

The Secure CEO Problem With Physical Identifiers Under Logarithmic Loss and Quadratic Distortion Measures

Vamoua Yachongka*, Hideki Yagi, and Hideki Ochiai

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the fundamental limits of the chief executive officer (CEO) problem in which physical identifiers are treated as information sources. To make the information leakage of the identifiers to the eavesdropper via helper data negligible, private keys, uniformly and independently chosen, are bonded to measurements of the identifiers at the encoders to generate the helper data. The CEO problem is renowned for the difficulty in characterizing the tight rate-distortion region, which is still an open question for the general case. In this study, we characterize the tight rate-key-distortion regions of such a problem under two specific distortion measures, namely logarithmic loss (both discrete and Gaussian settings) and quadratic distortion measures. We also provide numerical calculations of the characterized regions, and the calculated results show that when a larger distortion is permitted, smaller storage and private-key rates are achievable. For special cases where the constraints of private-key rates and negligible leakage are not imposed, our characterizations naturally reduce to the rate-distortion regions provided by Courtade and Weissman (2014) for logarithmic loss distortion, and Prabhakaran et al. (2004), Chen et al. (2004), and Oohama (2005) for quadratic distortion measure.

Keywords: The CEO problem; physical identifiers; private keys; logarithmic loss; quadratic distortion.

1 Introduction

In recent years, private authentication using physical and biometric identifiers emerges to be one of the promising security protocols for identifying legitimate Internet-of-Things (IoT) devices as well as authorized users due to the properties of low cost, design simplicity, and power efficiency [1], [2]. Examples of physical identifiers include physical unclonable functions (PUFs) [3], and some representative biometric identifiers are fingerprints, faces, and so on [4]. In practical security systems, a drawback of deploying such identifiers as information sources is that if an eavesdropper (Eve) has access to the identifiers, Eve may be able to acquire the genuine identities of devices or users. Therefore, the privacy of the identifiers should be protected from any inference made by Eve [5], [6]. Additionally, the transmission cost over public communication channels should be minimized to save hardware cost and power consumption [7]–[9].

We consider a lossy two-encoder remote source coding model where physical or biometric identifiers X^n , simply called *identifiers*, are treated as the sources (cf. Fig. 1). Observing measurements (Y_1^n, Y_2^n) , which are corrupted versions of the identifiers X^n through the channels $P_{Y_1|X}$ and $P_{Y_2|X}$, respectively, the encoders (agents) encode the measurements with private keys (P_1, P_2) to generate helper data (J_1, J_2) . Assume that the helper data (J_1, J_2) are shared with the decoder (chief executive officer (CEO)) via public noiseless channels in which Eve can perfectly intercept these pieces of information. The CEO uses both the helper data together with the private keys to reconstruct the original identifiers \hat{X}^n at a prescribed distortion level. The model considered in this paper can be viewed as the CEO problem [10], but in the presence of identifiers and private keys. In this manuscript, the CEO problem with identifiers and private keys is referred to as *the secure CEO problem* for simplicity. Later in Section 5, the fundamental limits of the secure CEO problem with multiple encoders are also studied.

The private keys P_1, P_2 are strings of numbers that are chosen independently of other random variables, i.e., X^n, Y_1^n , and Y_2^n , and provided to the agents and CEO beforehand through a secure database that stores them. It is assumed that Eve has no knowledge about these keys as well as the secure database. The keys are bonded with the measurements by the agents so as to avoid any privacy leakage, i.e., information leakage of the identifiers to Eve through the helper data transmitted over public channels. Shannon cipher systems [11], [12], zero-leakage-key agreement with identifiers [5], and biometric identification systems that preserve privacy [13] are a few example applications using private keys to conceal source information.

1.1 Related Work

Studies of the CEO problem are not very new. In the early 1980s, an achievable rate-distortion region of the CEO problem with two agents was studied by Yamamoto and Itoh in [14], whereas an alternative expression of the achievable region and some actual code-design techniques were developed by Flynn and Gray [15], [16] later on. The problem was generalized to m ($m \geq 2$) agents by Berger et al. in [10] for discrete sources and in [17], [18] for Gaussian sources. This problem was broadly investigated in many subsequent papers, but even to date, finding a tight rate-distortion region for a general distortion measure remains to be solved. For some special cases, however, notable progress has been made. The

*Corresponding author: yachongka-vamoua-fs@ynu.ac.jp




Figure 1: A two-encoder remote source coding model with physical identifiers and private keys

tight rate-distortion region for the quadratic Gaussian CEO problem has been found in [19]–[21] and the tight region under logarithmic loss (log-loss) distortion measure has been elaborated in [22]. Recently, some extensions of the scalar Gaussian case have been given in [23] for byzantine agents and in [24], [25] for sources having memory. As a development of the scalar Gaussian case, the vector Gaussian CEO problem, where the tight rate-distortion region is not yet known, was also extensively analyzed and some interesting results were discussed in the literature, e.g., [26]–[29]. The papers [28] and [29] demonstrated that the outer bound for vector Gaussian sources is tight for some specific cases but not in general. Unlike quadratic distortion, the tight rate-distortion region of the Gaussian CEO problem under the log-loss was completely solved in [30]. Motivated by using PUF signals for IoT device authentication, the CEO problem with two agents was extended to incorporate equivocation-rate constraints in [31], and the optimal rate-equivocation-distortion region for the quadratic Gaussian case was clarified. Using a private key whose rate may be smaller than the privacy-leakage rate [9] to partially protect the identifiers in the Slepian-Wolf type of multiterminal source coding with is investigated in [32], [33].

1.2 Motivations

Quadratic and log-loss distortion measures are two important metrics, and they are widely used in theory as well as practical applications [22], [34], [35]. For example, quadratic distortion plays a key role in estimating statistical behaviors (channel state information) of fading channels in wireless communications [36], and log-loss distortion is applied in deep neural networks for image classification, e.g., to estimate a distribution assigning different probabilities to distinct classes of images [37], [38].

As we mentioned earlier, the work of [31] studied the CEO problem with the identifiers and clarified the tight rate-equivocation-distortion region under quadratic distortion measure. However, when the distortion measure is replaced by the log-loss, the rate-equivocation-distortion region may not be tight even if the model considered in this paper is taken into consideration. See a counterexample shown in Appendix E for the CEO problem with two agents. In the areas of classification, learning, data mining, and prediction, a bunch of literature is published for the log-loss case, but there are not many theoretical results available on this measure in the field of information theory. This motivates us to investigate a tight region for the CEO problem with identifiers under this distortion measure.

In essence, the samples generated by a PUF are real numbers, e.g., Ring Oscillator and Arbiter PUF samples are mathematically modeled as a Gaussian distribution [39]. For Gaussian sources, a similar problem with two agents under the quadratic distortion was studied in [31], but it is common to consider the CEO problem with multiple agents, and thus from theoretical interests, we extend the model analyzed in [31, Appendix F] to a general setting. Also, we allow Eve to have all the helper data generated by agents. This is because the agents share helper data with the CEO via public communication channels, and there is a possibility that Eve may have access to all of them at the same time.

1.3 Main Contributions

Similar to the works [32] and [33], instead of evaluating the equivocation rates as in [31], we analyze the minimum rates of the private keys that are necessary to ensure negligible leakage of the identifiers and show that it is possible to characterize the exact bound for the secure CEO problem under both loss-log and quadratic distortion measures. In the sequel, the optimal trade-off region among public communication (storage) rates, private-key rates, and distortion of the secure CEO problem is called *the rate-key-distortion region*. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- To facilitate the comprehension of our main contributions, we first investigate the rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem with two agents. An inner bound of the region, an extended version of Berger-Tung inner bound [40], [41] is derived. Some interesting trade-off relations between storage and private-key rates of the considered problem are witnessed.
- We demonstrate that the extended Berger-Tung inner bound is tight for some specific cases, namely, log-loss and quadratic distortion measures. For log-loss distortion, the tight rate-key-distortion regions for both discrete and scalar Gaussian sources are characterized.
- Some numerical calculations of the rate-key-distortion regions are provided for the secure Gaussian CEO problem under log-loss and quadratic distortion. The numerical results show that to achieve smaller distortion, larger storage

and private-key rates are required. Also, we examine a relation of the private-key rate and minimum distortion for fixed conditions of storage rates. When the private-key rate becomes large, the minimum distortion is in a saturation state, which cannot be further improved due to the impact of fixed storage rates.

- The secure CEO problem with two agents under the log-loss and quadratic distortion measures is extended to a generalized model with $m \geq 2$ agents, and the corresponding rate-key-distortion regions are also revealed.

In special cases, when there is no consideration of the private-key and leakage constraints, the inner bound of the secure CEO problem is specialized to the well-known Berger-Tung inner bound [40], [41]. In addition, the regions characterized in this work for the specific cases coincide with the rate-distortion regions provided in [19]–[21] for the quadratic Gaussian CEO problem and in [22] for the CEO problem under log-loss distortion measure.

1.4 Notation and Organizations

Uppercase A and lowercase a denote a random variable (RV) and its realization, respectively. The probability mass function of RV A is written as $P_A(\cdot)$. The superscript n denotes n -length sequences across time, e.g., $A^n = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$, where the subscript represents the position of an RV in the string. $A_{\mathcal{A}}$ for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ means $(A_k : k \in \mathcal{A})$. $D(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$ denotes Kullback–Leibler divergence [42]. Bold uppercase \mathbf{A} stands for a matrix. For integers j and k such that (s.t.) $j < k$, $[j : k] = \{j, j + 1, \dots, k\}$. $[x, y]$ is the closed interval between real numbers x and y . $\log x$ ($x > 0$) is logarithm of base two. The δ -strongly typical set is defined as $\mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\cdot)$ with joint and conditional versions also defined in a similar manner [43, Chapter 2].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: We describe our system model and formulate the achievability definition in Section 2. The statement of our main results is given in Section 3. More precisely, Section 3.1 argues a Berger-Tung type inner bound for the secure CEO problem, Section 3.2 deals with the tight rate-key-distortion region of the problem under log-loss for both discrete and scalar Gaussian sources, Section 3.3 uncovers the tight rate-key-distortion region of the secure Gaussian CEO problem under quadratic distortion, and Section 3.4 concerns with some specific numerical examples of the secure Gaussian CEO problem. An overview regarding the proof of our main results is provided in Section 4, and the detailed proof is available in the appendixes. The secure CEO problem with two encoders is generalized to the one with $m \geq 2$ encoders in Section 5. Finally, some concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

2 System Model and Problem Formulation

2.1 System Model

The system model of the secure CEO problem with two agents is depicted in Fig. 1. Random vectors X^n and \hat{X}^n stand for the source identifier and its reconstructed version, respectively. Assume that the source-identifier vector X^n is independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.), generated from the source P_X , and both the channels $(\mathcal{X}, P_{Y_1|X}, \mathcal{Y}_1)$ and $(\mathcal{X}, P_{Y_2|X}, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ are discrete memoryless. The joint distribution of the random vectors Y_1^n , X^n , and Y_2^n is given as

$$P_{X^n Y_1^n Y_2^n} = P_{Y_1^n | X^n} \cdot P_{X^n} \cdot P_{Y_2^n | X^n} = \prod_{t=1}^n P_{Y_{1,t} | X_t} \cdot P_{X_t} \cdot P_{Y_{2,t} | X_t}. \quad (1)$$

That is, we have the Markov chain $Y_1^n - X^n - Y_2^n$. Let \mathcal{J}_1 and \mathcal{J}_2 be the sets of helper data generated from the agents f_1 and f_2 , respectively. Also, let \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 denote the sets of private keys P_1, P_2 that are provided to the agents f_1 and f_2 , respectively. Assume that all alphabets \mathcal{Y}_1 , \mathcal{X} , and \mathcal{Y}_2 are finite, but this assumption will be relaxed in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. The encoding functions at the agents f_1 and f_2 of the system are defined as

$$f_1 : \mathcal{Y}_1^n \times \mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_1, \quad f_2 : \mathcal{Y}_2^n \times \mathcal{P}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_2, \quad (2)$$

and the decoder mapping g at the CEO is defined as

$$g : \mathcal{J}_1 \times \mathcal{J}_2 \times \mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathcal{P}_2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n, \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$ is the n th Cartesian product of $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$, denoting the set from which RV \hat{X} takes values.

