Association, 2016, p. 601–618.
- [37] B. Wang and N. Z. Gong, "Stealing hyperparameters in machine learning," in *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2018, Proceedings, 21-23 May 2018, San Francisco, California, USA*. IEEE Computer Society, 2018, pp. 36–52. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2018.00038>
- [38] M. Barreno, B. Nelson, R. Sears, A. D. Joseph, and J. D. Tygar, "Can machine learning be secure?" in *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security*, ser. ASIACCS '06. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2006, p. 16–25. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1128817.1128824>
- [39] B. I. Rubinstein, B. Nelson, L. Huang, A. D. Joseph, S.-h. Lau, S. Rao, N. Taft, and J. D. Tygar, "Antidote: Understanding and defending against poisoning of anomaly detectors," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement*, ser. IMC '09. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2009, p. 1–14. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1644893.1644895>
- [40] B. Biggio, B. Nelson, and P. Laskov, "Poisoning attacks against support vector machines," in *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. ICML'12. Madison, WI, USA: Omnipress, 2012, p. 1467–1474.
- [41] H. Xiao, B. Biggio, G. Brown, G. Fumera, C. Eckert, and F. Roli, "Is feature selection secure against training data poisoning?" in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, F. Bach and D. Blei, Eds., vol. 37. Lille, France: PMLR, 07–09 Jul 2015, pp. 1689–1698. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/xiao15.html>
- [42] B. Li, Y. Wang, A. Singh, and Y. Vorobeychik, "Data poisoning attacks on factorization-based collaborative filtering," in *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'16. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2016, p. 1893–1901.
- [43] G. Yang, N. Z. Gong, and Y. Cai, "Fake co-visitation injection attacks to recommender systems," in *24th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2017, San Diego, California, USA, February 26 - March 1, 2017*. The Internet Society, 2017. [Online]. Available:

- <https://www.ndss-symposium.org/ndss2017/ndss-2017-programme/fake-co-visitation-injection-attacks-recommender-systems/>
- [44] B. Nelson, M. Barreno, F. J. Chi, A. D. Joseph, B. I. P. Rubinstein, U. Saini, C. Sutton, J. D. Tygar, and K. Xia, "Exploiting machine learning to subvert your spam filter," in *Proceedings of the 1st Usenix Workshop on Large-Scale Exploits and Emergent Threats*, ser. LEET'08. USA: USENIX Association, 2008.
 - [45] A. Shafahi, W. R. Huang, M. Najibi, O. Suciu, C. Studer, T. Dumitras, and T. Goldstein, "Poison frogs! targeted clean-label poisoning attacks on neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'18. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2018, p. 6106–6116.
 - [46] T. Gu, K. Liu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, "Badnets: Evaluating backdooring attacks on deep neural networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 47 230–47 244, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2909068>
 - [47] H. Aghakhani, T. Eisenhofer, L. Schönherr, D. Kolossa, T. Holz, C. Kruegel, and G. Vigna, "VENOMAVE: clean-label poisoning against speech recognition," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2010.10682, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.10682>
 - [48] M. Fang, G. Yang, N. Z. Gong, and J. Liu, "Poisoning attacks to graph-based recommender systems," in *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, ser. ACSAC '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 381–392. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274694.3274706>
 - [49] A. N. Bhagoji, S. Chakraborty, P. Mittal, and S. Calo, "Analyzing federated learning through an adversarial lens," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, Eds., vol. 97. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019, pp. 634–643. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/bhagoji19a.html>
 - [50] M. Fang, X. Cao, J. Jia, and N. Z. Gong, "Local model poisoning attacks to byzantine-robust federated learning," in *29th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2020, August 12-14, 2020*, S. Capkun and F. Roesner, Eds. USENIX Association, 2020, pp. 1605–1622. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity20/presentation/fang>
 - [51] T. Gu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, "Badnets: Identifying vulnerabilities in the machine learning model supply chain," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1708.06733, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06733>
 - [52] O. Suciu, R. Mărginean, Y. Kaya, H. Daumé, and T. Dumitras, "When does machine learning fail? generalized transferability for evasion and poisoning attacks," in *Proceedings of the 27th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium*, ser. SEC'18. USA: USENIX Association, 2018, p. 1299–1316.
