

Efficient Secure Aggregation Based on SHPRG For Federated Learning

Zizhen Liu^{1,3}, Si Chen², Jing Ye^{1,3}, Junfeng Fan², Huawei Li^{1,3}, Xiaowei Li^{1,3}

¹Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, ²Open Security Research, ³CASTEST

¹{liuzizhen18s, yejing, lihuawei, lxw}@ict.ac.cn, ²{si.chen, fan}@osr-tech.com

ABSTRACT

We propose a novel secure aggregation scheme based on seed-homomorphic pseudo-random generator (SHPRG) to prevent private training data leakage from model-related information in Federated Learning systems. Our constructions leverage the homomorphic property of SHPRG to simplify the masking and demasking scheme, which entails a linear overhead while revealing nothing beyond the aggregation result against colluding entities. Additionally, our scheme is resilient to dropouts without extra overhead. We experimentally demonstrate our scheme significantly improves the efficiency to 20× over baseline, especially in the more realistic case in which the number of clients and model size become large and a certain percentage of clients drop out from the system.

1 Introduction

In Federated Learning (FL), multiple participants collaborate to train a machine learning model without putting together their raw training data [1]. In the scenario of horizontal FL, a central coordinator updates the global model with the aggregation of the clients' local model updates. However, as recent studies argue, the privacy of training data can be compromised from the information of model update [2, 3], which puts forward requirements that the model update should be exchanged in a secure way. In this paper, we consider the setting of cross-device, horizontal FL [4], which presents challenges for privacy-preserving schemes from the following aspects:

1. **Efficiency:** the computation and communication cost should not limit the scalability of the FL system which may combine thousands or even millions of clients to train models with millions of parameters.
2. **Security:** the coordinator learns global model update without learning any additional information (e.g. the parties' local model update or training data) even in colluding cases.
3. **Practicality:** the scheme should be robust against client dropouts, and preferably be simple to implement in common Internet environment.
4. **Accuracy:** the degradation of the trained model's accuracy should be minimal.

Existing privacy solutions for FL tend to apply privacy protection technologies main including Secure Multiparty Computation (SMC) [5-10], Homomorphic Encryption(HE) [11, 12], and Differential Privacy(DP) [13] in the local model sharing process.

SecAgg [5] is one of the most practical solutions to provide a privacy guarantee in the horizontal FL, which enables an aggregator to learn the sum of the vector inputs of many clients

securely. In SecAgg, for any pair of clients u, v in the set of clients U , they securely agree upon a masking seed $s_{u,v}$. Then for each client u in U , the seed of another mask is generated. The message of client u is masked as $y_u = m_u + PRG(b_u) + \sum_{v < u} PRG(s_{u,v}) - \sum_{u < v} PRG(s_{u,v})$. All the masking seeds b_u and $s_{u,v}$ are also secret-shared among all clients, which allows the reconstruction upon sufficient shares. After receiving the masked values, the aggregator can reconstruct b_u and remove $PRG(b_u)$ from y_u if u is still online, or reconstruct $s_{u,v}$ for every other online client v and remove all $PRG(s_{u,v})$'s from y_u if u drops out. The pairwise masking scheme entails computation complexities of $O(N^2M)$ for the aggregator, and $O(NM)$ for each client, where N is the number of clients, and M is the number of parameters in the model under training. This quadratic overhead in N may limit its practical applications to FL systems with thousands of clients. Several subsequent works [6-8] make the secure aggregation more efficient but will incur new restrictions, such as weakened dropout resilience or increased communication costs.