The agents f_1 and f_2 bond the private keys P_1 and P_2 into the measurements Y_1^n and Y_2^n , respectively, to generate helper data $J_1 \in \mathcal{J}_1$ and $J_2 \in \mathcal{J}_2$;

$$J_1 = f_1(Y_1^n, P_1), \quad J_2 = f_2(Y_2^n, P_2). \quad (4)$$

The helper data J_1 and J_2 can be regarded as compressed versions of Y_1^n and Y_2^n , and they are passed to the CEO via public noiseless channels. Upon receiving the helper data, the CEO collects all required information (J_1, J_2, P_1, P_2) and reconstructs a lossy version of the original identifiers as

$$\hat{X}^n = g(J_1, J_2, P_1, P_2). \quad (5)$$

The distortion that the source identifier and the reconstructed sequence incur is calculated by the single-letter measure

$$d^{(n)}(x^n, \hat{x}^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d(x_t, \hat{x}_t), \quad (6)$$

where $d : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$.

Eve eavesdrops (J_1, J_2) and tries to further sniff the source identifiers X^n , which is hidden from the public network. However, the private keys P_1, P_2 (random bit sequences) are utilized to cover the identity of X^n , so that Eve is able to acquire only an insignificant amount of information regarding X^n based on the data available.

In this manuscript, Eve is assumed to be a passive eavesdropper. In fact, in real-life circumstances, the activities of Eve can roughly be classified into two categories, that is, passive and active types. However, we focus only on the former type, and this is motivated by the fact that it is extremely hard to detect the location and behavior of such a traducer since the passive one never reacts with the mechanism of authentication systems. Therefore, from the security perspective, protecting the identifiers from such unconscious attacks is crucial.

2.2 Problem Formulation

The achievability definition of the secure CEO problem is defined as follows:

Definition 1. A tuple of storage rates, private-key rates, and distortion $(R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$ is said to be achievable if, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, $\delta > 0$, and large enough n , there exist encoding functions (f_1, f_2) , and a decoding function g s.t.

$$\log |\mathcal{J}_k| \leq n(R_k + \delta), \quad (\text{storage rates}) \quad (7)$$

$$\log |\mathcal{P}_k| \leq n(K_k + \delta), \quad (\text{private-key rate}) \quad (8)$$

$$I(X^n; J_1, J_2) \leq n\delta, \quad (\text{negligible privacy-leakage}) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[d^{(n)}(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \leq D + \delta. \quad (\text{distortion}) \quad (10)$$

Moreover, \mathcal{R} is defined as the closure of the set of all achievable rate tuples, called the rate-key-distortion region.

Each constraint in Definition 1 can be interpreted as follows: Constraints (7) and (8) relate to the storage and private-key rates of the problem, and these should be minimized to save the usage of transmission cost and storage space. Though it does not appear in Fig. 1, indeed, it can be considered that the private keys granted to the agents are chosen from secure databases, and thus minimizing the private-key rates contributes to reducing the sizes of those secure databases. Equation (9) concerns the privacy leakage of the identifiers, and the normalized amount of this term should be bounded by a negligible value even if Eve has both helper data J_1 and J_2 . The last condition is the averaged distortion value between the source identifier and its lossy reconstructed sequence, and the value may not exceed a prescribed distortion D .

3 Statements of Main Results

In this section, our main results are presented in detail. More specifically, we provide an inner bound of the rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem under a general distortion measure for discrete sources, and the tight storage-key-distortion regions of the secure CEO problem under log-loss distortion for both discrete and Gaussian sources and the secure Gaussian CEO problem under quadratic distortion. Finally, we give numerical calculations for these regions.

3.1 Inner Bound of the Secure CEO Problem

It is well-known that the inner and outer bounds on the rate-distortion region of multiterminal source coding problems, including the CEO problem, do not match in general [40], [41], [43, Chapter 12]. The same claim holds for the secure CEO problem as well. In this section, we leave the derivation of the outer bound in the general case for future work and show only the inner region as it will be useful for discussions of some special cases in the upcoming subsections.

In the subsequent arguments, the RV Q , taking values from a finite set \mathcal{Q} , is referred to as a timesharing RV, and it is independent of RVs (Y_1, X, Y_2) . The timesharing RV Q is required for convexification.

Definition 2. Let \mathcal{A}_{in} be the closure of the set of all rate tuples (R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) that satisfy

$$R_1 \geq I(Y_1; U_1 | U_2, Q), \quad R_2 \geq I(Y_2; U_2 | U_1, Q), \quad R_1 + R_2 \geq I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2 | Q), \quad (11)$$

$$K_1 \geq I(X; U_1 | U_2, Q), \quad K_2 \geq I(X; U_2 | U_1, Q), \quad K_1 + K_2 \geq I(X; U_1, U_2 | Q), \quad (12)$$

$$R_1 + K_2 \geq I(Y_1, X; U_1, U_2 | Q), \quad R_2 + K_1 \geq I(X, Y_2; U_1, U_2 | Q), \quad (13)$$

$$D \geq \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2, Q))] \quad (14)$$

for a joint distribution

$$P_X(x)P_Q(q) \prod_{k=1}^2 P_{Y_k|X}(y_k|x)P_{U_k|Y_k Q}(u_k|y_k, q) \quad (15)$$

with $|\mathcal{U}_1| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_1|$, $|\mathcal{U}_2| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_2|$ and $|\mathcal{Q}| \leq 6$, and a reproduction function $\phi: \mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_2 \times \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$.

Theorem 1. For a general distortion measure, it holds that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}. \quad (16)$$

Proof: See Appendix A. \square

The constraints (11) and (14) in Definition 2 coincide with the Berger-Tung inner bound [40], [41] when the auxiliary sequences U_1^n and U_2^n are required to be reliably estimated at the decoder within a certain distortion level D . Equation (12) expresses the minimum amounts of the private-key rates that are needed at agents 1 and 2 for achieving negligible privacy leakage. The condition (13) reflects a trade-off of the storage and private-key rates from different agents. This trade-off suggests that in terms of the sum rate, the inner region of the secure CEO problem is not only constrained by the sum rate of storage rates and the sum rate of privacy-key rate, but also a jointly mixed combination of these rates from distinct agents. A similar trade-off between the storage and equivocation rates was also seen in [31, Theorem 1].

Remark 1. Due to the Markov chain $J_1 - X^n - J_2$, it holds that the right-hand side of (9) can be transformed as $I(X^n; J_1, J_2) = I(X^n; J_1) + I(X^n; J_2|J_1) = I(X^n; J_1) + I(X^n; J_2) - I(J_1; J_2) \leq I(X^n; J_1) + I(X^n; J_2)$. This transformation tells us that to achieve negligible leakage for $I(X^n; J_1, J_2)$ is equivalent to making the sum of $I(X^n; J_1)$ and $I(X^n; J_2)$ negligible. In other words, Theorem 1 is characterized in the same form if the constraint (9) in Def. 1 is replaced by $I(X^n; J_1) \leq n\delta$ and $I(X^n; J_2) \leq n\delta$ simultaneously, or by their sum $I(X^n; J_1) + I(X^n; J_2) \leq 2n\delta$.

Remark 2. Instead of using private keys to hide identifiers' identities from Eve, in case one evaluates the privacy-leakage rates between the identifiers and helper data as in [9], i.e., (8) and (9) are replaced by $I(X^n; J_1) \leq n(L_1 + \delta)$ and $I(X^n; J_2) \leq n(L_2 + \delta)$, the inner bound of this setting is \mathcal{A}_{in} by replacing K_1 and K_2 with L_1 and L_2 , respectively. This indicates that the optimal bounds on the private-key and privacy-leakage rates are identical, and the rates of the private keys granted to each agent must be greater than or equal to the minimum privacy-leakage rates in order to achieve a negligible amount of leakage.

Theorem 1 is a result of evaluating the secure CEO problem in terms of averaged performance over all possible codebooks. Therefore, when a rate tuple (R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) is taken under (11)–(14), it is guaranteed that there exists at least a fine codebook that satisfies the requirements (7)–(10). The same conclusion can also apply to the case of multiple agents which will be discussed in Section 4.

In the following subsections, we show that the region \mathcal{A}_{in} is tight for some special cases.

3.2 The Secure CEO Problem Under Log-Loss Distortion

In this section, we focus on deriving the rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem for both discrete and Gaussian sources under the log-loss distortion measure. In this setting, the reconstruction alphabet $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ is the set of probability distributions on \mathcal{X} . Given $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\hat{x}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}$, the symbol-wise distortion in (6) is replaced by

$$d(x_t, \hat{x}_t) = \log \left(\frac{1}{\hat{x}_t(x_t)} \right) \quad \text{for } t \in [1 : n], \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{x}_t(\cdot)$ is the t th symbol in the reconstructed sequence \hat{x}^n , and $\hat{x}_t(x_t)$ designates a probability distribution on the set \mathcal{X} , and this distribution is evaluated based on the outcome $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. See [22, Section 2] or [44, Definition 1] for a clear explanation of its definition and the motivation for using this metric in multiterminal source coding problems.

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{B}_{in} be the closure of the set of all rate tuples $(R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$ that satisfy all the conditions in Definition 2 except that the distortion constraint (14) is replaced by

$$D \geq H(X|U_1, U_2, Q) \quad (18)$$

for a joint distribution defined in (15) with $|\mathcal{U}_1| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_1|$, $|\mathcal{U}_2| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_2|$ and $|Q| \leq 6$.

Theorem 2. An inner bound on the rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem under log-loss distortion is given by

$$\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}. \quad (19)$$

Proof: This proof follows from Theorem 1 by applying the theorem with the lossy reconstruction function $\phi(U_1, U_2, Q) \triangleq \{P_{X=x|U_1U_2Q}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$. \square

Definition 4. Let \mathcal{B}_{out} be the closure of the set of all rate tuples $(R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$ that satisfy

$$R_1 \geq I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q) + H(X|U_2, Q) - D, \quad R_2 \geq I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q) + H(X|U_1, Q) - D, \quad (20)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \geq I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q) + I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q) + H(X) - D, \quad (21)$$

$$K_1 \geq H(X|U_2, Q) - D, \quad K_2 \geq H(X|U_1, Q) - D, \quad K_1 + K_2 \geq H(X) - D,$$

$$R_1 + K_2 \geq I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q) + H(X) - D, \quad R_2 + K_1 \geq I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q) + H(X) - D, \quad (22)$$

$$D \geq H(X|U_1, U_2, Q)$$

for a joint distribution defined (15) with $|\mathcal{U}_1| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_1|$, $|\mathcal{U}_2| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_2|$ and $|Q| \leq 6$.

Theorem 3. An outer bound on the rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem under log-loss distortion measure is given by

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}. \quad (23)$$




Figure 2: The system model of the secure Gaussian CEO problem with two agents.

Proof: See Appendix B. \square

Constraints (20), (21), and (22) in Def. 4 are exactly identical to the outer region of the typical CEO problem under log-loss distortion measure [22, Theorem 2].

Proposition 1. *For log-loss distortion measure, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}} = \mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}. \quad (24)$$

Proof: See Appendix C. \square

Remark 3. *As we have previously mentioned, the rate-equivocation-distortion region may not be tight; however, Proposition 1 indicates that by replacing equivocation rates with private-key rates, the inner and outer bounds of the CEO problem with identifiers under log-loss distortion match. This claim may apply to the case of evaluating the privacy-leakage rates instead of the equivocation rates as well because the privacy-leakage and private-key rates are equivalent in our model.*

Using Proposition 1, it is obvious that the following theorem holds.

