

Protecting Confidentiality, Privacy and Integrity in Collaborative Learning

Dong Chen^{†,*,¶} Alice Dethise^{§,¶} Istemi Ekin Akkus[§] Ivica Rimac[§] Klaus Satzke[§]
Antti Koskela[§] Marco Canini[‡] Wei Wang[†] Ruichuan Chen[§]
[§]Nokia Bell Labs [†]HKUST [‡]KAUST

Abstract

A collaboration between dataset owners and model owners is needed to facilitate effective machine learning (ML) training. During this collaboration, however, dataset owners and model owners want to protect the *confidentiality* of their respective assets (i.e., datasets, models and training code), with the dataset owners also caring about the *privacy* of individual users whose data is in their datasets. Existing solutions either provide limited confidentiality for models and training code, or suffer from privacy issues due to collusion.

We present CITADEL++, a collaborative ML training system designed to *simultaneously* protect the confidentiality of datasets, models and training code as well as the privacy of individual users. CITADEL++ enhances *differential privacy* mechanisms to safeguard the privacy of individual user data while maintaining model utility. By employing Virtual Machine-level Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs) as well as the improved *sandboxing* and *integrity* mechanisms through OS-level techniques, CITADEL++ effectively preserves the confidentiality of datasets, models and training code, and enforces our privacy mechanisms even when the models and training code have been maliciously designed. Our experiments show that CITADEL++ provides model utility and performance while adhering to the confidentiality and privacy requirements of dataset owners and model owners, outperforming the state-of-the-art privacy-preserving training systems by up to 543× on CPU and 113× on GPU TEEs.

1 Introduction

High-quality machine learning (ML) training requires a well-designed model and representative datasets. On the one hand, *dataset owners* own siloed user data but may not have extensive ML expertise. For instance, hospitals have patient data and banks maintain customers’ financial records; however, they may have limited expertise to leverage advanced ML technologies to utilize their datasets. On the other hand, *model owners* have ML expertise and may have developed sophisticated models, but they need datasets from diverse sources to train their models. For instance, a BioTech company has developed a drug design model but needs data from

hospitals to generalize the model. As a result, the collaboration between dataset owners and model owners is required.

Although there are various attempts at enabling this much-needed collaboration [31–33, 45, 46], dataset owners and model owners do not always trust each other. Dataset owners care about their datasets. For instance, they may want to monetize these datasets via marketplace [31, 32, 114]. In addition, these datasets may contain sensitive user data, raising privacy concerns and being subject to various privacy regulations (e.g., EU AI Act [40], GDPR [44], CCPA [18], HIPAA [52]). Any leak of such sensitive data can lead to severe fines, business impact and reputation loss.

On the other hand, today’s ML models are increasingly complex and innovative. Model owners spend significant time and resources designing the model structure and the way it can be trained efficiently; therefore, models and training code are often considered as key intellectual properties. Although there are open-sourced foundation models in domains such as natural language processing [35, 89] and image generation [116], there are many confidential models that have been employed (and will likely be employed in the future) in many industries, e.g., drug design models in pharmaceuticals and stock price prediction models in finance.

As a result, there is a dilemma. Even though the collaboration between dataset owners and model owners is required and highly beneficial for both sides, neither side is willing to share their assets. Existing attempts to solving this dilemma either address it partially or impose significant computation and communication overheads, impeding scalability. For instance, federated learning (FL) [65, 69, 80, 86, 87] enables dataset owners to train a model over local datasets and synchronize with a server that aggregates all the local model updates. FL aims to achieve data privacy as local datasets are not shared with the server; however, recent work has shown that a malicious server can infer sensitive information via attacks such as data reconstruction [43, 54, 132, 137] and membership inference [19, 100, 112]. In addition, FL lacks model confidentiality because the model is made available at the dataset owners. In parallel, the community has also been exploring collaborative training based on cryptographic approaches such as homomorphic encryption (HE) [10, 16, 17, 49, 79] or secure multi-party computation (SMPC) [3, 20, 53, 71, 83, 96, 97, 99, 101, 105, 108, 119, 126, 127]. However, both HE-

*Work done during internship at Nokia Bell Labs.

¶Equal contribution.

and SMPC-based approaches impose significant computation and communication overheads; therefore, they can only be applied to small datasets and models [82].

Recently, confidential computing has become an emerging paradigm that leverages the hardware-based Trusted Execution Environments (TEEs) to provide assurances for confidentiality and integrity when executing code on data within a TEE [26, 27]. This paradigm has gained significant traction among CPU and GPU manufacturers [7, 11, 12, 62, 63, 85, 102], and has become an essential offering of all major cloud providers [11, 13, 14, 47]. Specifically, a TEE utilizes a hardware root-of-trust and enables users to access cloud computing resources without trusting the provider’s software, including the privileged hypervisor and operating system.

Because of TEEs’ generality, strong guarantees, high efficiency and wide availability, they have been regarded as key to safeguarding data and models in ML processes [30, 56, 61, 113, 118]. Indeed, a large body of research has leveraged TEEs for privacy-preserving ML computations [55, 57, 58, 60, 77, 84, 94, 95, 103, 106, 107, 120, 125, 134]. Unfortunately, none of these approaches can fully protect the datasets, model and training code. Furthermore, as a model and its training code could be maliciously designed to leak or embed private data during training, previous approaches require the model and training code to be *a priori* inspected and agreed upon to ensure that private data cannot be intentionally leaked while running inside TEEs. For instance, Citadel [134] is a state-of-the-art collaborative ML training system that aims to protect the confidentiality of both training datasets and the model using TEEs. Citadel, similar to traditional FL, partitions the training code into two parts (i.e., data handling part and model updating part), and distributes them across multiple SGX [62] enclaves for confidentiality and scalability. To enhance data privacy, Citadel imposes zero-sum masking onto model updates exchanged between these two parts. However, Citadel still requires the data handling code to be inspectable to gain the trust of the dataset owners [134], cannot use GPUs, and is still vulnerable to various privacy attacks that can be launched in FL [19, 43, 54, 100, 112, 132, 137].

In this paper, we propose CITADEL++, a scalable collaborative training system that *simultaneously* protects the confidentiality of datasets, models and training code as well as the privacy of individual users whose data is present in those datasets. The design of CITADEL++ is inspired by Citadel’s general architecture [134]. Specifically, like Citadel, we also employ TEEs in CITADEL++, and adopt the FL-style programming paradigm that greatly lowers the entry barrier for today’s ML practitioners, where the training code is split into two parts: 1) the *data handling* code directly operates on datasets to compute gradients, and 2) the *model updating* code aggregates gradients to update the model. However, such a design is not enough to achieve our goals to protect the full data and model assets supplied by dataset owners and

model owners. We advance this design with three substantial contributions on strong privacy, sandboxing and integrity.

First, CITADEL++ creates a *privacy barrier* between the data handling code and the model updating code by employing a set of privacy mechanisms based on DP-SGD [1], in conjunction with masking, dynamic gradient clipping and noise correction. This privacy barrier ensures that any computational results (e.g., gradients) sent from data handling code to model updating code are differentially private with high utility, and little information about any individual user’s data can be gained through such results, even in the presence of collusion among dataset owners and model owners.

Second, training a model within TEEs protects the confidentiality of the datasets, model and training code; however, this leads to a situation where no one can detect whether the model and its training code are maliciously attempting to leak private data (e.g., by writing data to external storage, or bypassing our privacy barrier). Therefore, CITADEL++ designs a *sandbox* to enforce appropriate access control (e.g., no network or shared resources, isolated file systems) and strictly regulate the data flow in the system to ensure that the data exchanged between the data handling and model updating components flows *only* through our privacy barrier. In doing so, the privacy of user data is guaranteed even if the model and training code are maliciously designed, thus removing the need to inspect them. CITADEL++ employs virtual machine (VM)-level TEEs, e.g., AMD SEV-SNP [7] and Intel TDX [63], which provide the required functionalities for sandboxing and also enable the usage of confidential GPUs, e.g., NVIDIA H100 [102]. We note that existing systems [59, 88, 135, 136] try to solve this issue via mechanisms based on software fault isolation in application enclaves on Intel SGX [62] or the VM privilege levels on AMD SEV-SNP [8]. These mechanisms are restrictive for isolating untrusted model and training code from the rest of our system, or depend on a specific AMD feature, specific hypervisor and modified kernel (can be complementary to our sandboxing mechanism, if needed).

