

MODEL EXTRACTION ATTACK AGAINST SELF-SUPERVISED SPEECH MODELS

Tsu-Yuan Hsu^{1†}, Chen-An Li^{2†}, Tung-Yu Wu³, Hung-yi Lee⁴

^{1,2}Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering

³Department of Electrical Engineering

⁴Graduate Institute of Electrical Engineering

{b08201047, b08902123, b08901133, hungyilee}@ntu.edu.tw

ABSTRACT

Self-supervised learning (SSL) speech models generate meaningful representations of given clips and achieve incredible performance across various downstream tasks. Model extraction attack (MEA) often refers to an adversary stealing the functionality of the victim model with only query access. In this work, we study the MEA problem against SSL speech model with a small number of queries. We propose a two-stage framework to extract the model. In the first stage, SSL is conducted on the large-scale unlabeled corpus to pre-train a small speech model. Secondly, we actively sample a small portion of clips from the unlabeled corpus and query the target model with these clips to acquire their representations as labels for the small model’s second-stage training. Experiment results show that our sampling methods can effectively extract the target model without knowing any information about its model architecture.

Index Terms— Self-supervised learning, speech representation learning, model extraction attack, knowledge distillation

1. INTRODUCTION

Model extraction attack (MEA) [1] has been posing a non-negligible threat to online deep learning (DL) applications. The adversary may extract models used in remote APIs simply by querying them. This kind of attack causes sizeable financial losses to victimized companies since the training of models and the collection of datasets may have cost a tremendous amount of time and money. Hence, it is an urgent task for researchers to study how the adversary may perform the attack and thus how to protect models.

MEAs against different classes of ML/DL models are broadly studied. Through some direct queries to the remote API, simple regression models and multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) can be easily stolen [1]. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) are also vulnerable to the attack [2, 3]. [2] randomly selects images on hand, queries the API with selected images to fetch fake labels, and utilizes the image-label pairs to train the local surrogate model. Knockoff Nets [3] adopts reinforcement learning (RL) to actively sample images, which surpasses the random-selection approach. Advanced models such as graph neural networks (GNNs) have also been examined. For instance, [4] demonstrates that, after collecting query graphs, a surrogate model can be effectively learned by minimizing RMSE loss between the remote GNN-based API’s and its graph responses. Besides model-type-specific extraction attacks, there are also some works [5, 6] committed to stealing certain information of remote

APIs. Model hyperparameters have been pointed out as a potential target, and a framework is proposed to verify the feasibility of hyperparameter extraction [5]. Metamodel methods [6] learn a classifier to predict model attributes, such as model architectures, adopted optimizers, and types of training datasets.

A more critical potential target of MEA is the large-scale self-supervised learning (SSL) models, such as BERT [7] and wav2vec 2.0 [8], since the SSL-model-based API can serve as a powerful feature extractor to generate representations of input data that help users train a wide range of downstream models, implementing various applications such as text question answering (QA) with BERT and automatic speaker verification (ASV) with wav2vec 2.0. Also, the training and fine-tuning of an SSL model require much time and effort. However, the MEA against SSL models are still underexplored. Though there have been some works [9, 10, 11] investigating MEA against text models, to our knowledge, approaches for speech models have not been discussed. Moreover, current text-model-based methods still exist some restrictions. [9] and [10] apply random sampling strategy to select query data, while [11] presents a hybrid strategy that integrates algebraic-based and learning-based methods. Nonetheless, they all assume attackers have access to output logits of downstream tasks and that each time of the attack merely focuses on stealing one task. In other words, current approaches cannot effectively steal a representation model itself since its original outputs are high-dimension vector representations instead of logits.

In this work, we implement the MEA against SSL speech models. With a limited number of queries to the victim model, our extracted model achieves performances fairly close to it. Our extraction process includes several steps: (1) pre-training a tiny SSL model on easily-collected unlabeled corpus such as LibriSpeech 960-hour [12]; (2) leveraging the pre-trained surrogate model to actively sample crucial clips in the unlabeled corpus; (3) using the sampled clips to conduct teacher-student training on the pre-trained surrogate model. Especially, since the presented active-sampling methods simply need access to data embeddings¹ instead of logits, we can then extract the remote SSL speech model directly rather than just a downstream task. In addition, our proposed selection methods consistently outperform baseline methods in several downstream tasks under the constraints of a limited number of queries. Also notable is that, the whole extraction pipeline does not require knowledge of the remote model’s architecture and its training corpus. To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to steal a large-scale speech model. Experiments are conducted in Section 3 to verify the effectiveness of our proposed clip sampling methods and the whole extraction pipeline.