Theorem 4. *The tight rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem under log-loss distortion is given by*

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{B}_{\text{in}} = \mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}. \quad (25)$$

When the private-key rates are large enough, that is, both K_1 and K_2 approach infinity, Theorem 4 matches with [22, Theorem 3].

In [45], it was demonstrated that when the distortion is measured by Hamming distance, the rate-distortion region of the CEO problem for binary sources is not tight. However, under the log-loss, the region is exactly established in [38]. Also, as we have mentioned in the introduction, the complete characterization of the rate-distortion region was provided in [30] for Gaussian sources. In the rest of this section, we extend the work of [30] to include the private-key constraints and show that the inner bound on the rate-key-distortion region is also tight for Gaussian settings. As an initial step, we concentrate on clarifying the region for scalar Gaussian sources.

The system model of the secure Gaussian CEO problem with two agents is depicted in Fig. 2. More precisely, each symbol of sources and measurements observed at the agents are modeled as

$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_X^2), \quad Y_1 = X + N_1, \quad Y_2 = X + N_2, \quad (26)$$

where the noises of each channel are $N_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{N_1}^2)$ and $N_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{N_2}^2)$, respectively. In other words, the sources are Gaussian with zero mean and variance σ_X^2 , and the noises added to the identifiers at each agent are additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN).

Theorem 5. *The rate-key-distortion region \mathcal{R} of the secure CEO problem for Gaussian sources under log-loss distortion measure is characterized by the set of all tuples $(R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\geq r_1 + \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_2}}{\sigma_{N_2}^2} \right)^{-1} - D, & R_2 &\geq r_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_1}}{\sigma_{N_1}^2} \right)^{-1} - D, \\ K_1 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_2}}{\sigma_{N_2}^2} \right)^{-1} - D, & K_2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_1}}{\sigma_{N_1}^2} \right)^{-1} - D, \\ R_1 + R_2 &\geq r_1 + r_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e \sigma_X^2) - D, & K_1 + K_2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \sigma_X^2 - D, \\ R_1 + K_2 &\geq r_1 + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e \sigma_X^2) - D, & R_2 + K_1 &\geq r_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e \sigma_X^2) - D \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for some $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$ s.t.

$$D \geq \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1}. \quad (28)$$

Proof: See Appendix D. \square

As a special case of Theorem 5, one can check that this theorem coincides with [30, Theorem 2] for scalar Gaussian sources when the private-key rates become large enough; namely, constraints (8) and (9) could be removed from Definition 1.

3.3 The Secure Gaussian CEO Problem Under Quadratic Distortion

In this subsection, we state the rate-key-distortion region of the secure Gaussian CEO problem under quadratic distortion measure, i.e., the symbol-wise distortion in (6) is replaced by

$$d(x_t, \hat{x}_t) = (x_t - \hat{x}_t)^2 \quad \text{for } t \in [1 : n]. \quad (29)$$

The source and the channels to the agents are modeled as in (26). We show that the inner bound stated in Theorem 1 is also tight in this case.

Theorem 6. *The rate-key-distortion region \mathcal{R} under quadratic distortion measure is given by the set of all tuples $(R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\geq r_1 + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1-2^{-2r_2}}{\sigma_{N_2}^2} \right)^{-1} \right), & R_2 &\geq r_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1-2^{-2r_1}}{\sigma_{N_1}^2} \right)^{-1} \right), \\ K_1 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1-2^{-2r_2}}{\sigma_{N_2}^2} \right)^{-1} \right), & K_2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1-2^{-2r_1}}{\sigma_{N_1}^2} \right)^{-1} \right), \\ R_1 + R_2 &\geq r_1 + r_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{D} \right), & K_1 + K_2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{D} \right), \\ R_1 + K_2 &\geq r_1 + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{D} \right), & R_2 + K_1 &\geq r_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{D} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

for some $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$ s.t.

$$D \geq \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1-2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1}. \quad (31)$$

Proof: The achievability of the above theorem follows by considering the minimum mean-square error (MMSE) estimator at the CEO, and the converse part can be proved via [46, Lemma 1] and the inequality

$$I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \leq \frac{n}{2} \log \left[\sigma_X^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1-2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right) \right] \quad (32)$$

with $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{1, 2\}$ and $r_k = \frac{1}{n} I(Y_k^n; J_k | X^n, P_k)$ for $k = 1, 2$. Equation (32) can be proved by a similar technique seen in [19, Lemma 3.1] and [21, Lemma 3], as $Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ and $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ are independent of each other, and therefore it is omitted. Refer to [31, Appendix F] for similar proof. \square

It is easy to check that when the private-key rates are large enough, i.e., $K_1, K_2 \rightarrow \infty$, Theorem 6 naturally reduces to the capacity region of the quadratic Gaussian CEO problem with two agents derived in [19]–[21].

3.4 Examples

We first explain Fig. 3. This figure illustrates the achievable regions of the storage rate (R_1, R_2) and the private-key rates (K_1, K_2) under the conditions of distortion $D = 0.5$ (blue line) and $D = 0.667$ (red line). We fix $\sigma_X^2 = 2$, $\sigma_{N_1}^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_{N_2}^2 = 1$, implying that the Gaussian RV corresponding to the identifiers has variance 2, and the channels $P_{Y_1|X}$ and $P_{Y_2|X}$ are AWGNs, with unit variance. The achievable regions are in the directions of the black arrows. These figures show when more distortion is allowed, smaller storage and private-key rates can be achieved. Equivalently, to reduce distortion, larger storage and private-key rates are required. This is an intuitive consequence since the agents have to share more information about the helper data with the CEO so as to reconstruct the lossy source sequence with small distortion values. As a result of sending more information to the CEO via public communication channels, the amount of information leaked to Eve increases, and thus larger privacy-key rates (longer private-key bits) are required for concealing that amount, which appears in Fig. 3(b).

Next, we take a look into the relation of privacy-key rate K_1 versus minimum distortion D for a practical situation where both the storage rates R_1 and R_2 are fixed. Additionally, the constraint of private-key rate K_2 is relaxed; namely, all constraints involving K_2 can be removed from Theorems 5 and 6. The detailed numerical results are displayed in Figure 4, and the left- and right-hand sides of this figure correspond to the curves of the secure Gaussian CEO problem under log-loss and quadratic distortion measures. We fix the noise variances as $(\sigma_{N_1}^2, \sigma_{N_2}^2) = (1, 1)$ and storage rate $R_2 = 0.5$ in all calculations, but R_1 is either 0.5 or 1.0. The red and blue curves represent the relation of the pair $(K_1, \min D)$ when the variances of the identifiers are $\sigma_X^2 = 2$ (blue) and $\sigma_X^2 = 5$ (red), respectively. A detailed description of parameter settings for calculations and resulting graphs is summarized in Table 1.

From the behaviors of each graph, one can see that when the private-key rate K_1 becomes large, the minimum distortion is in a saturation state. This phenomenon is due to the effect that the storage rates R_1, R_2 are fixed as noted in [47] for




Figure 3: Achievable regions of storage rates (left) and private-key rates (right) for different distortion values.

Table 1: List of parameters, their values, and corresponding graphs in Fig. 4.

Variances of sources and channels			Storage rates		Obtaining graphs (in both figures of Fig. 4)
σ_X^2	$\sigma_{N_1}^2$	$\sigma_{N_2}^2$	R_1	R_2	
2	1	1	0.5	0.5	blue curves marked with circles
2	1	1	1.0	0.5	blue curves marked with triangles
5	1	1	0.5	0.5	red curves marked with circles
5	1	1	1.0	0.5	red curves marked with triangles

a multiterminal source coding with a helper and a privacy constraint. The reason for turning out to be in a saturated condition is justified below. For brevity, we focus only on the quadratic Gaussian case. After some algebra, alternative forms of the constraints in Theorem 6 when K_2 is sufficiently large are specified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
D &\geq 2^{2(r_1 - R_1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_2}}{\sigma_{N_2}^2} \right)^{-1}, & D &\geq 2^{2(r_2 - R_1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_1}}{\sigma_{N_1}^2} \right)^{-1}, \\
D &\geq 2^{-2K_1} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_2}}{\sigma_{N_2}^2} \right)^{-1}, & D &\geq 2^{-(K_1 + R_2 - r_2)} \sigma_X^2, \\
D &\geq 2^{2(r_1 + r_2 - (R_1 + R_2))} \sigma_X^2, & D &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

for a given K_1 and some $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$. As an instance, we use the values in the first row of Table 1, where $(\sigma_X^2, \sigma_{N_1}^2, \sigma_{N_2}^2) = (2, 1, 1)$ and $(R_1, R_2) = (0.5, 0.5)$, to more thoroughly explain the saturation state. By substituting these specific values into the constraints in (33), they can be simplified as

$$D \geq 2^{2(r_1 - 0.5)} \left(\frac{3}{2} - 2^{-2r_2} \right)^{-1}, \quad D \geq 2^{2(r_2 - 0.5)} \left(\frac{3}{2} - 2^{-2r_1} \right)^{-1}, \tag{34}$$

$$D \geq 2^{-2K_1} \left(\frac{3}{2} - 2^{-2r_2} \right)^{-1}, \quad D \geq 2^{-(K_1 - r_2)}, \tag{35}$$

$$D \geq 2^{2(r_1 + r_2 - 0.5)}, \quad D \geq \left(\frac{5}{2} - (2^{-2r_1} + 2^{-2r_2}) \right)^{-1} \tag{36}$$

for a given K_1 and $0 \leq r_1, r_2 \leq 0.5$.

Since both R_1 and R_2 are fixed at 0.5, from the first and second constraints in (30), it is clear that the ranges of r_1 and r_2 are limited to $[0, 0.5]$. When K_1 is large, i.e., 2^{-2K_1} converges to zero exponentially, the conditions in (35), which are related to the private-key rate K_1 , become redundant. The minimum value of distortion D subjected to (34) and (36) when r_1 and r_2 vary over $[0, 0.5] \times [0, 0.5]$ remains unchanged, and thus, the saturation situation occurs. The same property is also seen in the case of log-loss distortion measure (cf. Fig 4(a)). In the low rate regime of K_1 , the relation




Figure 4: A relation of privacy-leakage rate versus minimum distortion of the secure Gaussian CEO problem under between log-loss (left) and quadratic (right) distortion measures.

of K_1 and minimum D is linear, which is obvious from the constraints in Theorem 5. Moreover, from the behaviors of graphs in Figure 4, it is clear that when the rate pair $(R_1, R_2) = (1.0, 0.5)$, a lower value in regard to the minimum D is achievable compared to the case of $(R_1, R_2) = (0.5, 0.5)$, which supports the consequence drawn in Figure 3.