To further improve the efficiency of SecAgg, this work develops a novel secure aggregation scheme based on seed-homomorphic pseudo-random generator (SHPRG) [14], which has the property $\sum SHPRG(k_i) \approx SHPRG(\sum k_i)$. For each client, instead of masking the data with N PRG outputs, only one mask is sufficient. The masked data is $y_u = m_u + SHPRG(k_u)$, where k_u is a self-generated seed. If the aggregator can securely get the sum of a subset of $\{k_u\}$, then the aggregator can remove the mask of the masked aggregation result by computing $\sum m_u \approx \sum y_u - SHPRG(\sum k_u)$. This simple construction has two advantages compared with SecAgg:

1. Masking and demasking are much simpler and efficient than those in SecAgg, resulting in computation complexities of $O(M)$ for both each client and the aggregator, and fewer rounds of communication.
2. If some clients drop out during the process, the remaining clients' masked data are still valid, and the aggregator can get the correct sum, as long as the aggregator can securely get the sum of masking seeds of the surviving clients.

In the following sections, we give detailed construction of our secure aggregation scheme, and show that it achieves the four aspects of requirements for a practical and secure FL system.

2 Background

2.1 Related work

We briefly review privacy solutions for horizontal FL in this section.

HE provides a general solution for security and privacy enhancements of FL [11, 12]. Many recent works advocate the use of additively HE schemes, notably Paillier [15], as the primary means of privacy guarantee in FL. HE performs complex cryptographic operations that are relatively expensive to compute. The reference develops a simple batch encryption technique based on new quantization and encoding schemes to improve efficiency. However, questions arise about the collusion threats.

DP is a rigorous mathematical framework to improve the privacy of the machine learning model by introducing a level of uncertainty into the released model [13]. With carefully added randomness to training data and/or trained models, DP can protect the privacy of individual samples in the dataset. DP can be used in combination with our scheme to provide further security guarantees.

SMC guarantees that a set of parties compute a function in a way that each one cannot learn anything except the output, and different SMC protocols such as SPDZ protocol [9] and threshold homomorphic encryption [10] have been utilized in the privacy-preserving FL framework. A notable work is the secure aggregation protocol proposed by Bonawitz et al. [5]. As reviewed in section 1, they developed a double masking solution, which achieve secure aggregation against colluding participants, and is robust to dropouts. However, the quadratic growth of computation overhead w.r.t. N is the major bottleneck. Several subsequent works improve the efficiency based on the framework of SecAgg. One-shot reconstruction of the aggregate-mask was employed in a recent work [16], but can only work with a trusted third party (TTP). TurboAgg utilizes a circular communication topology to reduce the communication and computation overhead [6]. SecAgg+ achieves polylogarithmic communication and computation per client via communication graph [8]. FastSecAgg presents a FFT-based multi-secret sharing scheme to obtain $O(M \log N)$ cost [7]. However, in SecAgg+, TurboAgg, and FastSecAgg, the robustness to dropouts and/or security guarantee are weaker than those of the original SecAgg. See Table I for a summary of features of these schemes.

2.2 Cryptographic Tools

Seed Homomorphic PRG. A seed homomorphic PRG (SHPRG) is a pseudo-random generator G mapping seeds in a group (\mathcal{X}, \oplus) to outputs in a group (\mathcal{Y}, \oplus) with the additional property that for every, we have that $G(S_1) \oplus G(S_2) = G(S_1 \oplus S_2)$ [14].

With the parameters $p < q, n < m$ and a random matrix $A \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_q^{m \times n}$ the public parameters, the SHPRG $(\mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^m)$ can be constructed based on the Learning With Rounding problem as:

$$PRG(s) = \lfloor A^T \cdot s \rfloor_p$$

It is almost seed homomorphic in the following sense: $PRG(S_1 + S_2) = PRG(S_1) + PRG(S_2) + e, e \in [0, 1]^m$. For a value $x \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, $\lfloor x \rfloor_p = \lfloor x \cdot p/q \rfloor$.

Note that the security of the PRG depends on the hardness of $LWR_{n,q,p}$ problem [17]. The value of $1/p$ corresponds to the error rate α in LWE, so the selection of parameters should assure that $LWE_{n,q,1/p}$ is hard to guarantee security.