Third, we need to ensure the *integrity* of the privacy barrier and sandboxing mechanisms, which are crucial in protecting the confidentiality and privacy of the datasets, model and training code as well as their correct execution. Although TEEs provide integrity protections for code running within them, current remote attestation mechanisms to ensure that the intended code is deployed and run correctly are limited. For instance, current VM-level TEEs running Confidential VMs (CVMs) primarily allow attestation of only the initial memory content, overlooking critical parts such as kernel and root file system [129]. Besides, the CVM owner (e.g., CITADEL++ provider) can change the CVM state with extra actions that are not reflected in the attestation report. To address these limitations, CITADEL++ utilizes Confidential Containers (CoCo) [24], and enhances its integrity mechanisms for CVM and container images housing our privacy

barrier and sandboxing mechanisms to guarantee their correct execution.

We implemented the full CITADEL++ system. Our evaluation demonstrates that CITADEL++ matches the model utility of standard central DP-SGD mechanisms, while providing stronger privacy guarantees and negligible overheads with our privacy barrier. The sandboxing mechanism with integrity in CITADEL++ adds reasonable overhead compared to a no-sandboxing baseline (e.g., 3.6% overhead for training a transformer model). When considering the full collaborative, confidential training, CITADEL++ is as efficient as non-confidential FL, demonstrating up to 543× speedup on CPU and 113× speedup on GPU compared to the state-of-the-art privacy-preserving training systems.

2 Actors, Assumptions and Goals

2.1 System Actors

Dataset owners are entities that possess datasets which may contain sensitive personal or organizational data (e.g., medical records of hospital patients, operational data from factory manufacturing lines). We note that the ownership of data in a dataset may vary according to jurisdiction. For instance, in Europe, individual users whose data is in a dataset are typically still considered as the owners of that data [44]. As a result, dataset owners care about not only the confidentiality of their datasets, but also the privacy of individuals whose data is present in those datasets.

Model owners are entities that create models and associated training code. Model owners may own some datasets to develop and test their models and training code; however, they do not possess enough and diverse datasets to generalize their models. They want to collaborate with dataset owners to access such datasets. During collaboration, they care about the confidentiality of their models and training code.

CITADEL++ provider is the entity that deploys and operates the CITADEL++ service to enable the collaborative training among model owners and dataset owners. It interfaces with the cloud provider for the necessary infrastructure.

Cloud provider is the entity that provides the underlying compute, network and storage infrastructures with their respective services. The compute infrastructure is equipped with TEEs, such as AMD SEV-SNP [7] or Intel TDX [63]. This infrastructure has been widely accepted and available among all major cloud providers [11, 13, 14, 47].

2.2 Assumptions and Threat Model

We assume an adversary can access privileged system stacks with the goal of learning confidential information: The *cloud provider* may manipulate the host OS kernel and process resources; the *CITADEL++ provider* may insert backdoors into and manipulate system components. TEEs ensure the code and data loaded inside them are protected with confidentiality and integrity [27]; therefore, TEEs have been

regarded as key to safeguarding data and models in ML processes [30, 56, 61, 113, 118]. We note that there have been attacks on TEEs, such as covert and side channels [50, 75, 76, 78, 98, 110, 122, 123, 131] and physical attacks [21, 34, 117, 121]. Defeating these attacks is an active research area, including mitigation strategies from TEE vendors [2], various software defenses using oblivious schemes to obfuscate timing and memory access patterns [57, 60, 103, 111, 124], defense-in-depth [22], and fault tolerance techniques against physical rollback attacks [25]. Nonetheless, we leave such attacks outside this paper’s scope and assume that the TEE guarantees are intact, but note that these defenses are complementary to CITADEL++.

No *actor* inherently trusts others. Each actor may try to learn the confidential datasets, models and training code, either individually or by colluding with others (as long as they do not attack TEEs as assumed). For instance, some dataset owners may collude with the model owner (e.g., by sharing their datasets) to learn the confidential datasets of other dataset owners. In addition, the model and training code provided by a model owner can be maliciously designed to break the confidentiality and privacy of datasets. For instance, the training code may intentionally leak private data to storage, abuse system APIs [138], or attempt to bypass CITADEL++’ protection mechanisms. Finally, the trustworthiness and usefulness of datasets can be efficiently checked via TEEs without violating confidentiality [6], ensuring that dataset owners provide their datasets according to their agreements with other dataset owners and model owner.

2.3 System Goals

Dataset/Model/Code Confidentiality: Assets provided by different participants should stay confidential. Datasets may contain sensitive information. Similarly, ML models including their parameters, structures and training code constitute intellectual properties. Therefore, protecting the confidentiality of these provided assets is important. This protection should apply not only when these assets are at rest and in transit but also in use during training.

Data Privacy: A dataset may be from one organization (e.g., operational data from a factory), but may also consist of data from multiple individual users (e.g., medical records of patients of a hospital). Individual users care about the privacy of their own data. Such data should stay differentially private, a widely established mechanism for mitigating privacy concerns [39], and little information about any individual user’s data should be gained or inferred in CITADEL++. Note that this privacy protection goes beyond what the aforementioned dataset confidentiality provides for a dataset as a whole.

Code Integrity: The code running in CITADEL++ should be integrity-protected. This protection applies to both the training code (from the model owner) and the CITADEL++ service code. The service code includes our system mechanisms (§4,




Figure 1. High-level overview of CITADEL++.

§5 and §6), and is crucial for achieving our confidentiality and privacy goals for datasets, models and training code.

Performance: The protection mechanisms in CITADEL++ should not affect the training performance. CITADEL++ should achieve no worse (often better) results for model accuracy and training time, compared to the state-of-the-art confidential training systems with weaker guarantees (e.g., require inspectable model and training code, cannot simultaneously protect datasets, model and training code). CITADEL++ should also take advantage of accelerators (e.g., GPUs) without losing the aforementioned protections.

3 CITADEL++ Design Overview

3.1 Background: TEE Capabilities

A Trusted Execution Environment (TEE) is a secure area within a processor. This area is isolated from the untrusted environment via hardware, providing confidentiality and integrity assurances for the code and data inside [26, 27]. With remote attestation [29, 51], users can authenticate the TEE hardware, verify its trusted state, and check if the expected code is running via the cryptographic measurement.

3.2 System Components and Mechanisms

Figure 1 shows a high-level overview of CITADEL++. The system components enable a collaborative training session between the dataset owners and model owner, while providing confidentiality, privacy and integrity protections. These components run in a cloud infrastructure equipped with TEEs and a storage service that is considered untrusted.

In CITADEL++, collaborative training follows a similar paradigm to FL, ensuring easy adoption by ML practitioners. Specifically, the model owner’s model training code is split in two parts: data handling code and model updating code. For each dataset owner, there is one **data handling component** running in a TEE, which uses the data handling code to process a dataset owner’s data and generate local model updates confidentially. For the model owner, there is a single **model updating component** running in a TEE, which uses

the model updating code to aggregate all the local model updates and update the global model, also confidentially. These components are coordinated by another TEE component, the **admin component**. It is responsible for synchronizing the training iterations among the data handling and model updating components as well as setting up our privacy barrier mechanism. Citadel [134] follows a similar architecture.

Besides their respective assets loaded at runtime, all TEE components also contain the CITADEL++ service code that is open-sourced to gain trust from dataset owners and model owners. This service code includes: 1) the **privacy barrier** mechanism that ensures local model updates exchanged between data handling and model updating components do not leak private information (§4), 2) the **sandboxing** mechanism that isolates the potentially malicious model and data handling code from the CITADEL++ service code, regulates the information flow in the system, and ensures our privacy barrier cannot be bypassed (§5), and 3) various **procedures** that handle the coordination of the training loop as well as common processing actions including encrypting/decrypting all communications among TEE components and untrusted storage (i.e., encryption-in-transit). CITADEL++ service code is key to protecting the confidentiality and privacy of the datasets, model and training code, as well as the correct execution of the training code; thus, we must protect the integrity of the service code. While part of this protection is provided by TEEs, it is limited and unsatisfactory (§6). Thus, we have extra **integrity mechanisms** for TEE components to ensure the CITADEL++ service code cannot be maliciously altered (§6).