[†] Equal contribution.

We thank NCHC of National Applied Research Laboratories in Taiwan for providing computational and storage resources.

¹Many current SSL-based APIs, such as official BERT and GPT-3 APIs, provide services of generating data embeddings




Fig. 1. Illustration of our model extraction attack framework. (I) Our surrogate model is pre-trained on corpus \mathcal{X}_{pre} . (II) The selection method is applied to obtain \mathcal{X}_S from \mathcal{X} . (III) The surrogate is then trained with \mathcal{X}_S and the obtained victim model features.

2. METHODS

In this paper, the victim model refers to the model being queried, such as the APIs mentioned in Section 1 and the surrogate model refers to the local model that performs model extraction on the victim model by queries to it. We assume the requests to the victim model are limited, and the knowledge of the victim model’s architecture and its training corpus is lacking. The query limitation is related to the total length of waveforms. The information returned by the victim model includes representations of input data.

Our proposed framework first pre-trains the surrogate model on unlabeled corpus \mathcal{X}_{pre} . Second, an active selection method is applied to sample a small portion of clips from dataset \mathcal{X} to a subset \mathcal{X}_S . The sampling process is done until the total length of the waveforms in \mathcal{X}_S is no less than the preset length H . Finally, we conduct supervised training, with the pre-trained surrogate model as the student and the victim SSL model as the teacher, to carry out knowledge distillation.

2.1. Selection Method

In this section, we propose and discuss several selection methods used to construct \mathcal{X}_S for the surrogate model’s teacher-student supervised training. Clip selection is conducted after pre-training a local surrogate model on the self-collected unlabeled corpus \mathcal{X}_{pre} .

2.1.1. Pre-training Loss Selection

We state that self-supervised pre-training loss can serve as a good metric to sample waveforms. Clips with high pre-training loss are regarded as hard samples, which the current surrogate model cannot tackle and thus worth engaging in the afterward teacher-student training. As a result, we evaluate the dataset \mathcal{X} on the pre-trained surrogate model and, calculating each waveform’s pre-training loss. The dataset \mathcal{X}_S keeps sampling waveform with the highest loss in \mathcal{X} until its total clip length reaches H . In this paper, we adopt the self-supervised loss of HuBERT.

2.1.2. Content-based Selection

A selection approach based on the acoustic content of speech clips is also proposed. We argue that, with the knowledge of each recording’s acoustic information, it is possible to sample a small portion of clips that represents the overall distribution of the whole corpus. To achieve this, we first leverage the surrogate SSL model to generate all the waveforms representations. Secondly, each waveform timestamp’s token is determined by feeding its representation into a clustering model fit on 10% of the representations, with consecutive same class removed. We then take these tokens as the content of a speech clip. Finally, we iteratively sample the corpus with the farthest point sampling (FPS). To be specific, after randomly picking the first clip, we calculate its token-based trigram Jaccard distance to all other clips:

$$D_{x,y} = 1 - J(X, Y) = 1 - \frac{|X \cap Y|}{|X \cup Y|}, \quad (1)$$

where x and y are two distinct clips (a sampled clip and an unsampled one in our case), while X and Y are their token trigram sets. Specifically, each element in the set is a set containing three consecutive tokens generated by the clustering model. $J(X, Y)$ is the Jaccard similarity. Among all unselected clips, we choose the one with the farthest distance (lowest similarity) to the previously-selected clip as the second sampled clip. If there have been multiple clips already sampled, an unsampled clip’s distance to them is defined as the Jaccard distance to its nearest sampled clip. The FPS process is repeated until the total length of sampled clips is no less than H .

2.1.3. Transcription-based Selection

In this method, we select clips with different content. We assume that every speech in the dataset has its corresponding transcription. We utilize pre-trained language model to generate [CLS] token embeddings for speech transcriptions. Next, fit a clustering model on [CLS] token embeddings to get clustering labels. Finally, we evenly select the corresponding clips from each cluster to increase the diversity.