Multiple privacy-critical applications have been built from Homomorphic PRF and PRG, such as distributed PRFs, undatable encryption [14] and private stream aggregation [18, 19]. The homomorphism property is in support of specific applications with provable security.

3 Proposed Method

We consider such a federated learning process, that N clients jointly train a model with M parameters, and each client uploads the local model update to the aggregator periodically before the aggregator computes the aggregation result of each period. To ensure the model update to be shared and computed without exposing information beyond aggregation results, we present an efficient privacy-preserving aggregation scheme based on SHPRG combining two layers of protocols: the Homomorphic Model Aggregation (HMA) protocol and the Masking Key Agreement (MKA) protocol. Figure 1 depicts the overall process of the mechanism for one epoch. The model updates are securely shared and computed following the HMA protocol, which calls the MKA protocol to return the demasking key to the aggregator and enable demasking to obtain the global model update. The process is repeated until the global model converges. Next, we will describe the two protocols in detail respectively.

3.1 The Homomorphic Model Aggregation protocol

In the Homomorphic Model Aggregation Protocol, the aggregation of clients' local models is computed under the orchestration of the aggregator, ensuring no information about the individual models is revealed beyond their aggregated value. As shown in Figure 2, each client firstly utilizes the SHPRG to generate the mask for the current epoch. They take the masking key which is a randomly sampled vector as the input to the SHPRG and stretch it to a mask for each entry of the model update.

During this step for masking and uploading data, some clients may drop out. We denote the initial set of clients as U_0 , and the set of clients that have successfully uploaded masked data as U_1 . Clients in U_1 and the aggregator run the MKA protocol, and some further client dropouts may happen. We denote the set of surviving clients after MKA as U_2 , and the aggregator should obtain $k_0 = \sum_{i \in U_2} k_i$ from the MKA protocol. The aggregator then sums up the model updates of clients in U_2 and removes the mask which is $SHPRG(k_0)$




Figure 1: The Overall Process of Our Protocol.

Subsequently, the aggregator dequantizes the result before computing the average over N_2 clients in set U_2 and broadcasts the final aggregated model update.

We instantiate the protocol by the almost seed homomorphic PRG introduced in Section 2. Since the output of SHPRG is in \mathbb{Z}_p^m , we set the public modulus P in our scheme equal to p , and the model updates are preprocessed by the quantization operation which converts each bounded model update to w -bit integer before adding masks. To void overflow, we set $p \geq N(2^w - 1) + 1$.

3.2 The Masking Key Agreement Protocol

In the Masking Key Agreement (MKA) Protocol, the aggregator and online clients in U_2 collaboratively compute the sum of the masking keys of online clients without disclosing the individual values to other clients or the aggregator. Various privacy protection approaches can be chosen to achieve secure aggregation.

In particular, the protocol of SecAgg [5] can be called to implement MKA. The original SecAgg protocol performs secure aggregation of the model updates exchanged during the FL learning process, while as an implementation of MKA, it only aggregates the SHPRG seeds. SecAgg is robust against user dropouts less than some threshold, and the rest of HMA is not affected by user dropouts, so the whole protocol is tolerant to dropouts.

Other secure aggregation solutions can be called for MKA as well. As a tradeoff between efficiency and security/robustness, we can utilize SecAgg+ [8], FastSecAgg [7], or TurboAgg [6] to further reduce the computation and communication overhead within MKA. Note that in these schemes, the security and robustness are somehow weaker than those of SecAgg and the ideal HMA, and the security and robustness of the overall HMA scheme are determined by the chosen MKA scheme. If one would like to further guarantee the privacy against malicious participants, the authentication or correctness verification can be combined in this protocol.