Recall that one of the main goals of CITADEL++ is to protect the confidentiality of various training assets (e.g., datasets, models and training code) while running in a cloud infrastructure. The cloud infrastructure (except TEEs) and its **storage service** are untrusted. Therefore, all training assets stored in the cloud storage before, during and after the training session are encrypted (i.e., encryption-at-rest).

To make these encrypted assets usable in the confidential training session with TEEs (i.e., encryption-in-use), the

corresponding keys have to be supplied by their respective owners to the relevant TEE components. For ease-of-use, CITADEL++ manages these keys inside the **key distribution service** (KDS) running in a TEE. The KDS is responsible for 1) storing keys of various assets along with the agreed training session configurations, and 2) sharing those keys with the relevant TEE components at the training start. Before sharing the keys, the KDS remotely attests the relevant TEE components via the trusted **attestation service** provided by TEE vendors [64, 109] or cloud providers [90], and only shares keys if these components run the correct service code and possess the agreed training session configuration. The correctness of these components in their respective TEEs can be remotely attested [29, 51], because the service code of all CITADEL++ components, including the KDS, are open-sourced.

We design a **management service** that sets up training sessions and tracks various metadata (e.g., participants, whether all required assets are available for training to start, training progress). The management service is untrusted. The KDS ensures the training session configuration supplied by the management service is consistent with its metadata.

3.3 CITADEL++ Workflow

CITADEL++ supports multiple training sessions in parallel. Here, we give the workflow of a single session for clarity.

After agreeing to join a collaborative training session, the dataset owners and model owner encrypt their respective assets (i.e., datasets, model and training code) with the keys of their choosing. They then upload their encrypted assets to the untrusted storage (Step 1 in Figure 1). These encrypted assets need to be decrypted inside the TEEs running the CITADEL++ training components for the training to proceed. Thus, these keys need to be shared with the respective components. To do so, the dataset owners and model owner upload their keys along with the agreed training session configuration to the key distribution service (KDS), after remotely attesting it via the attestation service (Steps 2 and 3).

Next, the management service starts the confidential training session and deploys the associated training components within TEEs: a data handling component for each dataset owner in the session¹, a model updating component, and an admin component. The admin component is initialized with the training session configuration that refers to the assets and privacy parameters to be used (Steps 4 and 5).

After the training session starts, the service code in the data handling and model updating components register with the admin component, which configures them with the relevant assets and privacy parameters: Each data handling component receives the corresponding dataset ID and the

data handling code ID. The model updating component receives the initial model ID, the model updating code ID, and the test dataset ID (for assessing the trained model). The service code in each component retrieves its still encrypted assets from the cloud storage and requests their corresponding keys from the KDS. The KDS remotely attests the training components via the attestation service, ensures the key metadata matches the training session configuration, and then shares the relevant keys with them (Steps 6 and 7). Once shared, the KDS discards the keys, so that a model owner cannot run multiple training sessions with the same datasets without involving the dataset owners.

Finally, the training loop starts. At the beginning of each iteration, the admin component notifies the other training components. The admin component generates and distributes differentially-private masks (DP-masks) (§4.2) to the data handling components. Each data handling component loads the current iteration’s dataset items and model, generates the gradients (i.e., model updates)² via the model owner’s data handling code, and applies the DP-mask received from the admin component. Afterwards, it encrypts the DP-masked gradients and sends them to the model updating component. Upon receiving these DP-masked gradients, the model updating component decrypts and aggregates them with the current model to obtain the next iteration’s updated model via the model owner’s model updating code. The model updating code may also assess the model with a confidential test dataset, before signalling the admin component whether to stop training (e.g., desired accuracy, number of iterations reached). The admin component also checks whether the training’s allocated privacy budget is fully spent. If any of these conditions is satisfied, the training is stopped.

4 Privacy Barrier

We first introduce the differentially-private stochastic gradient descent (DP-SGD) mechanism. We then describe the three techniques that constitute our privacy barrier.

4.1 Background: DP-SGD

DP-SGD [1] is a standard way to ensure the differential privacy (DP) guarantees for an ML training process. The guarantees are achieved by perturbing the generated gradients (with bounded L_2 -norm) with Gaussian noise. A randomized mechanism \mathcal{M} satisfies (ϵ, δ) -DP if for any two neighboring datasets D and D' (differing in at most one data item) and for any subset S of possible outputs, it holds: $\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D) \in S] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D') \in S] + \delta$. There are two privacy parameters, ϵ and δ , which mainly control the trade-off between the model accuracy and privacy guarantee.

¹Multiple data handling components can also be deployed for a large dataset.

²In this paper, we use gradients and model updates interchangeably.



Figure 2. Differential-private masking.

4.2 Differentially-Private Masking

The potentially malicious model updating code (provided by a model owner) can utilize the received gradients to infer sensitive information about the training datasets [19, 43, 54, 100, 112, 132, 137]. Therefore, the gradients sent from data handling components need to be privacy-protected.

We design a differentially-private masking mechanism, where random masks are generated such that their sum provides DP guarantees under the central DP model [1]. These DP-masks are added to the gradients, making each individual gradient appear purely random. Specifically, as shown in Figure 2, the admin component generates the DP-masks, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 C^2 \mathbf{I}) = \xi$, where m_i is the DP-mask sent to the i -th data handling component, σ is the noise scale parameter, and C is the gradient clipping bound. These masks are then distributed to the respective data handling components. Each i -th data handling component applies its received DP-mask m_i to its local gradient g_i before sending the DP-masked gradient $g_i + m_i$ to the model updating component. Finally, the aggregated gradient produced by the model updating component is equal to the sum of non-private gradients and the DP noise ($\sum_{i=1}^n g_i + \xi$), providing the same privacy-utility trade-off for the model as DP-SGD [1]. Therefore, by design, our DP-masking mechanism defeats a range of privacy attacks such as data reconstruction [43, 54, 132, 137] and membership inference [19, 100, 112], and protects against privacy leakage due to collusion (§8.2).

4.3 Dynamic Gradient Clipping

DP-SGD computes a gradient for each individual data item, and enforces a bounded norm for each gradient by applying the gradient clipping [1], which scales down any gradient whose norm exceeds a *fixed* clipping bound C . Since the added DP noise is also scaled with C , a larger C retains more gradient information but requires more noise for the same level of DP guarantees, while a smaller C leads to clipping more gradients. Both could degrade the model utility, highlighting a careful selection of C .

In CITADEL++, we compute this clipping bound *dynamically* in each iteration, by approximately clipping r percentage of gradients. More specifically, each data handling component computes the norms of its generated gradients and constructs a count histogram of the norms using predefined bins $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^k$. The admin component receives these count histograms from all data handling components, sums them up to obtain a histogram estimate of norms across all




Figure 3. CITADEL++ service code stack.

gradients, and adds Gaussian noise to the counts of this histogram with noise variance σ_g^2 . The norm matching the r -th percentile is then selected and returned to data handling components for clipping gradients with that norm. This dynamic gradient clipping is proven DP (§7), and can work with our DP-masking mechanism. Unlike prior adaptive schemes [9], our procedure does not require a lengthy adaptive process.

4.4 DP Noise Correction

Recall that the DP noise is generated by the admin component inside a TEE (§4.2). As a result, CITADEL++ has more control over how noise is generated. By exploiting this fact, we further develop a noise correction technique that adds more noise in each iteration and cancels it out afterwards (different from commonly considered noise adaptation schemes [128, 130]), for stronger privacy protection during training.

Specifically, suppose the admin component generates the DP noise $\xi_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 C^2 \mathbf{I})$ in each iteration t . Then, the noise added in iteration $t + 1$ is $\xi_{t+1} - \lambda \cdot \xi_t$, where the noise correction coefficient $\lambda \in [0, 1)$. This technique removes some noise added in iteration t by subtracting part of it in iteration $t + 1$. Since the noise value is kept within the admin component (in a TEE), this technique does not leak the value $\lambda \cdot \xi_t$. With a noise level of $\frac{\sigma}{1-\lambda}$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ (instead of σ), we achieve approximately the same privacy guarantee and utility for the *final* model as compared to DP-SGD (§7 and Appendix A.3), but provide stronger privacy for gradients in each iteration *during* training.