Table 1. Evaluation results with querying dataset LibriSpeech 960-hour for KS, IC, and ER in accuracy and SD in diarization error rate. The first section of the table is the result of *Pre-trained Surrogate*, the setting without any query to the victim model. The second section is the results with the victim model HuBERT Base. The third section is the results with the victim model WavLM Base+. The best performance of each column in each section is marked in bold text.

		KS			IC			ER			SD		
<i>Pre-trained Surrogate</i>		92.41			77.91			57.7			7.86		
<i>Method</i>	<i>Victim Model</i>	<i>0.1h</i>	<i>1h</i>	<i>10h</i>	<i>0.1h</i>	<i>1h</i>	<i>10h</i>	<i>0.1h</i>	<i>1h</i>	<i>10h</i>	<i>0.1h</i>	<i>1h</i>	<i>10h</i>
<i>Baseline_R</i>	HuBERT Base	83.47	89.65	94.26	63.67	79.73	87.29	56.41	57.72	60.39	11.02	10.05	7.56
<i>Baseline_P</i>	HuBERT Base	92.05	94.16	94.35	75.43	87.43	88.98	56.91	60.28	60.06	9.15	7.64	7.18
<i>Transcription</i>	HuBERT Base	92.11	93.57	94.22	76.19	84.29	90.17	58.68	59.78	61.48	9.61	7.63	7.61
<i>SSL</i>	HuBERT Base	93.12	95.30	95.07	79.09	88.74	90.43	59.34	60.03	62.11	9.14	8.32	7.16
<i>Content</i>	HuBERT Base	92.08	94.45	95.29	77.54	88.72	91.27	57.99	60.36	61.49	9.28	7.80	6.93
<i>Baseline_R</i>	WavLM Base+	81.5	88.93	93.02	60.77	78.01	86.45	55.18	58.00	61.55	12.46	10.48	7.56
<i>Baseline_P</i>	WavLM Base+	93.22	93.51	94.35	78.30	87.77	91.48	59.41	61.56	61.95	9.62	7.31	7.52
<i>SSL</i>	WavLM Base+	93.67	94.68	95.46	82.92	90.11	92.33	59.87	61.78	63.71	8.96	7.74	7.23
<i>Content</i>	WavLM Base+	93.18	94.55	95.13	79.41	90.4	92.17	58.84	62.29	62.7	8.74	7.77	6.84




Fig. 2. Performances of *Content*, *SSL*, and *Baseline_P* on KS, IC, and ER with victim model WavLM Base+.

2.2. Model Extraction

We perform model extraction by knowledge distillation. In this paper, we refer to DistilHuBERT framework. We assume that the victim model will return multiple representations per query because weighted-sum multiple hidden states of the pre-train model will significantly improve the downstream performance [13]. The surrogate model is followed by multiple separate prediction heads, which are used to learn the victim model’s representations from different layers.

Given victim model’s n -th output representation $h^{(n)}$ and the prediction head vector learn from victim model’s n -th output $\hat{h}^{(n)}$, The objection function can be shown as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{extract}}^{(n)} &= \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{cos}}^{(n)} + \mathcal{L}_{l1}^{(n)} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \left[-\alpha \log \sigma \left(\cos \left(h_t^{(n)}, \hat{h}_t^{(n)} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{D} \left\| h_t^{(n)} - \hat{h}_t^{(n)} \right\|_1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{extract}} = \sum_{n \in N} \mathcal{L}_{\text{extract}}^{(n)} = \sum_{n \in N} \left[\alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{cos}}^{(n)} + \mathcal{L}_{l1}^{(n)} \right] \quad (3)$$

where $t \in [T]$, T is the number of timestamps, N is the set of the

layers’ indices, $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes as sigmoid function, $\cos(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes as cosine similarity function, D is the feature dimension of the representation and $\alpha > 0$ is the weight for cosine similarity loss.