Homomorphic Model Aggregation Protocol for epoch t	
Parameter:	a random matrix $A \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_q^{\lambda \times M}$, $\lambda, q, p, M \in \mathbb{N}$, with $q > p, \lambda < M$
Input:	$m_{U_0} = \{m_i\}_{i \in U_0}$ for the clients
Output:	$m_0 = \sum_{i \in U_2} m_i$
Client $\{C_i\}_{i \in U_0}$:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Preprocess the model update m_i to \hat{m}_i and compute the masked model update $y_i = \hat{m}_i + SHPRG(k_i)$; 2: Upload y_i to the aggregator
Aggregator:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Collect y_i of all clients $\{C_i\}_{i \in U_1}$, and call the Masking Key Agreement protocol which returns $k_0 = \sum_{i \in U_2} k_i$. 2: Do the aggregation $y_0 = \sum_{i \in U_2} y_i$, and unmask it by computing $\hat{m}_0 = y_0 - SHPRG(k_0)$ 3: Decode the result \hat{m}_0 to obtain $m_0 = \sum_{i \in U_2} m_i$ and return the averaged aggregation m_0/N_2.

Figure 2: The Homomorphic Model Aggregation Protocol.

3.3 Correctness and Security

In this section, we state our correctness and security theorems. We consider clients in U_0 and the aggregator A execute HMA with inputs $m_{U_0} = \{m_i\}_{i \in U_0}$, $|U_0| = N$, $U_0 \supseteq U_1 \supseteq U_2 \supseteq U_3$.

Theorem 1(Correctness): If participants in U_2 follow the protocol, regardless of dropouts in $U_0 \setminus U_2$ (entries that are in U_0 but not in U_2), the aggregator can obtain $\sum_{i \in U_2} m_i$ with negligible noise based on the given $k_0 = \sum_{i \in U_2} k_i$.

Proof: Because the selected PRG is almost seed-homomorphic, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n SHPRG(k_i) &= SHPRG(\sum_{i=1}^n k_i) + e \\ &= SHPRG(k_0) + e \pmod{p}, e \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \end{aligned}$$

For the HMA protocol, $y_i = \hat{m}_i + SHPRG(k_i) \pmod{P}$, where $SHPRG(k_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^M$, $P = p$, $p \geq N(2^w - 1) + 1 \geq N_2(2^w - 1) + 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}_0 &= \sum_{i \in U_2} y_i - SHPRG(k_0) \pmod{P} \\ &= \sum_{i \in U_2} (\hat{m}_i + SHPRG(k_i)) - SHPRG(\sum_{i \in U_2} k_i) \pmod{P} \\ &= \sum_{i \in U_2} \hat{m}_i + \sum_{i \in U_2} SHPRG(k_i) - SHPRG(\sum_{i \in U_2} k_i) \pmod{P} \\ &= \sum_{i \in U_2} \hat{m}_i + e_0 \pmod{P}, e_0 \in \{0, \dots, N_2 - 1\} \end{aligned}$$

The noise here is insignificant relative to the domain of aggregated quantized model updates which is $N_2(2^w - 1)$, which

can be demonstrated to have a negligible impact on the quality of the trained model. \square

In Theorem 2 below we show that HMA is secure against colluding participants which may contain the aggregator, irrespective of how and when clients drop out. Those clients and the aggregator learn nothing more than their own inputs, and the sum of the inputs and masks of the other clients.

Theorem 2(Security): For the SHPRG parameterized by pp , there exists a PPT simulator SIM such that for all $U_0, m_{U_0}, U_1, U_2, U_3$ and $\nu \subset U_0 \cup A, |\nu \setminus \{A\}| < N - 1$, the output of SIM is computationally indistinguishable from the joint view of $REAL_{\nu}^{U_0, N, \lambda}$ of the parties in ν :

$$REAL_{\nu}^{U_0, N, pp}(m_{U_0}, U_1, U_2, U_3) \approx SIM_{\nu}^{U_0, N, pp}(m_{\nu}, z_m, z_k, U_1, U_2, U_3)$$

$$z_m = \sum_{i \in U_2 \setminus \nu} m_i, z_k = \sum_{i \in U_2 \setminus \nu} SHPRG(k_i)$$

Proof: We prove the theorem by a standard hybrid argument. We will present a series of hybrids from variable REAL to SIM where any two subsequent random variables are computationally indistinguishable. We assume that $A \in \nu$, which indicates the view of the aggregator should be considered. The case of A not in ν is much easier to prove and is omitted for brevity.