5 Sandboxing Untrusted Code

In CITADEL++, we want to protect the confidentiality of the model and training code provided by a model owner, meaning we cannot inspect them. They may attempt to leak the confidential datasets they operate on (e.g., send data to storage or network [138], bypass our privacy barrier (§4)). This section describes how our sandboxing mechanism regulates the data flow and enforces the privacy barrier.

5.1 Service Code Stack

The CITADEL++ service code stack aims to offer confidentiality on untrusted cloud hosts as well as the protection against potentially malicious training code and model supplied by the model owner. Figure 3 shows a high-level view of this stack. Each host is equipped with VM-level TEEs (e.g., AMD SEV-SNP [7], Intel TDX [63]) which enable the usage of

TEE capabilities on GPUs (e.g., NVIDIA H100 [102]) and provide isolation and confidentiality to secure entire VMs, thus creating confidential VMs (CVMs) that run alongside other components (e.g., untrusted hypervisor, and other CVMs) on a host. Each CITADEL++ CVM runs a service container that houses the service code responsible for the privacy barrier and the sandboxes for various training components (i.e., data handling, model updating and admin).

For these training components, we employ Confidential Containers (CoCo) [24] that uses CVMs to run containers, whose images and data may be sensitive. However, CoCo assumes that the code running in the container will not break confidentiality at runtime. Therefore, we need additional mechanisms to prevent potentially malicious training code from breaking the confidentiality and privacy properties in CITADEL++. We build upon CoCo, but further leverage privilege and access control mechanisms in its CVM.

5.2 Sandboxing Details

In CITADEL++, a data handling component loads the data handling code provided by a model owner at runtime and executes it. Due to confidentiality requirement, this code cannot be inspected and can be malicious. Thus, its execution behavior needs to be restricted to only the functional requirements of data handling code: computing gradients, and returning them to the service code which applies the privacy barrier.

To enforce this restriction, we leverage OS-level privilege and Linux kernel namespaces mechanisms [81]. The combination of these mechanisms on a process effectively creates a *sandbox* for it. Recall that various CITADEL++ components in a training session run in their own CVMs with CoCo (Figure 3). Inside the CVM, the service code runs as a *privileged* container. Although running containers as privileged is not recommended in general settings [66], we have the following reasoning: First, the CITADEL++ provider makes all its service code open-sourced and inspectable, which is also required for any remote attestation procedure. Second, the service container is the only one running in this CVM, meaning that it does not have adverse effects on other system components.

The service container uses a separate *unprivileged* process inside the container to execute the untrusted data handling code, and controls its lifecycle. This process is further isolated via Linux kernel namespaces to apply various restrictions.

R1: Network isolation. The network connections inside the unprivileged process should be restricted to limited destinations, so that CITADEL++ can control the data flow from the untrusted code to pass it through our privacy barrier, and prevent malicious code from sending data to unauthorized destinations. For each unprivileged process executing the untrusted data handling code, CITADEL++ applies a separate network namespace. As a result, an unprivileged process in the service container can communicate with *only* one destination: the privileged service code that launched it.

R2: Resource isolation. The CITADEL++ service code includes the privacy barrier and sandboxing mechanisms. A malicious data handling code overwriting these mechanisms could bypass our privacy protections and break the confidentiality of datasets. In addition, for DP guarantees, the data handling code should not accumulate state about dataset items via local files or other shared resources (e.g., memory, message queues and pipes to other processes).

To address these issues, the service container spawns a new unprivileged process at each iteration with a freshly-created isolated file system, and passes to it only the dataset items required for that iteration. For each unprivileged process it spawns, the service container creates a private mount from the original root file system and remounts all writable directories (e.g., /tmp, /home, /var) to provide a clean working root file system for the process. This private mount prevents this process from modifying the service container’s root file system, protecting the service code from being overwritten and the file system from being used as a communication channel. To prevent leakage via other shared resources, the service container applies a separate Inter-Process Communication (IPC) namespace for each process, preventing shared memory, message queues and pipes.

Optimizations. Besides satisfying these isolation requirements, we also reduce any incurred performance overheads. First, creating a process and loading the data handling code do not depend on the dataset and model. This allows CITADEL++ to create a *pool of sandboxed processes*, and use an already initialized one when needed. Second, we observe that, in each iteration, the updated model from the model updating component needs to be loaded into the data handling component to compute gradients. Because the data handling code is in Python, an interpreted language, this loading in a clean sandboxed process can be slow. We *warm up the code path of the model initialization function* in the data handling code by loading a dummy model at process initialization.

6 Providing Service Integrity

The integrity of CITADEL++ service code is crucial to ensure that the privacy barrier (§4) and sandboxing (§5) mechanisms work as expected. We use CoCo [24] as our underlying framework and enhance its existing integrity properties, so that the CVM running the CITADEL++ service container and the corresponding images are integrity-protected.

6.1 Background: TEE Integrity Protection

Remote attestation [29, 51] allows users to establish trust in a TEE by authenticating the hardware, verifying its state, and checking whether the expected software is running via the cryptographic measurement. In process-level TEEs (e.g., Intel SGX [62]), this measurement refers to the initial code and data loaded into the secure segment of the process’ memory that cannot be modified afterwards. Although integrity

protections provided by process-level TEEs satisfy our requirements regarding the service code integrity, they have significant drawbacks for the sandboxing of potentially malicious code: Any additional code loaded at runtime runs in the same memory with the same privilege as our service code, potentially allowing it to bypass our privacy barrier.

In contrast, VM-level TEEs (e.g., AMD SEV-SNP [7], Intel TDX [63]) can protect entire VMs, creating CVMs, and offer more flexibility to isolate such code. A VM-level TEE’s attestation report measures the initial memory content, typically containing *only* the virtual firmware which then loads the rest of the CVM. Next, the CVM owner can freely use the CVM (e.g., install packages). Any such actions, however, are not reflected in the attestation report, requiring extra mechanisms to protect the integrity of the rest of the CVM [129], especially in an as-a-service scenario using CVMs, where the service provider is not trusted by service users [5, 42].

6.2 CVM Integrity Enhancements

As described previously, the CVM attestation report only encompasses a cryptographic measurement of the CVM’s initial memory content, typically the virtual firmware. Crucial components such as the kernel, `initrd`, and root file system are excluded from this report. Therefore, any malicious alterations to these components after the initial boot (e.g., by a malicious CITADEL++ provider) could compromise the confidentiality and privacy properties that CITADEL++ wants to achieve for its end users (i.e., dataset owners, model owners).

To ensure the *complete* remote attestation of the CVM hosting the CITADEL++ service container, we need to protect the integrity of the CVM at two stages: First, at the initialization stage, we need to ensure that all CVM components are reflected in the attestation report provided by the VM-level TEE. Second, at runtime (i.e., after the boot), we need a mechanism to prevent the runtime access to the CVM.

CVM Initialization. To extend the attestation report to cover all crucial components, we utilize *measured direct boot*, where one component loads and verifies the integrity of the next: The hypervisor uses a pre-configured VM image to launch the CVM. The cryptographic hashes of the kernel, `initrd` and kernel command line parameters are embedded into the virtual firmware, so that these values are reflected in the attestation report generated by the VM-level TEE. During the boot, the virtual firmware loads the kernel, `initrd` and kernel command line, and compares their hashes to the expected values. We only need to protect the service container execution; thus, mount a minimal root file system.

CVM Runtime. In general, CVMs are accessible by their respective owners. In CITADEL++, however, this access puts at risk the confidentiality and privacy of the training session for end users (i.e., dataset owners, model owner). As a result, we need to restrict any access to the CVM after its start. To do so, we utilize an *access policy* that removes all management interfaces (e.g., `ssh`) and only exposes a small set of RPC




Figure 4. CITADEL++ service integrity mechanisms.

endpoints for communication purposes. For instance, the policy can set `ExecProcessRequest` as false to disable the `kubectl exec` commands to login into a container, or embed information about the container image integrity (§6.3). A default policy along with a policy manager is embedded in the `initrd`, whose integrity is covered by the CVM attestation report. Using a default policy allows us to build the `initrd` once and reuse it (e.g., for different components with different container images, for updates to container images). For different training components and container images, we install a different policy at startup. In CITADEL++, during the guest CVM’s startup, the hash of the new policy is reflected in the `HOSTDATA` field of the attestation report generated by the VM-level TEE (Figure 4). Using this information, the policy agent checks and allows only the matching policy to be installed. In addition, using the attestation report, the end users can check the integrity of the installed policies.