3. EXPERIMENTS

3.1. Experimental Setup

3.1.1. Data and Preprocessing

We use LibriSpeech 960-hour to pre-train the surrogate model and as the querying dataset to the victim model in our main results. Extensive experiments using Wall Street Journal [14] and Aishell-1 [15] as querying datasets are also conducted. Considering the victim model should have a querying-length constraint, the maximum input sequence length is set to 15.6 seconds, and each clip longer than 15.6s is split. Also, we set the minimum waveform length to 2s, which means the clip less than 2 seconds will be dropped.

3.1.2. Victim Model

We consider HuBERT Base [16] and WavLM Base+ [17] as the victim models. Both of them have a 12-layer transformer encoder and

Table 2. Performances of SID and SD with victim model WavLM Base+. Results better than *Pre-trained Surrogate* (65.80 for SID and 7.86 for SD) are marked in bold.

Method	SID			SD		
	0.1h	1h	10h	0.1h	1h	10h
<i>Baseline_P</i>	55.17	65.90	71.42	9.62	7.31	7.52
<i>Most Speakers</i>	56.55	64.76	71.55	9.83	8.35	7.74

we assume their 4th, 8th, and 12th layer features are returned after each query.

3.1.3. Surrogate Model

Our surrogate model is initialized as a 7-layer CNN extractor following a 2-layer transformer encoder, called *Random Surrogate*. HuBERT pre-training is applied on *Random Surrogate* with LibriSpeech 960-hour to obtain *Pre-trained Surrogate*. The first iteration is trained for 250k steps by utilizing the MFCC clustered labels, and the second iteration is trained for 400k steps by using the clustered labels generated from the 1st transformer encoder layer features of first-iteration *Pre-trained Surrogate*.

In the selection stage, the corresponding features of sampled clips are retrieved by querying the victim model, where the clips are obtained by either random, pre-training loss, content-based, or transcription-based selection.

In the model extraction stage, our surrogate model (*Random Surrogate* or *Pre-trained Surrogate*) is trained on the clip-feature pairs for $10000 \times d$ steps with batch size 24, where d is the total hour of sampled clips and $d = 0.1, 1, 10$ are considered in this paper.

3.2. Evaluation Metrics

We use SUPERB [13] benchmark to evaluate our surrogate model. In SUPERB, the surrogate model is frozen and a trainable linear layer is adopted to weigh each layer’s output features of our surrogate model, including one CNN extractor’s, two transformer encoder layers’, and three prediction heads’ outputs. The downstream models then use the weighted feature as the input. In this paper, four downstream tasks are selected to evaluate the surrogate model, including keyword spotting (KS), intent classification (IC), emotion recognition (ER), and speaker diarization (SD).

3.3. Main Results

In Table 1, *Baseline_R* denotes training *Random Surrogate* with data pairs obtained from applying the random selection method. *Baseline_P*, *Transcription*, *SSL*, and *Content* denote training *Pre-trained Surrogate* with pairs acquired by applying random, transcription-based, pre-training loss, and content-based selection methods, respectively. In Table 1, *Baseline_P* shows an overall-better performance compared to *Baseline_R*, especially in the highly low-resource situation, which indicates the use of pre-training the surrogate model. Note that “low-resource” in this paper refers to the limitation on the number of queries.

For the proposed methods discussed in Section 2.1, *Transcription* has a similar performance compared to *Baseline_P*. This indicates that selecting the queries based on speech transcriptions is not effective. From Table 1 and Table 2, both *SSL* and *Content* consistently surpass the baselines and *Transcription* on KS, IC, and ER.

Table 3. Performances of SD with the victim model HuBERT Base. The querying datasets are denoted in parentheses.

Method	SD (Aishell-1)			SD (WSJ)		
	0.1h	1h	10h	0.1h	1h	10h
<i>Baseline_P</i>	9.09	8.25	7.21	8.55	8.44	7.80
<i>SSL</i>	8.31	7.46	6.90	9.45	7.73	7.88
<i>Content</i>	9.21	8.20	6.88	9.50	7.82	7.93




Fig. 3. IC performances of *Content*, *SSL*, and *Baseline_P* with querying dataset Aishell-1 and WSJ.

For the speaker tasks SD and SID², all methods and baselines suffer performance degradation in low-resource situations compared with *Pre-trained Surrogate*. In *Most Speakers*, we use the most-speaker selection, which samples as many speakers as possible. However, the performance still does not improve under the low-resource setting.