Hyb0: In this hybrid, the variables are distributed exactly as in REAL. We choose a specific client u' in $U_2 \setminus \nu$. For this client, based on the given z_m and z_k , we can write as

$$y_{u'} = m_{u'} + SHPRG(k_{u'}) = z_m + z_k - \sum_{u \in U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}} y_u.$$

Hyb1: In this hybrid, for a party u in $U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}$, instead of sending $y_u = m_u + SHPRG(k_u)$, we send $y_u = m_u + P_u$, where P_u is uniformly random. For u' , the masked data is still generated by $y_{u'} = z_m + z_k - \sum_{u \in U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}} y_u$. The security of SHPRG guarantees that the distribution of $y_{U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}}$ is identically distributed to the corresponding one in Hyb0. On the other hand, $y_{u'}$ is fully determined by $y_{U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}}$, z_m and z_k , so the distribution of $y_{U_2 \setminus \nu}$ is identically distributed to that in Hyb0.

Hyb2: In this hybrid, for party u in $U_1 \setminus U_2 \setminus \nu$, the simulator can just substitute their inputs by uniform random vectors. Since the aggregator will not do aggregation on their inputs and has no access to the values, the joint view of the parties in ν does not depend on their inputs. Consequently, the joint view of the participants will be identical to the previous one.

Hyb3: In this hybrid, for client u in $U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}$, we replace the uploaded data by $y_u = P_u$, which is possible since P_u was obtained in Hyb1 to be uniformly random, $m_u + P_u$ is also uniformly random. For the chosen client u' , its uploaded data is still computed by $y_{u'} = z_m + z_k - \sum_{u \in U_2 \setminus \nu \setminus \{u'\}} y_u$, which makes the sum of clients in $U_2 \setminus \nu$ consistent with the previous one, and the joint distribution of the data uploaded by clients in U_2 stays

identical. Hence the joint view of the participants including the aggregator is indistinguishable from the previous hybrid.

Thus, the PPT simulator SIM that samples from the distribution described in the last hybrid can output computationally indistinguishable from REAL, the distribution can be computed based on m_{ν}, z_m, z_k . The simulation does not restrict the number of joint viewed parties, which means our scheme can preserve the security against the aggregator colluding with an arbitrary subset of up to $N-1$ clients. \square

4 Evaluation

In this section, we perform a detailed evaluation of our proposed scheme from the perspectives of efficiency, accuracy, privacy security and practicality theoretically and experimentally.

Table I: Comparison of efficiency, security and dropout guarantees of our proposed scheme and the related works.

	SecAgg[5]	SecAgg+[8]	Turbo[14]	FastSec[7]	Ours ¹
Computation (Client)	$O(MN+N^2)$	$O(\log^2 N + M \log N)$	$O(M \log N \log^2 \log N)$	$O(M \log N)$	$O(M+N^2)$
Computation (Aggregator)	$O(MN^2)$	$O(N \log^2 N + NM \log N)$	$O(M \log N \log^2 \log N)$	$O(M \log N)$	$O(M+N^2)$
Communication (Client)	$O(M+N)$	$O(M+\log N)$	$O(M \log N)$	$O(M+N)$	$O(M+N)$
Communication (Aggregator)	$O(N^2+MN)$	$O(MN+N \log N)$	$O(MN \log N)$	$O(N^2+MN)$	$O(MN+N^2)$
Security/T	Adaptive N/3	Non-adaptive Parameter	Non-adaptive N/2	Adaptive N/10	Adaptive N/3
Dropouts/ D_{max}	Worst-case N/3	Average-case Parameter	Average-case N/2	Average-case N/10	Worst-case N/3

4.1 Efficiency

In this section, we analyze the computation and communication costs theoretically and experimentally. As Table I shows, our solution achieves the best asymptotic computation efficiency for both clients and the aggregator.