 - [53] N. Papernot, P. McDaniel, I. Goodfellow, S. Jha, Z. B. Celik, and A. Swami, "Practical black-box attacks against machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. ASIA CCS '17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, p. 506–519. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3052973.3053009>
 - [54] C. Zhu, W. R. Huang, H. Li, G. Taylor, C. Studer, and T. Goldstein, "Transferable clean-label poisoning attacks on deep neural nets," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, Eds., vol. 97. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019, pp. 7614–7623. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/zhu19a.html>
 - [55] C. Fung, C. J. M. Yoon, and I. Beschastnikh, "Mitigating Sybils in Federated Learning Poisoning," *arXiv e-prints*, Aug. 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2018arXiv180804866F>
 - [56] G. Sun, Y. Cong, J. Dong, Q. Wang, and J. Liu, "Data poisoning attacks on federated machine learning," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2004.10020, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.10020>
 - [57] J. Zhang, J. Chen, D. Wu, B. Chen, and S. Yu, "Poisoning attack in federated learning using generative adversarial nets," in *18th IEEE International Conference On Trust, Security And Privacy In Computing And Communications / 13th IEEE International Conference On Big Data Science And Engineering, TrustCom/BigDataSE 2019, Rotorua, New Zealand, August 5-8, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 374–380. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TrustCom/BigDataSE.2019.00057>
 - [58] S. Mahloujifar, M. Mahmoodi, and A. Mohammed, "Universal multi-party poisoning attacks," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov, Eds., vol. 97. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019, pp. 634–643. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/mahloujifar19a.html>
 - [59] P. Blanchard, E. M. El Mhamdi, R. Guerraoui, and J. Stainer, "Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent," in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'17. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2017, p. 118–128.
 - [60] X. Chen, C. Liu, B. Li, K. Lu, and D. Song, "Targeted backdoor attacks on deep learning systems using data poisoning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1712.05526, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1712.05526>
 - [61] Y. Liu, S. Ma, Y. Aafer, W. Lee, J. Zhai, W. Wang, and X. Zhang, "Trojaning attack on neural networks," in *25th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2018, San Diego, California, USA, February 18-21, 2018*. The Internet Society, 2018. [Online]. Available: http://wp.internetsociety.org/ndss/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2018/02/ndss2018_03A-5_Liu_paper.pdf
 - [62] J. Dumford and W. J. Scheirer, "Backdooring convolutional neural networks via targeted weight perturbations," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1812.03128, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.03128>
 - [63] Y. Ji, X. Zhang, S. Ji, X. Luo, and T. Wang, "Model-reuse attacks on deep learning systems," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 349–363. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3243734.3243757>
 - [64] E. Bagdasaryan, A. Veit, Y. Hua, D. Estrin, and V. Shmatikov, "How To Backdoor Federated Learning," in *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, S. Chiappa and R. Calandra, Eds., vol. 108. Online: PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020, pp. 2938–2948.
 - [65] C. Xie, K. Huang, P.-Y. Chen, and B. Li, "Dba: Distributed backdoor attacks against federated learning," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rkgY50VFvr>
 - [66] C. Szegedy, W. Zaremba, I. Sutskever, J. Bruna, D. Erhan, I. J. Goodfellow, and R. Fergus, "Intriguing properties of neural networks," in *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun, Eds., 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199>
 - [67] B. Biggio, I. Corona, D. Maiorca, B. Nelson, N. Šrđić, P. Laskov, G. Giacinto, and F. Roli, "Evasion attacks against machine learning at test time," in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, H. Blockeel, K. Kersting, S. Nijssen, and F. Železný, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 387–402.
 - [68] N. Carlini and D. A. Wagner, "Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks," in *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2017, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 39–57. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2017.49>
 - [69] O. Suciu, S. E. Coull, and J. Johns, "Exploring adversarial examples in malware detection," in *2019 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*, 2019, pp. 8–14.
 - [70] M. Bauer, "New Covert Channels in HTTP: Adding Unwitting Web Browsers to Anonymity Sets," in *Proceedings of the 2003 ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, ser. WPES '03. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2003, p. 72–78. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1005140.1005152>
 - [71] A. Mileva and B. Panajotov, "Covert channels in TCP/IP protocol stack - Extended version -," *Central European Journal of Computer Science*, vol. 4, pp. 45–66, 06 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.2478/s13537-014-0205-6>
 - [72] J. Selvi, "Covert channels over social networks," SANS Institute, Tech. Rep., June 2012, <https://www.sans.org/reading-room/whitepapers/engineering/paper/33960>.
 - [73] S. Chandra, Z. Lin, A. Kundu, and L. Khan, "Towards a systematic study of the covert channel attacks in smartphones," in *International Conference on Security and Privacy in Communication Networks*, J. Tian, J. Jing, and M. Srivatsa, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 427–435.
 - [74] S. Zander, G. Armitage, and P. Branch, "Covert channels and countermeasures in computer network protocols," *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*, vol. 9, pp. 44–57, 09 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2007.4317620>

- [75] D. C. Castro, J. Tan, B. Kainz, E. Konukoglu, and B. Glocker, "Morpho-MNIST: Quantitative assessment and diagnostics for representation learning," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 20, no. 178, 2019.