4 Overviews of the Proof

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the property of the strong typicality set [42], [43], i.e., superposition coding, random binning, and jointly typical encoding at the agents, as well as jointly typical decoding at the CEO. We use a one-time pad operation to bond the private keys into a part of helper data so that the privacy leakage of the identifiers via the helper data vanishes. To bound the privacy leakage rate, we make use of [47, Lemma 4] to derive an upper bound on conditional entropy for jointly typical sequences. The detail of the proof of Theorem 1 is available in Appendix A. Later, this theorem is applied to derive the inner bounds in the considered special cases, and we explain that briefly as follows:

- **Achievability part:** The proof of the results for both discrete and Gaussian sources under loss-log distortion simply follows with the application of a specific reconstruction function to Theorem 1 (cf. Proof of Theorem 3). For quadratic distortion, a key point in the derivation is to deploy the MMSE estimator as the reproduction function at the decoder as in [19], [21]. Note that, although Theorem 1 is derived based on the strong typicality set, which is generally valid for discrete alphabets, the same expression also holds for Gaussian sources when considering a discretization procedure before actual encoding processes [43, Chapter 3.4]. Hence, the inner region on the rate-key-distortion region of the secure Gaussian CEO problem can directly be derived via the theorem.
- **Converse part:** For the result for the discrete sources under log-loss, a feature that the expected log-loss distortion is lower bounded by a conditional entropy, initially established in [22, Lemma 1], is remarkably useful in the analysis of each rate constraint. Here, we extend the lemma to incorporate the private keys. For the Gaussian case, the outer regions are via the approach used in [33], [48]–[50] for analyzing key agreement problems using physical identifiers. The approach is based on fixing conditional entropies to find the optimal outer region and it is deployed because the proof can be shown via the single-letter expression (cf. Definition 4) directly and thus the entire flow becomes simpler and shorter. Nevertheless, upon using this argument, finding a fine setting that satisfies all possible situations of the conditional entropy that will be fixed is a bit tricky in general. Finally, for quadratic distortion, we make use of a standard approach taken in, e.g., [19]–[21], [31].

5 The Secure CEO Problem With m Encoders

In this section, we state the rate-key-distortion regions of the secure CEO problem with m agents, which is a generalized model of the 2-link case considered in Section 3. See Figure 5 for a detailed illustration. We state only definitions and theorems corresponding to the mentioned problem. For the proofs of all theorems given herein, the details are omitted since they can be shown by the same analogy of deriving the results for the two-encoder case.

Let us define $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ as the index set of the agents, their corresponding observed measurements, and helper data. Also, let \mathcal{K} be a subset of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S} be a subset of \mathcal{M} , i.e., $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. $Y_{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes the string of RVs indexed by elements in the set \mathcal{S} and $U_{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined in the same manner, but note that $X_{\mathcal{S}} = (X_1, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{S}|}) = (X, \dots, X)$ since there is only a single source, and $Y_{\emptyset} = X_{\emptyset} = U_{\emptyset} = \emptyset$. The achievability definition of the secure CEO problem with m encoders is formally defined below.




Figure 5: The system models of the secure CEO problem with m encoders. The left- and right-hand sides illustrate the models for discrete and Gaussian sources, respectively.

Definition 5. A tuple $(R_1, \dots, R_m, K_1, \dots, K_m, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2m+1}$ is said to be achievable if, for $\delta > 0$ and large enough n , there exist encoding functions (f_1, \dots, f_m) and a decoding function g s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\mathcal{J}_k| &\leq n(R_k + \delta), & \log |\mathcal{P}_k| &\leq n(K_k + \delta), \\ I(X^n; J_1, \dots, J_m) &\leq n\delta, & \mathbb{E}[d^{(n)}(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] &\leq D + \delta \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

for all $k \in \mathcal{M}$. Additionally, \mathcal{R}^m is defined as the rate-key-distortion region for the m -link case.

For the log-loss distortion measure, define $\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}^m$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}^m$ as the inner and outer regions of the rate-key-distortion region of the secure CEO problem with m encoders, respectively.

Corollary 1. The inner bound $\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}^m$ of the m -link case is provided by the closure of the set of all rate tuples $(R_1, \dots, R_m, K_1, \dots, K_m, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2m+1}$ that satisfy

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} R_k + \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}^c} K_{k'} \geq I(Y_{\mathcal{K}}, X_{\mathcal{K}^c}; U_{\mathcal{S}} | U_{\mathcal{S}^c}, Q), \quad D \geq H(X | U_{\mathcal{M}}, Q) \quad (38)$$

for all $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ s.t. $\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}^c = \mathcal{S}$ and all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ s.t. $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c = \mathcal{M}$, and a joint distribution

$$P_X(x)P_Q(q) \prod_{k=1}^m P_{Y_k|X}(y_k|x)P_{U_k|Y_k,Q}(u_k|y_k,q) \quad (39)$$

with $|\mathcal{U}_k| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_k|$ and $|Q| \leq 2(m+1)$. \square

Corollary 2. The outer bound $\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}^m$ is characterized by the closure of the set of all rate tuples $(R_1, \dots, R_m, K_1, \dots, K_m, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2m+1}$ that satisfy

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} R_k + \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}^c} K_{k'} \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} I(Y_k; U_k | X, Q) + H(X | U_{\mathcal{S}^c}, Q) - D \quad (40)$$

for all $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ s.t. $\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}^c = \mathcal{S}$ and all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ s.t. $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c = \mathcal{M}$, and a joint distribution defined in (39) with $|\mathcal{U}_k| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_k|$ and $|Q| \leq 2(m+1)$. \square

To derive the cardinality bounds on the auxiliary RVs U_k , similar to the two-encoder case, we apply a technique proposed in [51, Lemma 2], also used in [22, Appendix A] for deriving the cardinality bounds on the auxiliary RVs of the CEO problem under the log-loss distortion, to show that it suffices to limit $|\mathcal{U}_k| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_k|$. This lemma gives tighter cardinality bounds in comparison with the support lemma [43, Appendix C]. For the timesharing random variable Q , Fenchel-Eggleston-Caratheodory theorem (cf. [43, Appendix A]) guarantees that $|Q| \leq 2(m+1)$ is enough for the convexification operation of extreme points.

Moreover, unlike the two-encoder case, it is nearly impossible to enumerate all extreme points of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{out}}^m$, with totally $\sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} 2^k + 1 = 3^m$ constraints when m is large. However, one can apply the submodularity argument given in [22, Appendix B] to prove that $\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}^m \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}^m$. The inverse relation $\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}^m \supseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}^m$ is obvious since any achievable tuple must contain in $\mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}^m$, and therefore the following theorem is straightforward.

Theorem 7. The rate-key-distortion region with m encoders for discrete sources under log-loss distortion is given by

$$\mathcal{R}^m = \mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}^m = \mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}^m. \quad (41)$$

\square

Some results related to the secure Gaussian CEO problem with m encoders for scalar Gaussian sources and channels are given below.

Theorem 8. *The rate-key-distortion region \mathcal{R}^m for Gaussian sources under log-loss distortion measure is characterized by the set of all tuples $(R_1, \dots, R_m, K_1, \dots, K_m, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2m+1}$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} R_k + \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}^c} K_{k'} \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} r_k + \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_j}}{\sigma_{N_j}^2} \right)^{-1} - D \quad (42)$$

for all $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ s.t. $\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}^c = \mathcal{S}$ and all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ s.t. $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c = \mathcal{M}$, and some $r_1, \dots, r_m \geq 0$. \square

The above theorem is simplified to [30, Theorem 2] for scalar Gaussian sources in case the private-key rates K_1, \dots, K_m are not taken into consideration.

Also, for the quadratic distortion measure, we have that

Theorem 9. *The region \mathcal{R}^m is provided as the set of all tuples $(R_1, \dots, R_m, K_1, \dots, K_m, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2m+1}$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} R_k + \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{K}^c} K_{k'} \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} r_k + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_j}}{\sigma_{N_j}^2} \right)^{-1} \right) \quad (43)$$

for all $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ s.t. $\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}^c = \mathcal{S}$ and all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ s.t. $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}^c = \mathcal{M}$, and some $r_1, \dots, r_m \geq 0$. \square

It is easy to check that without the private-key rates, i.e., $\mathcal{K}^c = \emptyset$, this theorem simply matches with [19, Theorem II.1].

6 Conclusions

In this study, we investigated the rate-key-distortion region of the CEO problem, where physical identifiers are treated as sources and private keys are used to protect the information leakage of the identifiers. We first derived a Berger-Tung-type inner bound of the problem, and then applied it to attain the tight rate-key-distortion region for log-loss and quadratic distortion measures. Also, some numerical calculations were given, and the numerical results showed that the larger the distortion, the smaller the storage and private-key rates.

For future work, it may be of interest to analyze the scenario where the eavesdropper can obtain not only the helper data but also a correlated sequence of the source identifiers. From a practical perspective, this is a more realistic model, since Eve may somehow obtain the correlated sequence of the source identifiers via a side channel and use both correlated information and helper data to learn the identifiers. For this model, the rate-key-distortion region under quadratic distortion may be derivable from the same technique used in [31], but at the moment, we do not yet know whether the technique used in Appendix B can be applied to derive the single-letter expression for the outer bound or not. Further investigations will be discussed in future research. Furthermore, another interesting topic is to characterize the capacity region of the model where the private-key rates may be shorter than the privacy-leakage rate as in [32], [33].

Acknowledgments

The first author would like to thank Prof. Yasutada Oohama at the University of Electro-Communications for constructive discussions and for sharing the handouts of the literature [40] and [41]. The author also thanks Prof. Hirosuke Yamamoto at the University of Tokyo for informing the references [14]–[16].

A Proof of Theorem 1

We fix $|\mathcal{Q}| = 1$ for achievability proof since the other cases can be proved by the timesharing argument (cf. [43, Chapter 4.5]). Also, fix the text channels $P_{Y_1|U_1}$ and $P_{Y_2|U_2}$, the block length n , a small enough value $\delta > 0$, and a reproduction function $\phi: \mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}$. For $k, k' \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k \neq k'$, set auxiliary rates $\tilde{R}_k = I(Y_k; U_k) + \delta$, and consider that the rate tuple (R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) is taken under the conditions that

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &\geq I(Y_k; U_k | U_{k'}) + 2\delta, & R_1 + R_2 &\geq I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta, \\ K_k &\geq I(X; U_k | U_{k'}) + 2\delta, & K_1 + K_2 &\geq I(X; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta, \\ R_1 + K_2 &\geq I(Y_1, X; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta, & R_2 + K_1 &\geq I(X, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta, \\ D &\geq \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2))] + \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Also, let

$$\mathcal{J}_k = [1 : 2^{nR_k}], \quad \mathcal{P}_k = [1 : 2^{nK_k}]. \quad (45)$$

Without loss of generality, assume the auxiliary, storage, and private-key rates satisfy $\tilde{R}_k \geq R_k \geq K_k$ since it suffices to demonstrate that the rate points that are extremely close to the boundary of \mathcal{A}_{in} , where R_k and K_k should be approaching $I(Y; U_k | U_{k'})$ and $I(X; U_k | U_{k'})$, are achievable. Furthermore, for showing that any rate tuple in (44) can be achieved, one may limit the argument to the following three extreme cases and demonstrate that they are achievable.

- 1): The sum rates $R_1 + R_2 = I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$ and $K_1 + K_2 = I(X; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, and the distortion $D = \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2))] + \delta$ are jointly satisfied, and other conditions are kept as in (44).
- 2): The sum rates $R_1 + R_2 = I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, $R_1 + K_2 = I(Y_1, X; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, and $R_2 + K_1 = I(X, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, and $D = \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2))] + \delta$ are jointly satisfied, and other conditions are kept as in (44).
- 3): The sum rates $R_1 + K_2 = I(Y_1, X; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, $R_2 + K_1 = I(X, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, and $K_1 + K_2 = I(X; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$, and $D = \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2))] + \delta$ are jointly satisfied, and other conditions are kept as in (44).

This is because these cases provide the tuple (R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) with lowest possible values, corresponding to rate points on the boundary of the inner bound \mathcal{A}_{in} , for given $P_{U_1|Y_1}$, $P_{U_2|Y_2}$, and ϕ .

We begin our proof by investigating the situation where $R_1 + R_2 = I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) + 3\delta$ and the constraints (i.e., $R_1 + R_2$, $R_2 + R_1$, $K_1 + K_2$, R_1 , R_2 , K_1 , K_2 , and D) are relaxed as seen in (44), which can recover both Cases 1) and 2). The analyses of error probability, storage and private-key rates, and negligible leakage are discussed below.