6.3 Service Container Image Integrity

Protecting the guest CVM which runs the CITADEL++ service container is necessary but not sufficient. In CoCo, the `containerd`’s `snapshotter` plugin [28] downloads and manages container images on the host, and the appropriate container image is mounted to the guest CVM at its start via shared file systems. This approach allows an untrusted host to manipulate the service container image. A trivial solution is to store and manage the container image directly inside the guest CVM. This solution, however, incurs a large memory footprint and long startup time due to each CVM needing to download the image from a remote registry at every boot.

In CITADEL++, we take an alternative approach (Figure 4). We utilize `dm-verity` [37], a kernel feature providing transparent integrity checking of block devices, and ensuring that the data read from a block device matches the precomputed hash tree. The container image layers are `tarball` files, which we convert via the `tardev-snapshotter` plugin [91, 92] to block devices that `dm-verity` can use. During this conversion, the plugin calculates the hash tree of each image layer and appends it to the block device, with the root hash of the tree embedded into the mount metadata. `dm-verity` and the policy agent in the guest CVM then ensure that only block devices with the correct root hash values are mounted via checking expected values from the installed policy that binds the container image integrity to the attestation report (§6.2).

7 Formal Privacy Analysis

CITADEL++ provides data privacy during and after training via the privacy barrier (§4) that leverages and extends the privacy mechanisms of DP-SGD [1]. Accounting for DP guarantees in DP-SGD can be done via the methods described in [48, 70]. Specifically, the scheme can be seen as an adaptive composition of DP mechanisms (i.e., Gaussian mechanisms and subsampled Gaussian mechanisms). Using the results of [48, 139], this composition can be evaluated using *privacy loss random variables* (PLRVs) determined by the individual mechanisms. The proofs for DP guarantees and details of PLRVs can be found in Appendices A.1 and A.2.

We design three additional differentially private mechanisms for CITADEL++: 1) DP masking, 2) dynamic gradient clipping, and 3) DP noise correction. Privacy leakage of each mechanism is assessed by how much the mechanism’s output changes with a single data item, and this guides the computation of the DP privacy parameters (ϵ, δ) .

DP masking (§4.2). DP masking does not change the final model’s DP guarantees, as the privacy leakage and the noise amount are unchanged from DP-SGD. It simply extends those guarantees even when the model owner and up to $n - 1$ data owners collude (§8.2).

Dynamic Gradient Clipping (§4.3). The histogram aggregation for dynamic gradient clipping is a Gaussian mechanism. During aggregation, changing a single data item changes the count of each of the two histogram bins at most by 1, meaning the L_2 -sensitivity is at most $\sqrt{2}$. This sensitivity and noise scale σ_g are sufficient to compute the DP guarantees of the gradient clipping mechanism, which are combined with the DP-SGD guarantees for the final model.

DP Noise Correction (§4.4). DP guarantees of the noise correction are also those of the Gaussian mechanism for a suitably chosen noise scale. As such, the analysis of the DP-SGD iterations simplifies, because it now corresponds to the analysis of a sequence of Gaussian mechanisms. The proof and results can be found in Appendices A.3 and A.4.

8 System Security Analysis

CITADEL++ addresses threats in collaborative ML training with its usage of VM-level TEEs, as well as its privacy barrier (§4), sandboxing (§5) and integrity (§6) mechanisms. Here, we analyze how these mechanisms address the concerns of dataset owners and model owners.

8.1 Common Concerns

An attacker may want to leak the datasets, and may try to extract the model structure and parameters as well as to learn the training code. The common concern of dataset owners and model owners is the confidentiality of their assets (i.e., datasets, model and training code). In CITADEL++, dataset owners and model owners upload their assets after encryption (§3.3). After attesting the key distribution service

(KDS), they share their decryption keys with the KDS which keeps the keys inside its protected memory. The KDS only shares these keys with the training components after attesting that they run the intended service code with the intended training session configuration, ensuring the datasets, model and training code are only accessed and decrypted by the sandboxed and integrity-protected CITADEL++ components. These CITADEL++ components operate the TEE memory and encrypted disks, shielding the assets from the CITADEL++ provider and cloud provider or other malicious actors.

8.2 Other Concerns of Dataset Owners

Besides dataset confidentiality, dataset owners also care about the privacy of individuals whose data is in the datasets.

Data Reconstruction and Membership Inference. An attacker may observe model updates to infer sensitive training data during training, try to determine whether a specific data item was used in the training, or reverse engineer the model to reconstruct training data. Our privacy barrier adds random DP masks into gradients, which bounds the influence of any single data item and ensures individual data impact remains obscured during and after training. Besides, our sandboxing mechanism enforces the data exchanged between data handling and model updating components flows only through the privacy barrier, such that data privacy is guaranteed even if the model and training code are maliciously designed.

Training Session Manipulation. An attacker may try to leak private data by extending a training session or run multiple training sessions with the same datasets. In CITADEL++, as described in §3.3, the former is prevented by the admin component which enforces the DP privacy budget and stops the training once the budget has been spent; the latter is prevented by the key distribution service (KDS) which discards the datasets’ decryption keys once shared, so that multiple training sessions with the same datasets cannot be run without involving the dataset owners.

Collusion Between Participants. Some dataset owners and model owner may collude to infer others’ data. The DP-masking in our privacy barrier ensures that each individual gradient appears purely random. To get any meaningful result, an attacker has to aggregate all DP-masked gradients, but then the aggregate will be DP-noisy. That means, even if the model owner colludes with up to $n - 1$ dataset owners, the non-colluding dataset owners are still protected with the full DP noise and remain private. Noise correction further prevents attackers from correlating noise across iterations.

Other Attacks. Our sandboxing mechanism enforces appropriate access control (e.g., no network or shared resources, isolated file systems, etc.) and strictly regulates the data exchanged between data handling and model updating components flows only through the privacy barrier. Our integrity mechanism further ensures the privacy barrier and sandboxing mechanisms are integrity-protected and executed as expected. Although these defenses raise the bar significantly




Figure 5. Model accuracy and convergence over time, compared with the non-private baselines.

for covert-, side-channel and physical attacks, CITADEL++ does not completely address them, as stated in our threat model (§2). We note, however, that CITADEL++’ modular design allows the integration of other defenses (e.g., oblivious schemes to defeat the attacks based on timing and memory access patterns [57, 60, 103, 111, 124]).

8.3 Other Concerns of Model Owners

Besides the confidentiality of the model and training code, a model owner also cares about the usefulness of the training. **Model Poisoning.** An attacker may try to inject malicious data or updates to poison the model. The trustworthiness and usefulness of datasets can be efficiently checked via TEEs without violating confidentiality [6], ensuring only authorized datasets are used in training. Dataset decryption keys are bound to the attested TEE components with the agreed training session configuration by the KDS (also protected by a TEE), so that they cannot be altered after uploading.

9 Implementation

We implemented the full CITADEL++ system. The training components (i.e., admin, data handling, model updating) are implemented in 7.5K lines of Python code. Each component is containerized, so that the confidential training session can be deployed in Kubernetes. For service integrity, we used several open-source components: AMD [7] provides the virtual firmware, guest kernel, host kernel and Qemu hypervisor. CoCo [24] provides the container runtime support for VM-level TEEs. We integrated Microsoft’s tardev-snapshotter plugin and policy agent [91, 92] to CoCo to enhance the CVM and container image integrity.

The management and key distribution service (KDS) consist of 2.3K and 1K lines of Python code, respectively. Dataset and model owners can use the Python SDK and GUI to encrypt and upload assets to untrusted cloud storage, upload keys to KDS after attestation, and manage a training session.