4.1.1 Computation overhead. In the HMA protocol, the computation cost is mainly derived from computing SHPRGs to generate masks for each entry in the model update vector. The computation costs for clients and the aggregator are both $O(M)$, regardless of the number of clients and the client dropout rate.

Recall that in SecAgg, which performs secure aggregation of model updates, the majority of computation cost comes from PRGs calculation expanding the various seeds to masks of M entries. For each client, N masks are required for one upload, entailing computation cost of $O(MN)$. For the aggregator, computation cost is $O(N^2M)$, which can be broken into $O(M(N-dN)+Md(N^2-dN))$, where d is the fraction of dropping-out clients. Apparently, the computation cost of the aggregator increases quadratically with N if d is nonzero.

The SecAgg in the MKA protocol is called to only aggregate the masking key of size λ instead of the model update with size M . The complexities of computation are $O(N)$ and $O(N^2)$ for each client and the aggregator separately.

¹ In the comparison, we implement the MKA protocol by calling SecAgg for baseline, other optimized solutions can be selected as well.




Figure 3: From left to right, (a) the running time as the number of model parameters increases for the FL system assembles 500 clients without dropouts. (b) the running time as the number of clients increases with $M=100k$ and $d=0.1$. (c) the running time with dropout fraction with $M=100K$ and $N=50$.

For the comparison with SecAgg, in addition to the difference of computational cost w.r.t. N , our protocol also incurs a much smaller effective dropout fraction d_0 , which is defined as the fraction of dropping-out clients who present extra overhead for recovery. This is because the masked model updates are uploaded before calling the MKA protocol, and the aggregator can aggregate and demask the model updates of remaining clients in U_2 correctly without considering the dropping-out clients in $U_0 \cup U_1$, while the dropout users in $U_1 \cup U_2$ are handled by the SecAgg protocol. In other words, $d_0 \approx d|U_1 \cup U_2|/|U_0|$. Since the clients may drop from the system at any time with a certain probability, the dropout fraction is positively correlated with the execution time of the corresponding process. The effective dropouts-related process in our solution is just the MKA protocol, while in SecAgg it includes the time-consuming step of masking and uploading model data. Therefore, the effective dropout fraction d_0 is approximately $\frac{C_N + \lambda}{C_N + M}d$, where C_N is a constant

related to the number of clients. For $N=500$, $M=100k$, we get $d_0 = d/7$ experimentally.

To conduct the evaluation in experiments, we measure the running time of secure aggregation of a single FL epoch and compare our scheme with SecAgg. We further study the impact of model size, the number of clients, and dropout fraction. The results are shown in Figure 3. In our implementation, we take $w=16$, and set the parameter of SHPRG used in the HMA protocol as $\lambda=512$, $p=2^{32}$, $q=2^{64}$, which the LWE evaluator estimates a hardness of over 2^{128} . Also, $q/p \geq \sqrt{\lambda}$, which ensures the LWR problem appears to be exponentially hard for any $p=\text{poly}(n)$ as described by [20]. For the implementation of the MKA protocol, we choose the same cryptographic primitives as the original implementation in SecAgg [5]. As the results illustrate, we can conclude that:

1. Our scheme improves the efficiency, and more importantly, the running time of our scheme increases more gently when the number of both model parameters and clients increases. Hence, our scheme can be scaled to the FL systems with millions of model parameters and thousands of clients.
2. The running time of our scheme is relatively stable as the user dropout rate increases. The degree of the improvement significantly increases as the dropout fraction increases, and

when $d=0.3$, our scheme provides a speedup of $20\times$ over SecAgg. This gain is expected to increase further for larger M and N .