Codebook Generation: Generate $2^{n\tilde{R}_k}$ i.i.d. sequences of $u_k^n(l_k)$, $l_k \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_k}]$, according to $P_{U_k^n}$. Divide these sequences equally into $2^{n(\tilde{R}_k - R_k)}$ bins, where each bin and the sequences inside a bin are indexed by b_k and i_k . Moreover, partition $2^{n\tilde{R}_k}$ sequences in the bin b_k to $2^{n(R_k - K_k)}$ sub-bins identically, and each sub-bin and the sequences in a sub-bin are denoted by m_k and s_k , respectively. This implies that the number of sequences in each sub-bin is exactly equal to 2^{nK_k} . Note that there exist one-to-one mappings between the index l_k and the pair (b_k, i_k) , and between the index i_k and the pair (m_k, s_k) . The codebook is revealed to all parties, i.e., the agents, CEO, and Eve.

Agents (Encoding): Observing y_k^n , the agent f_k finds an index l_k s.t. $(y_k^n, u_k^n(l_k)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(Y_k U_k)$. In case there are multiple such indexes l_k , the agent picks one at random. In contrast, if there is no such l_k , it sets $l_k = 1$ and an error is declared. The agent uses the index of the bin to which index l_k belongs, $l_k = (b_k, i_k) = (b_k, m_k, s_k)$, to generate

$$j_k = (m_k, s_k \oplus^k p_k),$$

where \oplus^k denotes the addition modulo- $|\mathcal{P}_k|$ defined in (45). The helper data j_k is shared with the CEO for reconstructing the source signal.

The CEO (Decoding): Seeing j_1 and j_2 , the CEO first utilizes the private keys to determine

$$i_k = \left(m_k, (s_k \oplus^k p_k) \ominus^k p_k \right),$$

where \ominus^k denotes the subtraction modulo- $|\mathcal{P}_k|$. After that it finds the unique indexes b_1 and b_2 s.t. $(u_1^n(b_1, i_1), u_2^n(b_2, i_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(U_1 U_2)$. If such b_1 and b_2 are uniquely determined, each symbol of the reconstructed sequence \hat{x}^n is computed as $\hat{x}_t(u_{1,t}(b_1, i_1), u_{2,t}(b_2, i_2))$ for $t \in [1 : n]$. Otherwise, $\hat{x}_t^n(u_1^n(1), u_2^n(1))$ is output and error is declared.

Performance Analysis: Let $U_k^n(L_k)$ be the chosen sequence at the agent f_k based on Y_k^n . Note that $L_k = (B_k, I_k) = (B_k, M_k, S_k)$, and the random codebook is denoted by \mathcal{C}_n , defined as $\{(U_1^n(l_1), U_2^n(l_2)) : l_1 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_1}] \text{ and } l_2 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_2}]\}$.

The subsequent lemmas will be used in the analysis of privacy leakage.

Lemma 1. *It holds that*

$$H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) \leq n(H(Y_k | X, U_k) + \epsilon_n), \quad (46)$$

where $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{n} + \delta \log(\max\{|\mathcal{Y}_1|, |\mathcal{Y}_2|\})$, and it goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Proof: See [47, Appendix C]. □

Lemma 2. *We have that*

$$I(X^n; J_k | \mathcal{C}_n) = I(X^n; M_k | \mathcal{C}_n). \quad (47)$$

Proof: The above lemma follows by the fact that the latter half of the helper data, i.e., $S_k \oplus^k P_k$, leaks no information about the source identifiers since the index S_k is completely masked by the private key P_k . The readers may refer to the analysis of privacy leakage in [5], [52] for a detailed discussion. □

Analysis of Error Probability: In the analysis, we use a simpler notation \mathcal{T}_δ^n to denote the strong typical set when it is clear from the context for brevity. Error events that may occur are specified as follows:

- At the agents:

$$\mathcal{E}_1: \{(Y_1^n, U_1^n(l_1)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\} \text{ for all } l_1 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_1}].$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2: \{(Y_2^n, U_2^n(l_2)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\} \text{ for all } l_2 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_2}].$$

- At the CEO:

$$\mathcal{E}_3: \{(U_1^n(B_1, M_1, S_1), U_2^n(B_2, M_2, S_2)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}.$$

◊ Possible error events with index of sequence U_1^n or U_2^n :

$$\mathcal{E}_4: \{\exists b_1 \neq B_1 \text{ s.t. } (U_1^n(b_1, M_1, S_1), U_2^n(B_2, M_2, S_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}.$$

$$\mathcal{E}_5: \{\exists b_2 \neq B_2 \text{ s.t. } (U_1^n(B_1, M_1, S_1), U_2^n(b_2, M_2, S_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}.$$

◇ Possible error events with indexes of both sequences U_1^n and U_2^n :

$$\mathcal{E}_6: \{\exists b_1 \neq B_1 \text{ and } \exists b_2 \text{ s.t. } (U_1^n(b_1, M_1, S_1), U_2^n(b_2, M_2, S_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}.$$

$$\mathcal{E}_7: \{\exists b_1 \text{ and } \exists b_2 \neq B_2 \text{ s.t. } (U_1^n(b_1, M_1, S_1), U_2^n(b_2, M_2, S_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}.$$

Using the covering lemma [43, Lemma 3.3], the encoding error probability of each agent $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2\}$ vanishes as we set $\tilde{R}_1 > I(Y_1; U_1)$ and $\tilde{R}_2 > I(Y_2; U_2)$. For decoding error at the CEO, Markov lemma [42, Lemma 15.8.1] ensures that $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_3\}$ goes to zero, and mutual packing lemma [43, Lemma 12.2] guarantees that $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_4\}$ and $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_5\}$ converges to zero by availing (48) and (49), respectively. Last but not least, both $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_6\}$ and $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_7\}$ drive to zero by the mutual pacing lemma as well due to (50). Equations (48)–(50) represent upper bounds on the rates of indexes b_1 of U_1^n and b_2 of U_2^n , and their sum rate, respectively.

$$\tilde{R}_1 - R_1 \leq I(Y; U_1) + \delta - (I(Y_1; U_1|U_2) + 2\delta) = I(U_1; U_2) - \delta, \quad (48)$$

$$\tilde{R}_2 - R_2 \leq I(Y; U_2) - I(Y; U_2|U_1) - \delta = I(U_1; U_2) - \delta, \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_1 - R_1 + \tilde{R}_2 - R_2 &= \tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2 - (R_1 + R_2) \\ &= I(Y_1; U_1) + I(Y_2; U_2) - I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) - \delta = I(U_1; U_2) - \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Therefore, the error probability tends to zero for large enough n .

Analyses of Storage and Private-Key Rates: The conditions (7) and (8) are straightforward from the parameter settings in (45).

Analysis of Negligible Leakage: As mentioned in Remark 2, due to the Markov chain $J_1 - X^n - J_2$, we have that

$$I(X^n; J_1, J_2 | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq I(X^n; J_1 | \mathcal{C}_n) + I(X^n; J_2 | \mathcal{C}_n). \quad (51)$$

Next, we focus on evaluating the individual privacy leakage at each agent in the inequality above. For $k = 1, 2$, using Lemma 2 gives

$$\begin{aligned} I(X^n; J_k | \mathcal{C}_n) &= I(X^n; M_k | \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &= H(M_k | \mathcal{C}_n) - H(M_k | X^n, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\leq n(R_k - K_k) - H(M_k | X^n, \mathcal{C}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

We continue bounding the last conditional entropy in (52) as

$$\begin{aligned} H(M_k | X^n, \mathcal{C}_n) &= H(Y_k^n, M_k | X^n, \mathcal{C}_n) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, M_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, M_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &= nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, B_k, M_k, S_k, P_k, J_k, \mathcal{C}_n) - I(Y_k^n; B_k, S_k, P_k, J_k | X^n, M_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, B_k, M_k, S_k, \mathcal{C}_n) - I(Y_k^n; B_k, S_k | X^n, M_k, P_k, J_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) - I(Y_k^n; B_k, S_k | X^n, M_k, P_k, J_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\geq nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) - H(B_k, S_k | X^n, M_k, P_k, J_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) - H(B_k, S_k | X^n, J_k, P_k, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) - H(B_k, S_k | X^n, J_k, P_k, J_{k'}, P_{k'}, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\geq nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) - H(B_k, S_k | J_k, P_k, J_{k'}, P_{k'}, \mathcal{C}_n) \\ &\stackrel{(f)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - H(Y_k^n | X^n, U_k^n(L_k), \mathcal{C}_n) - n\delta_n \\ &\stackrel{(g)}{\geq} nH(Y_k | X) - n(H(Y_k | X, U_k) + \epsilon_n) - n\delta_n \\ &= n(I(Y_k; U_k | X) - (\epsilon_n + \delta_n)), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where (a) follows because (Y_k^n, X^n) is independent of \mathcal{C}_n and i.i.d. generated, (b) holds due to the fact that J_k is a function of (M_k, S_k, P_k) , P_k is independent of other RVs, and the Markov chain $(P_k, J_k) - (X^n, M_k) - Y_{k'}^n$ holds, (c) follows as the tuple (B_k, M_k, S_k) directly determines $U_k^n(L_k)$ and conditioning reduces entropy, (d) holds since J_k includes M_k , (e) is due to the Markov chain $(B_k, S_k) - (X^n, J_k, P_k) - (J_{k'}, P_{k'})$, (f) is due to Fano's inequality with $\delta_n = \frac{1}{n} + \delta(\max\{\tilde{R}_1 - R_1 + K_1, \tilde{R}_2 - R_2 + K_2\})$, and (g) is due to Lemma 1.

Substituting (53) into (52) yields

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X^n; J_k | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq R_k - K_k - I(Y_k; U_k | X) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n \quad (54)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= R_k + R_{k'} - (R_{k'} + K_k) - I(Y_k; U_k | X) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n \\ &\leq \epsilon_n + \delta_n, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_k + R_{k'} - (R_{k'} + K_k) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(Y_k, Y_{k'}; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta - (I(X, Y_{k'}; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{=} I(Y_k, X, Y_{k'}; U_k, U_{k'}) - I(X, Y_{k'}; U_k, U_{k'}) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& = I(Y_k; U_k, U_{k'}|X, Y_{k'}) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{=} I(Y_k; U_k|X, Y_{k'}) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{=} I(Y_k; U_k|X) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where (a) follows since we set $R_k + R_{k'} = I(Y_k, Y_{k'}; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta$ for Cases 1) and 2), and the constraint of $R_k + K_{k'}$ in (44) is used, (b) holds due to the Markov chain $X - (Y_k, Y_{k'}) - (U_k, U_{k'})$, (c) follows from the Markov chain $Y_k - (U_k, X, Y_{k'}) - U_{k'}$, and (d) is due to the Markov chains $Y_k - X - Y_{k'}$ and $Y_k - (U_k, X) - Y_{k'}$.