10 Evaluation

We evaluated the performance of CITADEL++ along two axes. In §10.1, we report the effects of our privacy barrier mechanism on the ML training (i.e., accuracy, convergence, privacy). In §10.2, we report the performance of our sandboxing and

integrity mechanisms, as well as compare CITADEL++ with the state-of-the-art privacy-preserving training systems.

For our evaluation, we first use a 3-layer MLP model with MNIST dataset (MNIST-MLP3) and a 6-layer CNN model with CIFAR10 dataset (CIFAR10-CNN6), which are widely used to evaluate recent systems for privacy-preserving ML training [83, 94, 95, 105]. It is known that using DP-SGD (today’s *de facto* standard which our privacy barrier is extended upon) for larger models *without pre-training* is undesirable regarding accuracy [38, 68, 73]. Note that, this constraint is due to DP-SGD and is orthogonal to our privacy barrier design; CITADEL++ can benefit from any advancements to DP-SGD accuracy. Nevertheless, to also showcase CITADEL++’s applicability to larger models, instead of doing a full training from scratch, we use a pre-trained 12-layer transformer model, Roberta-base [41], and *fine-tune* it with AG-News dataset [4] (AGNEWS-Roberta-base) with DP guarantees. More details of our evaluation setup can be found in Appendix B.

10.1 Effects of Privacy Barrier

CITADEL++ is designed to ensure that the privacy guarantee of its DP-masking mechanism (§4.2) is the same as the centralized DP-SGD (§4.1). Key differences in CITADEL++ are: 1) it is more attack resistant (§8.2), 2) it has enhancements such as dynamic gradient clipping (§4.3) and DP noise correction (§4.4), and 3) all privacy mechanisms are enforced by our sandboxing and integrity mechanisms.

Model Accuracy & Convergence. Privacy levels defined by the (ϵ, δ) value pair affect the model accuracy, with larger ϵ values representing lower privacy guarantees, and vice versa. To show the trade-off between accuracy and privacy, we train all three models for 1000 iterations with different privacy budgets to compare how models converge at different privacy levels. As expected, Figure 5 shows that models tend to reach higher accuracy with larger ϵ values. In addition, all models have reached or are approaching the accuracy of non-private baselines, showing the effectiveness of our privacy mechanisms.

Figure 5 also shows the model convergence. Here, the noise is adapted to always ensure that the full privacy budget is spent exactly after 1000 iterations. Note that, these plots show the *complete* training: even if some curves indicate the model accuracy could still be improved, the admin




Figure 6. MNIST-MLP3 with dynamic gradient clipping.




Figure 7. Latency per iteration with and without DP dynamic gradient clipping (DP-dyn).

component in CITADEL++ ensures that no further training is allowed because the full privacy budget is spent (§3.3). With a fixed privacy budget, a longer training time (i.e., more iterations) means less privacy budget spent (i.e., more noise) per iteration to maintain the DP guarantee.

Dynamic Gradient Clipping. To show the effect of dynamic gradient clipping (§4.3), we trained the MNIST-MLP3 model with dynamic clipping and the initial clipping bound of 2.0. Figure 6 shows that a clipping bound attempting to dynamically keep 75% or more of the gradients unclipped requires increased noise that actually prevents model convergence, highlighting a trade-off: A larger clipping bound preserves more gradient information but requires more noise to maintain the same DP level, while a smaller clipping bound requires more clipping but adds less noise. Figure 7 shows the latency overhead of dynamic gradient clipping, which is negligible compared with operations like ‘data handling’.

DP Noise Correction. To validate our DP noise correction mechanism (§4.4), we trained a feed-forward model with MNIST dataset using ϵ values corresponding to noise levels σ of 20, 40 and 80, respectively, and the noise correction coefficient $\lambda = 0.7$. As expected, Figure 8 shows that the model performs similar to DP gradient descent without noise correction, but with stronger privacy protections for individual gradients during training (§4.4 and Appendix §A.3).

10.2 System Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the overheads of sandboxing and integrity mechanisms in CITADEL++. We then compare CITADEL++ with the state-of-the-art systems. Finally, we show how GPU TEE acceleration helps improve the performance.




Figure 8. MNIST classification problem and a feed-forward neural network, trained using DP Gradient Descent (DP-GD) with and without DP Noise Correction, $\lambda = 0.7$.

Execution Environment Overhead. Figure 9 shows training latency in different execution environments, with and without integrity protection. CoCo with ‘tardev-snapshotter’ (i.e., CCT-NS and CCT-SB) is 2.9 – 32.0% faster than Kata [67] (i.e., QVM-NS and QVM-SB), because of its pre-allocated memory resources and the VM I/O-friendly block device snapshotter implementation.

Sandboxing Overhead. Inside a sandbox, the overhead comes from three sources: 1) initializing the current iteration’s model (i.e., de/serialization), 2) computing gradients, and 3) returning the gradients to the parent process (i.e., over local network). Sandboxing corresponds to 1.9 – 56.2% of the end-to-end overhead (Figure 9, CCT-SB vs. CCT-NS), depending on the model and batch size.

The relative overhead of sandboxing is smaller with larger models, because more time is spent on computing gradients. For instance, with a batch size of 64, this overhead in MNIST-MLP3, CIFAR10-CNN6 and AGNEWS-Roberta-base is 44.3%, 8.8% and 3.6%, respectively. In addition, larger batches produce more gradients, causing more overhead due to de/serialization and communication. For instance, in CIFAR10-CNN6, batch sizes of 64, 256 and 1024 lead to 8.8%, 11.5% and 18.0% sandboxing overhead, respectively.

Comparison with State-of-the-Art. We compare CITADEL++ with the state-of-the-art privacy-preserving ML training systems: 1) **FL with DP** [1], 2) Crypto-based **Pencil** [83], and 3) TEE-based **Citadel** [134]. For Pencil, we use both CPU and GPU. For Citadel, we adapt its TEE from Intel SGX to AMD SEV-SNP for a fair comparison. Note that, FL with DP has no confidentiality and integrity protections. Citadel cannot protect against collusion between dataset owners and model owners. Furthermore, all these systems cannot guarantee data privacy if the model or training code is maliciously designed; therefore, to gain dataset owners’ trust, they require the model and its training code to be inspectable (i.e., no confidentiality). Nonetheless, these systems make good baselines for performance comparison.

Figure 10 shows the latency per iteration for training the three models. CITADEL++ (CPU) demonstrates comparable performance to FL with DP and Citadel (CPU), but with stronger confidentiality and privacy properties. CITADEL++ (CPU) achieves 7-543 \times speedups over Pencil (CPU). Pencil (GPU) suffers from scaling problems and unsupported model




Figure 9. Latency per iteration for different execution environments. QVM: Kata containers [67], CCT: CoCo with tardev-snapshotter. NS: no sandbox, SB: with sandbox. All evaluations use 12 vCPUs.




Figure 10. Latency per iteration for CITADEL++ and the state-of-the-art systems. Missing bars for Pencil are due to out-of-memory errors (CIFAR10-CNN6 with the batch size of 1024) or unsupported model layers (attention layers in AGNEWS-Roberta-base). All CPU-based evaluations use 12 vCPUs. Citadel++ (GPU) uses 12 vCPUs and 1 H100 GPU in TEE mode.




Figure 11. Latency per iteration for AGNEWS-Roberta-base with CPU only and GPU TEE (H100 in TEE mode). NS: no sandbox, SB: with sandbox. 12/40: number of vCPUs.

layers for larger models and batch sizes, while CITADEL++ (GPU) outperforms Pencil (GPU) up to 113× in other cases. The only exception is for the small MNIST-MLP3 with a small batch size of 64, where CITADEL++ (GPU) is slightly slower. **GPU TEE Acceleration.** Figure 9 shows that, in a training iteration, up to 88.7% of time is spent on computing and applying gradients (i.e., ‘data handling’ and ‘model updating’). These compute-intensive tasks can benefit from accelerators. We integrated NVIDIA H100 GPU TEE [102], and evaluated it with AGNEWS-Roberta-base. As expected, Figure 11 shows that, using a GPU TEE greatly accelerates the training speed. For instance, for a batch size of 128, the latency is reduced

by 93.9% for ‘data handling’ and 96.9% for ‘model updating’ operations (SB-CPU-12 vs. SB-GPU-12), respectively.