4.1.2 Communication overhead. The main contribution to the communication traffic comes from the HMA protocol in which the communication cost is $O(M)$ for each client and $O(MN)$ for the aggregator which is equal to the plain learning FL. The only communication involved is the upload of masked models of size $M \log_2 p$.

For the MKA protocol, the size of raw data needs to be transferred securely is λ . The communication cost differs with different secure aggregation solutions, all independent of the number of model parameters. If SecAgg is employed in the MKA protocol, four rounds of communication are needed in the MKA protocol and the communication cost is $O(N)$ for clients and $O(N^2)$ for the aggregator.

The total amount of transferred data of our scheme is dominated by the collection of masked model data, which is approximately $NM \log_2 p$. The inflation factor relative to the communication traffic of the plain FL learning system is $(NM \log_2 p + T)/NMw$, where T denotes the size of transferred data in the MKA protocol. For the selected protocol, the inflation factor is about 2.06 when $N=500$, $M=10^6$, $w=16$, $p=2^{32}$, which is the same as SecAgg. When M or N becomes larger, our inflation factor stays basically constant. While TurboAgg [6] requires at least $\log N$ rounds communication, with increased communication overhead.

4.2 Privacy Security

As proved in Section 3, our scheme can provide a privacy guarantee against the server colluding with an arbitrary subset of clients in the honest-but-curious setting. For the ideal aggregation scheme, if the aggregator corrupts a set of clients, the partial aggregation result of the remaining clients will be disclosed as well. The information obtained by the colluding participants in our scheme is the same as the ideal case. While as summarized in Table I, existing solutions can guarantee security against the server colluding with up to T clients, where T denotes the colluding threshold. The security of the HMA protocol in our scheme presents no restriction on the number of colluding parties, which means T in our scheme depends on the implement of the MKA protocol.




Figure 3: Model Accuracy

As another aspect of privacy guarantee, our scheme can mitigate adaptive adversaries. Recall that an adaptive adversary can choose the set of clients to corrupt during the protocol execution. In the proof of Theorem 2, the joint view of ν can be simulated for any subset of parties without any restriction, so the adversary can adaptively choose the corrupted set at any stage of the protocol, which makes no difference to the conversion between hybrids and the final distribution of SIM. In comparison, in SecAgg+ and TurboAgg, subsets of clients perform secure aggregation in stages, an adaptive adversary may corrupt all clients in such a subset, and cause information leakage.

4.3 Practicality

As Table I illustrates, our scheme can provide worst-case dropout resilience, which means the protocol can maintain correctness and security against any subset of up to D_{\max} clients dropping-out. On the other hand, the average-case dropout robustness is limited to only random dropouts. For the defined dropout tolerance D_{\max} , SecAgg+ [8] sets it as an adjustable variable, and larger D_{\max} demands more neighbors in the graph to provide security. In FastAgg [7], $D_{\max} > N/10$ may result in failure to recover the secret, and D_{\max} must also be a constant fixed in advance. The proposed HMA protocol can be executed successfully with security guarantee for any $D < D_{\max} = N - 1$, so the dropout tolerance is determined by the MKA protocol. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.1.1, MKA in our scheme incurs a much smaller effective dropout fraction, making the dropout condition of our scheme $D_0 = d_0 N < D_{\max}$ satisfied more easily.

Apart from the solid dropout guarantee, our scheme can be executed without the assumption of trusted third party (TTP). Also, there is no direct communication between clients, making our scheme easy to implement in real world.