Equation (55) indicates that the separate leakage at each agent can be made negligible. Now let us turn our attention to the joint privacy leakage in (51). Combining (55) for $k = 1, 2$, (51) yields

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X^n; J_1, J_2 | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq \frac{1}{n} I(X^n; J_1 | \mathcal{C}_n) + \frac{1}{n} I(X^n; J_2 | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq 2(\epsilon_n + \delta_n). \tag{57}$$

For showing Case 3), we fix $R_k + K_{k'} = I(Y_k, X; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta$ for $k = 1, 2$ jointly and the other conditions are kept as in (44). In this case, the error probability of the system can be made negligible because the inequalities in (48)–(50) still hold. For the analyses of storage and private-key rates, it is obvious from (45). Lastly, the negligible leakage can be verified as follows: In (54), instead of $R_{k'}$, if we add and subtract $K_{k'}$ to the right-hand side of the inequality, it also holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X^n; J_k | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq R_k - K_k - I(Y_k; U_k|X) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n \tag{58}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = R_k + K_{k'} - (K_{k'} + K_k) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n \\
& \leq \epsilon_n + \delta_n,
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where the last equality is due to

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_k + K_{k'} - (K_{k'} + K_k) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(Y_k, X; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta - (I(X; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) \\
& = I(Y_k; U_k, U_{k'}|X) - I(Y_k; U_k|X) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where (a) follows because $R_k + K_{k'} = I(Y_k, X; U_k, U_{k'}) + 3\delta$ and the constraint $K_1 + K_2$ in (44) are used. Using (51) and (59) gives

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X^n; J_1, J_2 | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^2 I(X^n; J_k | \mathcal{C}_n) \leq 2(\epsilon_n + \delta_n). \tag{61}$$

Analysis of Distortion: For the analysis of distortion, the same equation developments shown in [31, Appendix A] guarantee that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[d^{(n)}(X^n, g(f_1(Y_1^n, P_1), f_2(Y_2^n, P_2))) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2))] + \delta \leq D + \delta \tag{62}$$

for large enough n .

Eventually, using the selection lemma [53, Lemma 2.2], there exists at least one good codebook that satisfies all the conditions in Definition 1. \square

B Proof of Theorem 3

Assume that a rate tuple (R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) is achievable, implying that there exist encoding and decoding functions satisfying all the requirements in Definition 1. For $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $t \in [1 : n]$, we define $U_{k,t} = (Y_k^{t-1}, J_k, P_k)$ and $Q_t = X^n \setminus t$. Let \mathcal{A} be a non-empty subset of the set $\{1, 2\}$. For example, $J_{\mathcal{A}} = J_1$ for $\mathcal{A} = \{1\}$, and $J_{\mathcal{A}} = (J_1, J_2)$ for $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2\}$. Conditioned on Q_t , the following long Markov chain holds:

$$U_{\mathcal{A},t} - Y_{\mathcal{A},t} - X_t - Y_{\mathcal{A}^c,t} - U_{\mathcal{A}^c,t}. \tag{63}$$

The proof of the Markov chain above is omitted because it follows from a straightforward discussion.

An essential property, the expected distortion is lower bounded by conditional entropy, for deriving the outer bound for discrete sources is shown in Lemma 3. For clarity, the pairs of RVs $(J_1, J_2) = (f_1(Y_1^n, P_1), f_2(Y_2^n, P_2))$ and (P_1, P_2) are denoted by J and P , respectively, and their corresponding realizations (j_1, j_2) and (p_1, p_2) by j and p in the following lemma.

Lemma 3. Let (J, P) be the arguments of the reproduction function $g(\cdot, \cdot)$. Then, we have that

$$n\mathbb{E}[d^{(n)}(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \geq H(X^n|J, P) = H(X^n|J_1, J_2, P_1, P_2). \quad (64)$$

Proof: The proof is similar to [22, Proof of Lemma 1] with a proper extension to include the private keys. Nevertheless, we provide it for completeness. Consider the reconstruction to be a probability measure on \mathcal{X}^n given (J, P) , i.e., $S_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p) = \prod_{t=1}^n \hat{x}_t(x_t|j, p)$. Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} n\mathbb{E}[d^{(n)}(X^n, \hat{X}^n)|J = j, P = p] &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n} P_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p) P_{\hat{X}^n|J,P}(\hat{x}^n|j, p) d^{(n)}(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p) d^{(n)}(x^n, g(j, p)) \\ &= \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p) \log \left(\frac{1}{S_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p)} \right) \\ &= D(P_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p) || S_{X^n|J,P}(x^n|j, p)) + H(X^n|J = j, P = p) \\ &\geq H(X^n|J = j, P = p), \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where (a) is due to the Markov chain $X^n - (J, P) - \hat{X}^n$ and (b) follows because the conditional distribution $P_{\hat{X}^n|J,P}(\hat{x}^n|j, p)$ is 1 if $\hat{x}^n = g(j, p)$ and 0 otherwise. By taking an expectation over all possible values of J and P , the proof is concluded. \square

The following lemma is often used in the analyses of the storage and private-key rates and their sum rates.

Lemma 4. It holds that

$$H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^n I(Y_{k,t}; U_{k,t}|X_t, Q_t) \right\}, \quad (66)$$

where \mathcal{A} is again a non-empty subset of the set $\{1, 2\}$.

Proof: The equation can be developed as

$$\begin{aligned} H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) &= H(Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n, J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - H(Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n|J_{\mathcal{A}}, X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n|X^n) - H(Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n|J_{\mathcal{A}}, X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \{H(Y_{\mathcal{A},t}|X^n) - H(Y_{\mathcal{A},t}|Y_{\mathcal{A}}^{t-1}, J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}, X^n)\} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \{H(Y_{\mathcal{A},t}|X_t, Q_t) - H(Y_{\mathcal{A},t}|U_{\mathcal{A},t}, X_t, Q_t)\} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^n \{I(Y_{k,t}; U_{k,t}|X_t, Q_t)\} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where (a) follows because $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a function of $(Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n, P_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ is independent of $(Y_{\mathcal{A}}^n, X^n)$, and (b) is due to (63) and the Markov chain $Y_{k,t} - (X_t, U_{k,t}) - (Y_{k',t}, U_{k',t})$ for indexes $k, k' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $k' \neq k$. \square

Analyses of Storage Rates and Their Sum Rate: By a proper modification of including the private keys to the equation developments around [22, Eqs. (4)–(8)], from (7), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} n \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} R_k + 2\delta \right) &\geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \log |\mathcal{J}_k| \geq H(J_{\mathcal{A}}) \geq H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) \\ &= I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}|J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) + H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(X^n|J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) - H(X^n|J_1, J_2, P_1, P_2) + H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} H(X^n|J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) - n(D + \delta) + H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n H(X_t|X^{t-1}, J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) + H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - n(D + \delta) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=1}^n H(X_t|Y_{\mathcal{A}^c}^{t-1}, J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}, X^{n \setminus t}) + H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - n(D + \delta) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{t=1}^n \{H(X_t|U_{\mathcal{A}^c,t}, Q_t)\} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^n I(Y_{k,t}; U_{k,t}|X_t, Q_t) \right\} - n(D + \delta), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where (a) holds since $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ is independent of $(X^n, J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c})$ and the Markov chain $J_{\mathcal{A}} - (X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - (J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c})$ is applied, (b) is due to Lemma 3 and (10), (c) follows from Lemma 4.

Analyses of Private-Key Rates and Their Sum Rate: From (9),

$$\begin{aligned} n\delta &\geq I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}) = I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - I(X^n; P_{\mathcal{A}}|J_{\mathcal{A}}) \geq I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - H(P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \log |\mathcal{P}_k| \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}) - n \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} K_k + |\mathcal{A}|\delta \right), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where (a) follows because the RV $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ is uniformly chosen and independent of X^n and (b) is due to (8). Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} n \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} K_k + 2|\mathcal{A}|\delta \right) &\geq I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}}) = I(X^n; J_{\mathcal{A}}|P_{\mathcal{A}}) = H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|P_{\mathcal{A}}) - H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &\geq H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c}) - H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|X^n, P_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=1}^n \{H(X_t|U_{\mathcal{A}^c,t}, Q_t)\} - n(D + \delta), \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where the last inequality is due to (66) and (68), where the relation that the conditional entropy $H(J_{\mathcal{A}}|J_{\mathcal{A}^c}, P_{\mathcal{A}}, P_{\mathcal{A}^c})$ is lower bounded by the last equality in the equation is applied.

Analyses of the Sum Rate of Storage and Private-Key Rates: Observe that from (7) and (9),

$$\begin{aligned} n(R_k + \delta) + n\delta &\geq \log |\mathcal{J}_k| + I(X^n; J_{k'}) \geq H(J_k) + I(X^n; J_{k'}) \\ &\geq H(J_k) + H(J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n) \\ &\geq H(J_k, J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n) \\ &= H(J_k, J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n, P_{k'}) - I(J_{k'}; P_{k'}|X^n) \\ &\geq H(J_k, J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n, P_{k'}) - H(P_{k'}) \\ &\geq H(J_k, J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n, P_{k'}) - \log |\mathcal{P}_{k'}| \\ &\geq H(J_k, J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n, P_{k'}) - n(K_{k'} + \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Therefore,

$$n(R_k + K_{k'} + 3\delta) \geq H(J_k, J_{k'}) - H(J_{k'}|X^n, P_{k'}). \quad (72)$$

Now using (66) with $\mathcal{A} = \{k'\}$ and (68) with $\mathcal{A} = \{k, k'\} = \{1, 2\}$, we have that

$$R_k + K_{k'} \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{H(X_t|U_{k',t}, Q_t) + I(Y_{k,t}; U_{k,t}|X_t, Q_t)\} - D - 4\delta. \quad (73)$$

Analysis of Distortion: For the distortion constraint, from (10), it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} n(D + \delta) &\geq n\mathbb{E}[d^{(n)}(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \geq H(X^n|J_1, J_2, P_1, P_2) \\ &\geq H(X^n|Y_1^{t-1}, J_1, P_1, Y_2^{t-1}, J_2, P_2) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n H(X_t|Y_1^{t-1}, J_1, P_1, Y_2^{t-1}, J_2, P_2, X^{t-1}) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=1}^n H(X_t|U_{1,t}, U_{2,t}, Q_t), \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where the second inequality is due to Lemma 3.

By the standard argument for single letterization with defining $X = X_T$, $Y_1 = Y_{1,T}$, $Y_2 = Y_{2,T}$, $U_1 = U_{1,T}$, $U_2 = U_{2,T}$ and $Q = (T, Q_T)$ for $T \sim \text{Unif}[1 : n]$, and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta \downarrow 0$, any achievable tuple (R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) of the secure CEO problem is contained in \mathcal{B}_{out} .

Finally, using [51, Lemma 2], we can prove that $|\mathcal{U}_k| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_k|$ are sufficient to preserve the outer bound \mathcal{B}_{out} . Also, utilizing Fenchel-Eggleston-Caratheodory theorem (cf. [43, Appendix A]), the cardinality bound on the timesharing RV Q is $|\mathcal{Q}| \leq 6$, completing the converse proof. \square

C Proof of Proposition 1

We prove this corollary without caring about the cardinality bounds on the auxiliary RVs U_1 , U_2 , and Q since they are obtainable by independent arguments.

It is sufficient to show $\mathcal{B}_{\text{in}} \supseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}$ for the proof since we have already demonstrated in Appendix B that every achievable tuple with respect to Definition 1 is contained in the region \mathcal{B}_{out} . For $j \in [1 : 10]$, we say that a point $P_j = (R_1^{(j)}, R_2^{(j)}, K_1^{(j)}, K_2^{(j)}, D^{(j)}) \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{out}}$ is dominated by a point \mathcal{B}_{in} if there exists some $(R_1, R_2, K_1, K_2, D) \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{in}}$ for

which $R_1 \leq R_1^{(j)}$, $R_2 \leq R_2^{(j)}$, $K_1 \leq K_1^{(j)}$, $K_2 \leq K_2^{(j)}$, and $D \leq D^{(j)}$. Fixing P_Q , $P_{U_1|Y_1Q}$, and $P_{U_2|Y_2Q}$, the extreme points of the polytope defined by the constraints in \mathcal{B}_{out} are listed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q) + I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q) + H(X)), \\
P_2 &= (0, I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q), 0, 0, I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q) + H(X)), \\
P_3 &= (I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q), 0, 0, 0, I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q) + H(X)), \\
P_4 &= (I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q), I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q), 0, 0, H(X)), \\
P_5 &= (0, I(Y_2; U_2|Q), 0, I(X; U_2|Q), I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q) + H(X|U_2, Q)), \\
P_6 &= (I(Y_1; U_1|Q), 0, I(X; U_1|Q), 0, I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q) + H(X|U_1, Q)), \\
P_7 &= (I(Y_1; U_1|X, Q), I(Y_2; U_2|Q), 0, I(X; U_2|Q), H(X|U_2, Q)), \\
P_8 &= (I(Y_1; U_1|Q), I(Y_2; U_2|X, Q), I(X; U_1|Q), 0, H(X|U_1, Q)), \\
P_9 &= (I(Y_1; U_1|Q), I(Y_2; U_2|U_1, Q), I(X; U_1|Q), I(X; U_2|U_1, Q), H(X|U_1, U_2, Q)), \\
P_{10} &= (I(Y_1; U_1|U_2, Q), I(Y_2; U_2, Q), I(X; U_1|U_2, Q), I(X; U_2|Q), H(X|U_1, U_2, Q)),
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

where the points P_1, \dots, P_8 correspond to the endpoints when the constraints $R_1 + R_2$, $R_1 + K_2$, $R_2 + K_1$, $K_1 + K_2$, R_1 , R_2 , K_1 , and K_2 in \mathcal{B}_{out} become zero, respectively, and P_9 and P_{10} are attained when the distortion constraint is optimal.