3.4. Different Querying Datasets

This section examines WSJ and AISHELL-1 as querying datasets to simulate the situation that the data for training the victim model is unknown. It is worth mentioning that AISHELL-1 is a Chinese corpus, which means the victim model’s pretraining dataset and our querying contains different languages.

As shown in Figure 3, there is no obvious performance difference between our proposed methods and *Baseline_P* (same conclusion can be drawn on KS, ER, and SD). From Table 1 and Table 3², we observe that extracting the models with the AISHELL-1 corpus achieves a slightly better performance on SD than with the WSJ and the LibriSpeech corpus. On the other hand, extracting the victim model with the LibriSpeech corpus usually outperforms the other two corpora in other tasks, which means that performing model extraction with the different datasets pre-trained on the victim model may significantly affect the performance.

4. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

This work makes the first attempt to conduct model extraction attack against SSL speech models. Experimental results on four diverse tasks in SUPERB show that our proposed selection methods outperform the naive data selection method. In this paper, we apply the HuBERT pre-training method and adopt LibriSpeech as the surrogate model’s pretraining corpus. More experiments on different datasets, methods, and downstream tasks are planned to be conducted in the future.

²Only part of the results are shown in due to page limitation.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Florian Tramèr, Fan Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart, “Stealing machine learning models via prediction {APIs},” in *25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, 2016, pp. 601–618.
- [2] Jacson Rodrigues Correia-Silva, Rodrigo F Berriel, Claudine Badue, Alberto F de Souza, and Thiago Oliveira-Santos, “Copycat cnn: Stealing knowledge by persuading confession with random non-labeled data,” in *2018 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–8.
- [3] Tribhuvanesh Orekondy, Bernt Schiele, and Mario Fritz, “Knockoff nets: Stealing functionality of black-box models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 4954–4963.
- [4] Yun Shen, Xinlei He, Yufei Han, and Yang Zhang, “Model stealing attacks against inductive graph neural networks,” in *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1175–1192.
- [5] Seong Joon Oh, Bernt Schiele, and Mario Fritz, “Towards reverse-engineering black-box neural networks,” in *Explainable AI: Interpreting, Explaining and Visualizing Deep Learning*, pp. 121–144. Springer, 2019.
- [6] Binghui Wang and Neil Zhenqiang Gong, “Stealing hyperparameters in machine learning,” in *2018 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 36–52.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [8] Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12449–12460, 2020.
- [9] Kalpesh Krishna, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Ankur P Parikh, Nicolas Papernot, and Mohit Iyyer, “Thieves on sesame street! model extraction of bert-based apis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12366*, 2019.
- [10] Chen Chen, Xuanli He, Lingjuan Lyu, and Fangzhao Wu, “Killing one bird with two stones: Model extraction and attribute inference attacks against bert-based apis,” *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2105, 2021.
- [11] Santiago Zanella-Beguelin, Shruti Tople, Andrew Paverd, and Boris Köpf, “Grey-box extraction of natural language models,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 12278–12286.
- [12] Vassil Panayotov, Guoguo Chen, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, “Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books,” in *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 5206–5210.
- [13] Shu-wen Yang, Po-Han Chi, Yung-Sung Chuang, Cheng-I Jeff Lai, Kushal Lakhota, Yist Y Lin, Andy T Liu, Jiatong Shi, Xuankai Chang, Guan-Ting Lin, et al., “SUPERB: Speech processing universal performance benchmark,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01051*, 2021.
- [14] Douglas B Paul and Janet Baker, “The design for the wall street journal-based csr corpus,” in *Speech and Natural Language: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Harriman, New York, February 23-26, 1992*, 1992.
- [15] Hui Bu, Jiayu Du, Xingyu Na, Bengu Wu, and Hao Zheng, “Aishell-1: An open-source mandarin speech corpus and a speech recognition baseline,” in *2017 20th conference of the oriental chapter of the international coordinating committee on speech databases and speech I/O systems and assessment (O-COCOSDA)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–5.
- [16] Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Kushal Lakhota, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman Mohamed, “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [17] Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Jinyu Li, Naoyuki Kanda, Takuya Yoshioaka, Xiong Xiao, et al., “Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 2022.