# Differential Privacy in Communications

#### Matthew Hale

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering University of Florida

Duke

AFOSR Center of Excellence Kickoff May 14, 2019















## Encryption Can Sometimes Be Restrictive

Sometimes we want to share some information















- Sometimes we want to share some information
- Example: coalitions may wish to share approximate locations







## How should we make sensitive data private?

#### **Fundamental Question**

# How can we share information but keep secrets in contested environments?

















## How should we make sensitive data private?

#### Fundamental Question

# How can we share information but keep secrets in contested environments?



#### Goal

Develop theoretical tools for protecting data while sharing it.















Example: Agents in a coalition want to share their states with another coalition







 Example: Agents in a coalition want to share their states with another coalition



 $\blacktriangleright$  No guarantee that the recipient only knows  $y_i(k)$  at time k





▶ We lose control of our data after sharing it







Duke





CR17



- We lose control of our data after sharing it
- ▶ We cannot know what an adversary will do with what they receive
  - Aggregate it over time?
  - Filter it?







- We lose control of our data after sharing it
- ▶ We cannot know what an adversary will do with what they receive
  - Aggregate it over time?
  - Filter it?



Privacy must (somehow) account for this



















DP is a privacy framework with a several key features:

It offers a formal definition of "privacy"















- It offers a formal definition of "privacy"
- It is immune to post-processing
  - $\blacktriangleright \ x \text{ private} \Rightarrow f(x) \text{ private for all } f$















- It offers a formal definition of "privacy"
- It is immune to post-processing
  - $x \text{ private} \Rightarrow f(x) \text{ private for all } f$
- It is robust to side information















- It offers a formal definition of "privacy"
- It is immune to post-processing
  - $x \text{ private} \Rightarrow f(x) \text{ private for all } f$
- It is robust to side information









- It offers a formal definition of "privacy"
- It is immune to post-processing
  - $x \text{ private} \Rightarrow f(x) \text{ private for all } f$
- It is robust to side information





## Fundamental Definitions in Differential Privacy

#### Adjacent trajectories in $\ell_p$ -spaces

We fix a constant b>0 and define  $\mathrm{Adj}_b:\ell_p^n\times\ell_p^n\to\{0,1\}$  as

$$\mathsf{Adj}_b(x_1, x_2) = 1 \Longleftrightarrow \|x_1 - x_2\|_{\ell_p} \le b.$$

















## Similarity of Outputs

#### Fundamental Inequality of Differential Privacy

For adjacent state trajectories  $x_1 \mbox{ and } x_2,$  we want the outputs  $y_1, \ y_2$  to satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(y_2) \le e^{\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(y_1) + \delta,$$





## Similarity of Outputs

#### Fundamental Inequality of Differential Privacy

For adjacent state trajectories  $x_1 \mbox{ and } x_2,$  we want the outputs  $y_1, \ y_2$  to satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(y_2) \le e^{\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(y_1) + \delta,$$

This is the definition of  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy.





 $\blacktriangleright$  Fix a probability space  $(\Omega,\Sigma,\mathbb{P}).$  Differential privacy is enforced by a mechanism of the form

$$M: \ell_p^n \times \Omega \to \ell_q^r.$$









Fix a probability space  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ . Differential privacy is enforced by a *mechanism* of the form

$$M: \ell_p^n \times \Omega \to \ell_q^r.$$

For us this will take the form





## Privacy Noise is Calibrated by What We Share

Sensitivity

The *p*-norm sensitivity of a mapping  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\Delta_p \mathcal{F} = \sup_{x_1, x_2: \operatorname{Adj}_B(x_1, x_2)} \left\| \mathcal{F}(x_1) - \mathcal{F}(x_2) \right\|_{\ell_p}.$ 





## Privacy Noise is Calibrated by What We Share

Sensitivity

The *p*-norm sensitivity of a mapping  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\Delta_p \mathcal{F} = \sup_{x_1, x_2: \operatorname{Adj}_B(x_1, x_2)} \left\| \mathcal{F}(x_1) - \mathcal{F}(x_2) \right\|_{\ell_p}.$ 



• For an agent sharing  $y_i(k) := C_i x_i(k)$ :  $\Delta_p \mathcal{F} = s_1(C_i) b$ 



## Privacy Noise is Calibrated by What We Share

Sensitivity

The *p*-norm sensitivity of a mapping  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\Delta_p \mathcal{F} = \sup_{x_1, x_2: \operatorname{Adj}_B(x_1, x_2)} \|\mathcal{F}(x_1) - \mathcal{F}(x_2)\|_{\ell_p} \,.$ 



▶ For an agent sharing  $y_i(k) := C_i x_i(k)$ :  $\Delta_p \mathcal{F} = s_1(C_i) b$ 

► We make it differentially private by adding noise  $w(k) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, s_1(C_i)b \cdot \kappa(\epsilon, \delta))$ 













## Differential privacy has been applied to:

Kalman filtering













### Differential privacy has been applied to:

- Kalman filtering
- Distributed linear-quadratic control















Differential privacy has been applied to:

- Kalman filtering
- Distributed linear-quadratic control
- Consensus problems















Differential privacy has been applied to:

- Kalman filtering
- Distributed linear-quadratic control
- Consensus problems
- Optimization in several forms















Differential privacy has been applied to:

- Kalman filtering
- Distributed linear-quadratic control
- Consensus problems
- Optimization in several forms
- Always involves introducing randomness

















- Contested environments have asynchronous communications
- How can we use asynchronous private information?









CR17





- Contested environments have asynchronous communications
- How can we use asynchronous private information?
- How can we privatize new data types, such as sets?