11 Related Work

TEEs are widely accepted and deployed in today’s cloud infrastructure [11, 13, 14, 47], and have been recognized as key to safeguarding datasets and models in ML processes [30, 56, 61, 113, 118]. Here, we give an overview of the TEE-based ML training systems, with more systems based on HE and SMPc being mentioned in §1 (due to space limit).

Early work [58, 103] deploys the full ML training task inside one TEE, where it is limited by TEE resources, working only for small datasets and models. To avoid these constraints, one can perform layer-wise partitioning where only some model layers are trained inside TEEs [94, 95]. This practice, however, cannot protect the full model confidentiality.

Recent systems adopt a more distributed architecture. SecureTF [107] is a distributed secure ML framework using TEEs, built for unmodified TensorFlow applications. SecureFL [106] leverages TEEs in an FL scenario to ensure confidentiality and integrity of the FL training process. Papaya [56] uses TEEs to implement secure aggregation to support asynchronous and synchronous FL training that scales to millions of users in production. AWS Clean Rooms ML [30] and Snowflake Data Clean Rooms [113] leverage

TEEs to safeguard proprietary data and ML models, with the help of a look-alike model for data richness.

Citadel [134] is a state-of-the-art collaborative ML training system which aims to protect both dataset and model confidentiality in an untrusted infrastructure. Like CITADEL++, Citadel employs TEEs and applies an FL-style programming paradigm. Unlike CITADEL++, however, Citadel cannot achieve strong DP guarantees for individual user data, cannot use GPUs, and does not have much-needed sandboxing and integrity protections for the *full* confidentiality of datasets, models and training code during collaborative training.

12 Conclusion

CITADEL++ is a collaborative ML training system that simultaneously protects the confidentiality of datasets, models and training code as well as the privacy of individual user data. We achieve these protections via the combination of VM-level TEEs, enhanced DP mechanisms as well as various OS-level sandboxing and integrity mechanisms. In addition, CITADEL++ achieves similar or better privacy and model utility as compared to the standard central DP-SGD mechanisms. Its performance also matches that of non-confidential FL and outperforms the state-of-the-art privacy-preserving training systems by up to two orders of magnitude.

References

- [1] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. 2016. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 308–318.
- [2] Affected Processors: Guidance for Security Issues on Intel Processors . <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/topic-technology/software-security-guidance/processors-affected-consolidated-product-cpu-model.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [3] Nitin Agrawal, Ali Shahin Shamsabadi, Matt J Kusner, and Adrià Gascón. 2019. QUOTIENT: Two-party secure neural network training and prediction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1231–1247.
- [4] AG’s News Topic Classification Dataset . <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/amananandrai/ag-news-classification-dataset>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [5] Istemi Ekin Akkus and Ivica Rimac. 2024. duet: Combining a Trustworthy Controller with a Confidential Computing Environment. In *2024 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*.
- [6] Istemi Ekin Akkus, Ivica Rimac, and Ruichuan Chen. 2024. PaaS: Verifiable Proofs of Property as-a-Service with Intel SGX. In *2024 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW)*.
- [7] AMD Secure Encrypted Virtualization (SEV) . <https://www.amd.com/en/developer/sev.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [8] AMD SEV-SNP: Strengthening VM isolation with integrity protection and more 2020. <https://www.amd.com/content/dam/amd/en/documents/epyc-business-docs/white-papers/SEV-SNP-strengthening-vm-isolation-with-integrity-protection-and-more.pdf>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [9] Galen Andrew, Om Thakkar, Brendan McMahan, and Swaroop Ramaswamy. 2021. Differentially private learning with adaptive clipping. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 17455–17466.
- [10] Yoshinori Aono, Takuya Hayashi, Lihua Wang, Shiho Moriai, and Shiho Moriai. 2017. Privacy-preserving deep learning via additively homomorphic encryption. *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security* 13, 5 (2017), 1333–1345.
- [11] Apple Private Cloud Compute: A new frontier for AI privacy in the cloud . <https://security.apple.com/blog/private-cloud-compute/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [12] Arm Confidential Compute Architecture . <https://www.arm.com/architecture/security-features/arm-confidential-compute-architecture>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [13] AWS Nitro Enclaves . <https://aws.amazon.com/ec2/nitro/nitro-enclaves/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [14] Azure confidential computing . <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/solutions/confidential-compute>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [15] Borja Balle and Yu-Xiang Wang. 2018. Improving the gaussian mechanism for differential privacy: Analytical calibration and optimal denoising. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 394–403.
- [16] Raphael Bost, Raluca Ada Popa, Stephen Tu, and Shafi Goldwasser. 2015. Machine Learning Classification over Encrypted Data. In *Proceedings 2015 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- [17] Justin Brickell, Donald E Porter, Vitaly Shmatikov, and Emmett Witchel. 2007. Privacy-preserving remote diagnostics. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 498–507.
- [18] California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) . <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [19] Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. 2022. Membership inference attacks from first principles. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 1897–1914.
- [20] Harsh Chaudhari, Rahul Rachuri, and Ajith Suresh. 2020. Trident: Efficient 4PC Framework for Privacy Preserving Machine Learning. In *Proceedings 2020 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- [21] Zitai Chen, Georgios Vasilakis, Kit Murdock, Edward Dean, David Oswald, and Flavio D Garcia. 2021. VoltPillager: Hardware-based fault injection attacks against Intel SGX Enclaves using the SVID voltage scaling interface. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 699–716.
- [22] Pau-Chen Cheng, Kevin Eykholt, Zhongshu Gu, Hani Jamjoom, KR Jayaram, Enriquillo Valdez, and Ashish Verma. 2024. DeTA: Minimizing Data Leaks in Federated Learning via Decentralized and Trustworthy Aggregation. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 219–235.
- [23] Confidential Compute on NVIDIA Hopper H100 . <https://images.nvidia.com/aem-dam/en-zz/Solutions/data-center/HCC-Whitepaper-v1.0.pdf>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [24] Confidential Containers . <https://confidentialcontainers.org/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [25] Graeme Connell, Vivian Fang, Rolfe Schmidt, Emma Dauterman, and Raluca Ada Popa. 2024. Secret Key Recovery in a Global-Scale End-to-End Encryption System. In *18th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 24)*. 703–719.
- [26] Confidential Computing Consortium. 2022. Confidential computing: Hardware-based trusted execution for applications and data. *Confidential Computing Consortium Technical Report v1.3* (2022).
- [27] Confidential Computing Consortium. 2022. A Technical Analysis of Confidential Computing. *Confidential Computing Consortium Technical Report v1.3* (2022).
- [28] Containerd snapshotter docs . <https://github.com/containerd/containerd/tree/main/docs/snapshotter>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [29] Victor Costan and Srinivas Devadas. 2016. Intel SGX explained. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2016).