4.4 Model Accuracy of FL system

We evaluate the impact of the noise produced by almost homomorphic PRG on the model accuracy of the FL system. We implement two representative ML applications in FL and perform plain aggregation and our proposed secure aggregation for each one. Our first application is a CNN model consisting of two convolutional layers for a total of about 20K parameters, trained over the MNIST dataset [21]. In another application, we train AlexNet [22] with 1.25M parameters on the CIFAR10 dataset [23]. The optimization approach for federated learning is the Federated Averaging algorithm [24]. For plain aggregation, the model updates are represented by real-valued vectors of 32 bits. For our scheme, the model updates have two sources of error: (1) the model parameters are quantized into 16-bit integers before

masking and corresponding dequantization is done after aggregation; (2) SHPRG induces an error term to aggregated model parameters. As Figure 3 shows, the speed of convergence and the peak test accuracy of the final model are not affected.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we present an efficient and practical secure aggregation scheme based on SHPRG. We demonstrate our scheme from the following aspects: (1) our scheme achieves better asymptotic computation costs than previous solutions, and improves the efficiency up to 20× over baseline experimentally. (2) the proposed scheme is proved to provide adaptively security against the aggregator colluding with an arbitrary subset of clients. (3) our scheme is robust to worst-case dropouts and simple to implement in common Internet environment for non-TTP assumption. (4) the trained model can obtain the same accuracy as in plain training case.

For future work, extension of the scheme to cross-silo FL settings, and the Byzantine-robustness of the scheme can be investigated.

REFERENCES

- [1] Yang, Q., et al. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM TIST*, 10, 2, 2019, 1-19.
- [2] Zhu, L. and Han, S. *Deep leakage from gradients*. Springer, 2020.
- [3] Hitaj, B., et al. Deep models under the GAN: information leakage from collaborative deep learning. in *CCS*, ACM, 2017.
- [4] Kairouz, P., et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:04977*, 2019.
- [5] Bonawitz, K., et al. Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning. in *CCS*, ACM, 2017.
- [6] So, J., et al. Turbo-Aggregate: Breaking the Quadratic Aggregation Barrier in Secure Federated Learning. *IEEE JSAT*, 2020.
- [7] Kadhe, S., et al. FastSecAgg: Scalable Secure Aggregation for Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11248*, 2020.
- [8] Bell, J. H., et al. Secure single-server aggregation with (poly) logarithmic overhead. in *CCS*, ACM, 2020.
- [9] Damgård, I., et al. Practical covertly secure MPC for dishonest majority—or: breaking the SPDZ limits. in *ESORICS*, Springer, 2013.
- [10] Truex, S., et al. A hybrid approach to privacy-preserving federated learning. in *AISec*, ACM, 2019.
- [11] Zhang, C., et al. Batchcrypt: Efficient homomorphic encryption for cross-silo federated learning. in *USENIX ATC*, 2020.
- [12] Aono, Y., et al. Privacy-preserving deep learning via additively homomorphic encryption. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics Security*, 13, 5, 2017, 1333-1345.
- [13] Geyer, R. C., et al. Differentially private federated learning: A client level perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:07557*, 2017.
- [14] Boneh, D., et al. Key homomorphic PRFs and their applications. in *CRYPTO*, Springer, 2013.
- [15] Paillier, P. Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes. in *Eurocrypt*, Springer, 1999.
- [16] Zhao, Y. and Sun, H. Information theoretic secure aggregation with user dropouts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:07750*, 2021.
- [17] Albrecht, M. R., et al. On the concrete hardness of learning with errors. *JMC*, 9, 3, 2015, 169-203.
- [18] Ernst, J. and Koch, A. Private Stream Aggregation with Labels in the Standard Model. *PETs*, 2021, 4, 2021, 117-138.
- [19] Valovich, F. Aggregation of time-series data under differential privacy. in *INSCRYPT*, Springer, 2017.
- [20] Banerjee, A., et al. Pseudorandom functions and lattices. in *EUROCRYPT*, Springer, 2012.
- [21] LeCun, Y. The MNIST database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998.
- [22] Krizhevsky, A., et al. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *NIPS*, 25, 2012, 1097-1105.
- [23] Krizhevsky, A. and Hinton, G. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images, 2009.
- [24] McMahan, B., et al. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. in *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, PMLR, 2017.