Note that the points P_9 and P_{10} lie in the region \mathcal{B}_{in} . Now observe that the point $(0, 0, 0, 0, H(X))$ is in \mathcal{B}_{in} , obtained by setting U_1 and U_2 to be constant, and this point dominates the points P_1 , P_2 , P_3 , and P_4 . In case of setting only U_1 to be constant, the point

$$(0, I(Y_2; U_2|Q), 0, I(X; U_2|Q), H(X|U_2, Q))$$

is in \mathcal{B}_{in} and dominates P_5 and P_7 . Moreover, by setting U_2 to be constant, we have that the point

$$(I(Y_1; U_1|Q), 0, I(X; U_1|Q), 0, H(X|U_1, Q))$$

is included in \mathcal{B}_{in} , which dominates P_6 and P_8 . Since \mathcal{B}_{out} is the convex hull of these extreme points P_1, \dots, P_{10} , it is guaranteed that the region \mathcal{B}_{in} contains \mathcal{B}_{out} . \square

D Proof of Theorem 5

Achievability: Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we focus on the case where the timesharing RV Q is constant. Suppose that for $k \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$U_k = Y_k + \Theta_k, \tag{76}$$

where $\Theta_k \in \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\Theta_k}^2)$. In the rest of this proof, set

$$r_k = I(Y_k; U_k|X) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_k}^2}{\sigma_{\Theta_k}^2} \right). \tag{77}$$

From (76), for $k = 1, 2$, the conditional entropy

$$h(X|U_k) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{2\pi e \sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_k}^2)}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_k}^2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1}. \tag{78}$$

Also, from (76), the covariance matrix among (X, U_1, U_2) is given as

$$\mathbf{K}_{XU_1U_2} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_X^2 & \sigma_X^2 & \sigma_X^2 \\ \sigma_X^2 & \sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_1}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_1}^2 & \sigma_X^2 \\ \sigma_X^2 & \sigma_X^2 & \sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_2}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_2}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{79}$$

and thus, using (77) and (79), it is not difficult to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\det(\mathbf{K}_{XU_1U_2})}{\det(\mathbf{K}_{U_1U_2})} &= \frac{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_1}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_1}^2) (\sigma_{N_2}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_2}^2)}{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_1}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_1}^2 + \sigma_{N_2}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_2}^2) + (\sigma_{N_1}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_1}^2) (\sigma_{N_2}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_2}^2)} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1}{\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \sigma_{\Theta_k}^2} \right)^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where $\det(\mathbf{K})$ denotes the determinant of a matrix \mathbf{K} . By choosing the reproduction function $\phi(U_1, U_2) \triangleq \{P_{X=x|U_1, U_2}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, the distortion achieves

$$\begin{aligned}
D &= \mathbb{E}[d(X, \phi(U_1, U_2))] = h(X|U_1, U_2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{\det(\mathbf{K}_{XU_1U_2})}{\det(\mathbf{K}_{U_1U_2})} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Other constraints can be verified as follows: Note that $(Y_k, Y_{k'}) = (Y_1, Y_2)$ and $(U_k, U_{k'}) = (U_1, U_2)$ for $k, k' \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k \neq k'$.

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &\geq I(Y_k; U_k | U_{k'}) \stackrel{(a)}{=} I(Y_k, X; U_k | U_{k'}) \stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X; U_k | U_{k'}) + I(Y_k; U_k | X) \\ &= h(X | U_{k'}) - h(X | U_k, U_{k'}) + I(Y_k; U_k | X) \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} h(X | U_{k'}) - D + I(Y_k; U_k | X), \quad (83)$$

where (a) holds because the Markov chains $U_k - (Y_k, U_{k'}) - X$ is used, (b) is due to the Markov chains $Y_k - X - U_{k'}$ and $Y_k - (U_k, X)_{k'}$, respectively, and (c) follows from the second equality in (81), and their sum rate is bounded by

$$R_1 + R_2 \geq I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) \stackrel{(*)}{=} h(X) - h(X | U_1, U_2) + \sum_{k=1}^2 I(Y_1; U_2 | X) \quad (84)$$

$$= h(X) - D + \sum_{k=1}^2 I(Y_1; U_2 | X), \quad (85)$$

where $(*)$ holds due to the following relation.

$$\begin{aligned} I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} I(X, Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2) = I(X; U_1, U_2) + I(Y_1, Y_2; U_1, U_2 | X) \\ &= I(X; U_1, U_2) + I(Y_1; U_1, U_2 | X) + I(Y_2; U_1, U_2 | X, Y_1) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X; U_1, U_2) + I(Y_1; U_1 | X) + I(Y_2; U_2 | X, Y_1) \\ &= I(X; U_1, U_2) + I(Y_1; U_1 | X) + I(Y_2; U_2 | X), \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

where (a) follows from the Markov chain $X - (Y_1, Y_2) - (U_1, U_2)$, (b) is due to the Markov chain $U_1 - (Y_1, X, U_2) - Y_2$, and the last equality holds because the Markov chains $Y_1 - X - Y_2$ and $Y_1 - (X, U_2) - Y_2$ are utilized.

The private-key rates and their sum rate can be simply developed as

$$K_k \geq h(X | U_{k'}) - h(X | U_k, U_{k'}) \quad (87)$$

$$= h(X | U_{k'}) - D, \quad (88)$$

$$K_1 + K_2 \geq I(X; U_1, U_2) = h(X) - h(X | U_1, U_2) \quad (89)$$

$$= h(X) - D. \quad (90)$$

For the mixed sum rate of storage and private-key rates, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} R_k + K_{k'} &\geq I(Y_k, X; U_k, U_{k'}) = I(X; U_k, U_{k'}) + I(Y_k; U_k, U_{k'} | X) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} h(X) - h(X | U_k, U_{k'}) + I(Y_k; U_k | X) \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

$$= h(X) - D + I(Y_k; U_k | X), \quad (92)$$

where (a) is due to the Markov chain $Y_k - (U_k, X) - U_{k'}$.

Now substituting (77), (78), and (81) into (83), (85), (88), (90), and (92), one can easily check that the constraints in Theorem 5 is achievable. \square

Converse part: We prove this part based on the constraints in Def. 4 as the outer bound for Gaussian sources is also characterized by the same expression. For $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and a parameter $\beta_k > 0$, similar to the technique in [33], [48]–[50], let us fix

$$h(X | U_k, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k)}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k} \right), \quad h(X | U_1, U_2, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e (\xi(\beta_1, \beta_2)) \quad (93)$$

where $\xi(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \frac{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_1}^2 + \beta_1) (\sigma_{N_2}^2 + \beta_2)}{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_1}^2 + \beta_1 + \sigma_{N_2}^2 + \beta_2) + (\sigma_{N_1}^2 + \beta_1) (\sigma_{N_2}^2 + \beta_2)}$. Note that RVs Q and (X, Y_1, Y_2) are independent of each other. The first condition in (93) comes from the reason that the term inside the parenthesis is a continuous and monotonically increasing function with respect to β_k , and when the auxiliary RV U_k varies, there always exists a β_k satisfying this condition since we have that $\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2 \sigma_{N_k}^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2} \right) = h(X | Y_k) \leq h(X | U_k, Q) \leq h(X) = \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \sigma_X^2$. Also, it is not difficult to verify that the setting of (93) is reasonable by a similar logic. Note that we can further transform the term inside the parenthesis in the left-hand side of (93) and the function $\xi(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ as

$$\frac{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k)}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k} = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \frac{1 - 2^{-r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1}, \quad \xi(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_X^2} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{1 - 2^{-2r_k}}{\sigma_{N_k}^2} \right)^{-1} \quad (94)$$

by defining $r_k = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k}{\beta_k} \right) \geq 0$.

In light of (22), since $h(X | U_k, Q)$ and $h(X | U_1, U_2, Q)$ are already fixed in (93), the remaining task is to find the optimal lower bound on $I(Y_k; U_k | X, Q)$. Note that $I(Y_k; U_k | X, Q) = I(Y_k; U_k | Q) - I(X; U_k | X, Q) = h(Y_k) - h(Y_k | U_k, Q) -$

$h(X) + h(X|U_k, Q)$, hinting that deriving the optimal upper bound on $H(Y_k|U_k, Q)$ is enough. From the covariance matrix $\mathbf{K}_{XY_2Y_2}$, the converted channel from Y_k to X is

$$X = \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2} Y_k + N'_k, \quad N'_k \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\sigma_X^2 \sigma_{N_k}^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2}\right). \quad (95)$$

Applying the conditional entropy power inequality [54] to (95) holds that

$$2^{2h(X|U_k, Q)} \geq 2^{2h\left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2} Y_k | U_k, Q\right)} + 2^{2h(N'_k | U_k, Q)} = \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2}\right)^2 2^{2h(Y_k | U_k, Q)} + 2\pi e \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2 \sigma_{N_k}^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2}\right),$$

Now using the first condition (93) gives

$$2^{2h(Y_k | U_k, Q)} \leq 2\pi e \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_2}^2}{\sigma_X^2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_X^2 (\sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k)}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k} - \frac{\sigma_X^2 \sigma_{N_k}^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2}\right) = 2\pi e \left(\frac{\beta_k (\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_2}^2)}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k}\right). \quad (96)$$

Therefore,

$$h(Y_k | U_k, Q) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \left(\frac{\beta_k (\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_2}^2)}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_{N_k}^2 + \beta_k}\right)\right), \quad (97)$$

and combining the first condition in (93) with (97) yields

$$I(Y_k; U_k | X, Q) = h(Y_k) - h(Y_k | U_k, Q) - h(X) + h(X | U_k, Q) \geq r_k. \quad (98)$$

Finally, putting (93), (94), and (98) into the constraints in Def. 4, the converse proof of Theorem 5 is complete. \square

E A Counterexample

In this appendix, we show that the inner and outer bounds on the rate-equivocation-distortion region under the log-loss do not coincide. From [31, Equations (84)–(92)], the inner bound on the rate-equivocation-distortion region is given by the set of all tuples $(R_1, R_2, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$, where Δ_1, Δ_2 denote the equivocation rates as in [31], satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\geq I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | \tilde{U}_2, Q), & R_2 &\geq I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | \tilde{U}_1, Q), & R_1 + R_2 &\geq I(Y_1, Y_2; \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2 | Q), \\ \Delta_1 &\leq H(X) - I(X; \tilde{U}_1 | \tilde{U}_2, Q), & \Delta_2 &\leq H(X) - I(X; \tilde{U}_2 | \tilde{U}_1, Q), \\ \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 &\leq H(X) + H(X | \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2, Q), & \Delta_2 - R_1 &\leq H(X) - I(Y_1, X; \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2 | Q), \\ \Delta_1 - R_2 &\leq H(X) - I(X, Y_2; \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2 | Q), & D &\geq H(X | \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2, Q) \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

for a joint distribution

$$P_X(x) P_Q(q) \prod_{k=1}^2 P_{Y_k | X}(y_k | x) P_{\tilde{U}_k | Y_k, Q}(\tilde{u}_k | y_k, q) \quad (100)$$

with $|\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_1| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_1|$, $|\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_2| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_2|$ and $|Q| \leq 6$.

By a similar argument shown in Appendix B (with defining $\tilde{U}_{1,t} = (J_1, Y_1^{t-1})$, $\tilde{U}_{2,t} = (J_2, Y_2^{t-1})$, and $Q_t = X^{n \setminus t}$), the outer bound is characterized by the set of all tuples $(R_1, R_2, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^5$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\geq I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | X, Q) + H(X | \tilde{U}_2, Q) - D, & R_2 &\geq I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | X, Q) + H(X | \tilde{U}_1, Q) - D, \\ R_1 + R_2 &\geq I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | X, Q) + I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | X, Q) + H(X) - D, \\ \Delta_1 &\leq H(X) - H(X | \tilde{U}_2, Q) + D, & \Delta_2 &\leq H(X) - H(X | \tilde{U}_1, Q) + D, \\ \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 &\leq H(X) + D, & \Delta_2 - R_1 &\leq -I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | X, Q) + D, \\ \Delta_1 - R_2 &\leq -I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | X, Q) + D, & D &\geq H(X | \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2, Q) \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

for a joint distribution defined in (100) with $|\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_1| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_1|$, $|\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_2| \leq |\mathcal{Y}_2|$ and $|Q| \leq 6$.

Suppose that the rate-equivocation-distortion is tight, i.e., the outer bound defined in (101) \subseteq the inner bound defined (99) for fixed $P_{\tilde{U}_k | Y_k, Q}$, $k = 1, 2$. However, for the regions in (99) and (101), a counterexample can be easily found as follows: For the extreme point where $D = I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | X, Q) + I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | X, Q) + H(X)$ (the right-hand side of the constraint for $R_1 + R_2$ is zero), the right-hand side of the constraint for Δ_1 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &\leq H(X) - H(X | \tilde{U}_2, Q) + D \\ &= H(X) - H(X | \tilde{U}_2, Q) + I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | X, Q) + I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | X, Q) + H(X) \\ &= H(X) + I(X; \tilde{U}_2 | Q) + I(Y_1; \tilde{U}_1 | X, Q) + I(Y_2; \tilde{U}_2 | X, Q), \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

which is greater than $H(X)$, the maximum achievable quantity of Δ_1 in the inner bound when we set both \tilde{U}_1 and \tilde{U}_2 to be constant. This implies there may be some rate tuple $(R_1, R_2, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, D)$ in the outer bound which is not contained in the inner bound. \square

References

- [1] Bloch, M.; Günlü, O.; Yener, A.; Oggier, F.; Poor, H.V.; Sankar, L.; Schaefer, R. An overview of information-theoretic security and privacy: Metrics, limits and applications. *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Inf. Theory* **2021**, *2*, 5–22.
- [2] Günlü, O.; Schaefer, R.F. An optimality summary: Secret key agreement with physical unclonable functions. *Entropy* **2021**, *23*, pp.1–16.
- [3] Gassend, B. Physical random functions. Master’s thesis, M.I.T., Cambridge, MA, Jan. 2003.
- [4] Jain, A. K.; Flynn, P.; Ross, A. *Handbook of Biometrics*. Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2009.
- [5] Ignatenko, T.; Willems, F.M. Biometric systems: Privacy and secrecy aspects. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security* **2009**, *4*, 956–973.
- [6] Lai, L.; Ho, S.-W.; Poor, H. V. Privacy-security trade-offs in biometric security systems–part I: single use case. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.* **2011**, *6*, 122–139.
- [7] Csiszár, I.; Narayan, P. Common randomness and secret key generation with a helper. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2000**, *46*, 344–366.
- [8] Watanabe, S.; Oohama, Y. Secret key agreement from vector Gaussian sources by rate limited public communication. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.* **2011**, *6*, 541–550.
- [9] Günlü, O.; Kramer, G. Privacy, secrecy, and storage with multiple noisy measurements of identifiers. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.* **2018**, *13*, 2872–2883.
- [10] Berger, T.; Zhang, Z.; Viswanathan, H. The CEO problem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1996**, *42*, 887–902.
- [11] Shannon, C. E. Communication theory of secrecy systems. *The Bell Syst. Tech. J.* **1949**, *28*, 656–715.
- [12] Yamamoto, H. Rate-distortion theory for the Shannon cipher system. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1997**, *43*, 827–835.
- [13] Zhou, L.; Vu, M. T.; Oechtering T. J.; and Skoglund, M. Privacy-preserving identification systems with noisy enrollment. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.* **2021**, *16*, 3510–3523.
- [14] Yamamoto, H.; Itoh, K. Source coding theory for multiterminal communication systems with a remote source. *The Trans. of the IEICE of Japan* **1980**, E-63, 700–706.
- [15] Flynn, T.; Gray, R. Encoding of correlated observations. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1987**, *33*, 773–787.
- [16] Flynn, T.; Gray, R. Correction to “Encoding of correlated observations”. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1991**, *37*, 699.
- [17] Viswanathan, H.; Berger, T. The quadratic Gaussian CEO problem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1997**, *43*, 1549–1559.
- [18] Oohama, Y. The rate-distortion function for the quadratic Gaussian CEO problem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1998**, *44*, 1057–1070.
- [19] Prabhakaran, V.; Tse, D.; Ramachandran, K. Rate region of the quadratic Gaussian CEO problem. In Proceedings of the 2004 International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Chicago, IL, USA, 27 June – 02 July 2004, p. 117.
- [20] Chen, J.; Zhang, X.; Berger, T.; Wicker, S. B. An upper bound on the sum-rate distortion function and its corresponding rate allocation schemes for the CEO problem. *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.* **2004**, *22*, 977–987.
- [21] Oohama, Y. Rate-distortion theory for Gaussian multiterminal source coding systems with several side informations at the decoder. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2005**, *51*, 2577–2593.
- [22] Courtade, T. A.; Weissman, T. Multiterminal source coding under logarithmic loss. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2014**, *60*, 740–761.
- [23] Kosut, O.; Tong, L. The quadratic Gaussian CEO problem with byzantine agents. In Proceedings of the 2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, Seoul, Korea (South), 28 June – 03 July 2009, pp. 1145–1149.
- [24] Chen, J.; Jiang, F.; Swindlehurst, A. L. The Gaussian CEO problem for scalar sources with arbitrary memory. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2017**, *63*, 4286–4297.
- [25] Kostina, V.; Hassibi, B. The CEO problem with inter-block memory. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2021**, *67*, 7752–7768.
- [26] Tavildar, S.; Viswanath, P. On the sum-rate of the vector Gaussian CEO problem. In Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers, Pacific Grove, CA, USA, 30 October – 02 November 2005, pp. 3–7.
- [27] Chen, J.; Wang, J. On the vector Gaussian CEO problem. In Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), St. Petersburg, Russia, 31 July – 05 August 2011, pp. 2050–2054.
- [28] Wang, J.; Chen, J. On the vector Gaussian L -terminal CEO problem. In Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Cambridge, MA, USA, 01 July – 06 July 2012, pp. 571–575.
- [29] Ekrem, E.; Ulukus, S. An outer bound for the vector Gaussian CEO problem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2014**, *60*, 6870–6887.
- [30] Ugür, Y.; Aguerri, I. E.; Zaidi, A. Vector Gaussian CEO problem under logarithmic loss and applications. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2020**, *66*, 4183–4202.
- [31] Naghibi, F.; Salimi, S.; Skoglund, M. The CEO problem with secrecy constraints. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.* **2015**, *10*, 1234–1249.

- [32] Ghourchian, H.; A. Stavrou, P.; Oechtering, T. J.; Skoglund, M. Secure source coding with side-information at decoder and shared key at encoder and decoder. In Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW), Kanazawa, Japan, 17 October – 21 October 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [33] Günlü, O.; Schaefer, R. F.; Boche, H.; Poor, H. V. Private key and decoder side information for secure and private source coding. *Entropy* **2022**, *24*, 1716.
- [34] No, A.; Weissman, T. Universality of logarithmic loss in lossy compression. In Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Hong Kong, China, 14–19 June 2015, pp. 2166–2170.
- [35] Vovk, V. The Fundamental nature of the log loss function. In Fields of Logic and Computation II, Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2015, pp. 307–318.
- [36] Tse, D.; Viswanath, P. *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005.
- [37] Cesa-Bianchi, N.; Lugosi, G. *Prediction, Learning, and Games*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006.
- [38] Nangir, M.; Asvadi, R.; Ahmadian-Attari, M.; Chen, J. Analysis and code design for the binary CEO problem under logarithmic loss. *IEEE Trans. Commun.* **2018**, *66*, 6003–6014.
- [39] Gebali, F.; Mamun, M. Review of physically unclonable functions (PUFs): Structures, models, and algorithms. **2022**, *Frontiers in Sensors*, *2*, 1–13.
- [40] Berger, T. *Multiterminal source coding*. In the Information Theory Approach to Communications (CISM Courses and Lectures), G. Longo, Ed. Vienna and New York: Springer-Verlag, 1978, 171–231.
- [41] Tung, S.-Y. Multiterminal Source Coding. Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, New York, 1978.
- [42] Cover, T.M.; Thomas, J.A. *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 2006.
- [43] El Gamal, A.; Kim, Y.H. *Network Information Theory*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2011.
- [44] Kittichokechai, K.; Chia, Y. -K.; Oechtering, T. J.; Skoglund, M.; Weissman, T. Secure source coding with a public helper. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, *62*, 3930–3949.
- [45] He, X.; Zhou, X.; Komulainen, P.; Juntti, M.; Matsumoto, T. A Lower Bound Analysis of Hamming Distortion for a Binary CEO Problem With Joint Source-Channel Coding. *IEEE Trans. Commun.* **2016**, *64*, pp. 343–353.
- [46] Oohama, Y. Gaussian multiterminal source coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1997**, *43*, 1912–1923.
- [47] Kittichokechai, K.; Oechtering, T. J.; Skoglund, M.; Chia, Y.K. Secure source coding with action-dependent side information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **2015**, *61*, 6444–6464.
- [48] Willems, F. M. J.; Ignatenko, T. Quantization effects in biometric systems. In Proceeding of Information Theory and Applications Workshop, San Diego, CA, 08 February –13 February 2009, pp. 372–379.
- [49] Yachongka, V.; Yagi, H.; Oohama, Y. Secret key-based authentication with passive eavesdropper for scalar Gaussian sources. In Proceedings of the 2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Espoo, Finland, 26 June – 1 July 2022, pp. 2685–2690.
- [50] Yachongka, V.; Yagi, H.; Ochiai, H. Secret-key agreement with physical identifiers for degraded and less noisy authentication channels. In Proceedings of the 2022 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW), Mumbai, India, 1 November – 2 November 2022, pp. 1–6. (extended version is available on arXiv:2208.10478)
- [51] Jana, S. Alphabet sizes of auxiliary random variables in canonical inner bounds. In Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS), Baltimore, MD, 18 March – 20 March 2009, pp. 67–71.
- [52] Yachongka, V.; Yagi, H.; Oohama, Y. Biometric identification systems with noisy enrollment for Gaussian sources and channels. *Entropy* **2021**, *23*, 1049.
- [53] Bloch, M.; Barros, J. *Physical-Layer Security*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2011.
- [54] Bergmans, P. A simple converse for broadcast channels with additive white Gaussian noise. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **1978**, *20*, 279–280.