- [30] Data Collaboration Service - AWS Clean Rooms - AWS . <https://aws.amazon.com/clean-rooms/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [31] Data Marketplace - AWS Data Exchange - AWS . <https://aws.amazon.com/data-exchange/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [32] Databricks Marketplace | Databricks . <https://www.databricks.com/product/marketplace>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [33] Datarade | Find the right data, effortlessly . <https://datarade.ai/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [34] Jesse De Meulemeester, Luca Wilke, David Oswald, Thomas Eisenbarth, Ingrid Verbauwhe, and Jo Van Bulck. 2025. BadRAM: Practical Memory Aliasing Attacks on Trusted Execution Environments. In *46th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*.
- [35] DeepSeek . <https://github.com/deepseek-ai>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [36] Sergey Denisov, H Brendan McMahan, John Rush, Adam Smith, and Abhradeep Guha Thakurta. 2022. Improved differential privacy for SGD via optimal private linear operators on adaptive streams. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 5910–5924.
- [37] dm-verity in Linux Kernel . <https://docs.kernel.org/admin-guide/device-mapper/verity.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [38] Friedrich Dörmann, Osvald Frisk, Lars Nørvang Andersen, and Christian Fischer Pedersen. 2021. Not all noise is accounted equally: How differentially private learning benefits from large sampling rates. In *2021 IEEE 31st International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [39] Cynthia Dwork. 2006. Differential privacy. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*.
- [40] EU Artificial Intelligence Act . <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [41] fairseq/examples/Roberta - Facebook Research . <https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq/tree/main/examples/roberta>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [42] Anna Galanou, Khushboo Bindlish, Luca Preibsch, Yvonne-Anne Pignolet, Christof Fetzer, and Rüdiger Kapitza. 2023. Trustworthy confidential virtual machines for the masses. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Middleware Conference*. 316–328.
- [43] Jonas Geiping, Hartmut Bauermeister, Hannah Dröge, and Michael Moeller. 2020. Inverting gradients-how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems (NeurIPS)* 33 (2020), 16937–16947.
- [44] General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) . <https://gdpr-info.eu/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [45] Rafael Genés-Durán, Juan Hernández-Serrano, Oscar Esparza, Marta Bellés-Muñoz, and José Luis Muñoz-Tapia. 2021. DEFS—Data Exchange with Free Sample Protocol. *Electronics* 10, 12 (2021), 1455.
- [46] Rafael Genés-Durán, Oscar Esparza, Juan Hernández-Serrano, Fernando Román-García, Miquel Soriano, Achille Zappa, Martin Serrano, Susanne Stahnke, Birthe Böhm, Edgar Fries, Vasiliki Koniakou, Bruno Michel, and Jose L. Muñoz-Tapia. 2022. Data Marketplaces with a Free Sampling Service. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Services Computing (SCC)*. 333–338. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SCC55611.2022.00055>
- [47] Google Cloud Confidential Computing . <https://cloud.google.com/security/products/confidential-computing>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [48] Sivakanth Gopi, Yin Tat Lee, and Lukas Wutschitz. 2021. Numerical Composition of Differential Privacy. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [49] Thore Graepel, Kristin Lauter, and Michael Naehrig. 2012. ML confidential: Machine learning on encrypted data. In *International conference on information security and cryptology*. Springer, 1–21.
- [50] Marcus Hähnel, Weidong Cui, and Marcus Peinado. 2017. High-Resolution side channels for untrusted operating systems. In *2017 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 17)*. 299–312.
- [51] Vivek Haldar, Deepak Chandra, and Michael Franz. 2004. Semantic remote attestation: A virtual machine directed approach to trusted computing. In *USENIX Virtual Machine Research and Technology Symposium*, Vol. 2004. USENIX Association.
- [52] Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act . <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/index.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [53] Ehsan Hesamifard, Hassan Takabi, Mehdi Ghasemi, and Rebecca N Wright. 2018. Privacy-preserving machine learning as a service. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2018).
- [54] Briland Hitaj, Giuseppe Ateniese, and Fernando Perez-Cruz. 2017. Deep models under the GAN: Information leakage from collaborative deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 603–618.
- [55] Weizhe Hua, Muhammad Umar, Zhiru Zhang, and G Edward Suh. 2022. GuardNN: Secure accelerator architecture for privacy-preserving deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 59th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*. 349–354.
- [56] Dzmityr Huba, John Nguyen, Kshitiz Malik, Ruiyu Zhu, Mike Rabbat, Ashkan Yousefpour, Carole-Jean Wu, Hongyuan Zhan, Pavel Ustinov, Harish Srinivas, Kaikai Wang, Anthony Shoumikhin, Jesik Min, and Mani Malek. 2022. PAPAYA: Practical, Private, and Scalable Federated Learning. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, D. Marculescu, Y. Chi, and C. Wu (Eds.), Vol. 4. 814–832. https://proceedings.mlsys.org/paper_files/paper/2022/file/a8bc4cb14a20f20d1f96188bd61eccc87-Paper.pdf
- [57] Tyler Hunt, Zhipeng Jia, Vance Miller, Ariel Szekely, Yige Hu, Christopher J Roszbach, and Emmett Witchel. 2020. Telekine: Secure computing with cloud GPUs. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 20)*. 817–833.
- [58] Tyler Hunt, Congzheng Song, Reza Shokri, Vitaly Shmatikov, and Emmett Witchel. 2018. Chiron: Privacy-preserving machine learning as a service. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05961* (2018).
- [59] Tyler Hunt, Zhiting Zhu, Yuanzhong Xu, Simon Peter, and Emmett Witchel. 2018. Ryoan: A Distributed Sandbox for Untrusted Computation on Secret Data. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems* (2018).
- [60] Nick Hynes, Raymond Cheng, and Dawn Song. 2018. Efficient deep learning on multi-source private data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06689* (2018).
- [61] Industry Perspectives: The Impact and Future of Confidential Computing . https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bb9NHTJ_Qnk. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [62] Intel Software Guard Extensions (Intel SGX) . <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/products/docs/accelerator-engines/software-guard-extensions.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [63] Intel Trust Domain Extensions (Intel TDX) . <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/tools/trust-domain-extensions/overview.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [64] Simon Johnson, Vinnie Scarlata, Carlos Rozas, Ernie Brickell, and Frank Mckeen. 2016. Intel software guard extensions: EPID provisioning and attestation services. *White Paper* 1, 1–10 (2016), 119.
- [65] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. 2021. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and trends in machine learning* 14, 1–2 (2021), 1–210.
- [66] Or Kamara. 2020. Hack my mis-configured Kubernetes – privileged pods. <https://www.cncf.io/blog/2020/10/16/hack-my-mis-configured-kubernetes-privileged-pods/>.
- [67] Kata Container: a secure container runtime with lightweight virtual machines . <https://katacontainers.io/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [68] Helena Klause, Alexander Ziller, Daniel Rueckert, Kerstin Hamernik, and Georgios Kaissis. 2022. Differentially private training of residual networks with scale normalisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.00324* (2022).

- [69] Jakub Konečný, H Brendan McMahan, Felix X Yu, Peter Richtárik, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Dave Bacon. 2016. Federated learning: Strategies for improving communication efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05492* (2016).
- [70] Antti Koskela, Joonas Jälkö, and Antti Honkela. 2020. Computing Tight Differential Privacy Guarantees Using FFT. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2560–2569.
- [71] Nishat Koti, Arpita Patra, Rahul Rachuri, and Ajith Suresh. 2022. Tetrad: Actively Secure 4PC for Secure Training and Inference. In *Proceedings 2022 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- [72] Alex Krizhevsky. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *University of Toronto* (2009).
- [73] Alexey Kurakin, Shuang Song, Steve Chien, Roxana Geambasu, Andreas Terzis, and Abhradeep Thakurta. 2022. Toward Training at ImageNet scale with Differential Privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.12328* (2022).
- [74] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. 1998. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE* 86, 11 (1998), 2278–2324.
- [75] Dayeol Lee, Dongha Jung, Ian T Fang, Chia-Che Tsai, and Raluca Ada Popa. 2020. An Off-Chip attack on hardware enclaves via the memory bus. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*.
- [76] Sangho Lee, Ming-Wei Shih, Prasun Gera, Taesoo Kim, Hyesoon Kim, and Marcus Peinado. 2017. Inferring fine-grained control flow inside SGX enclaves with branch shadowing. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. 557–574.
- [77] Taegyong Lee, Zhiqi Lin, Saumay Pushp, Caihua Li, Yunxin Liu, Youngki Lee, Fengyuan Xu, Chenren Xu, Lintao Zhang, and Junehwa Song. 2019. Occlumency: Privacy-preserving remote deep-learning inference using SGX. In *The 25th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*. 1–17.
- [78] Mengyuan Li, Luca Wilke, Jan Wichelmann, Thomas Eisenbarth, Radu Teodorescu, and Yanqian Zhang. 2022. A systematic look at ciphertext side channels on AMD SEV-SNP. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 337–351.
- [79] Ping Li, Jin Li, Zhengan Huang, Tong Li, Chong-Zhi Gao, Siu-Ming Yiu, and Kai Chen. 2017. Multi-key privacy-preserving deep learning in cloud computing. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 74 (2017), 76–85.
- [80] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2020. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine* 37, 3 (2020), 50–60.
- [81] Linux Namespace kernel documents . <https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man7/namespaces.7.html>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [82] Bo Liu, Ming Ding, Sina Shaham, Wenny Rahayu, Farhad Farokhi, and Zihuai Lin. 2021. When machine learning meets privacy: A survey and outlook. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 2 (2021), 1–36.
- [83] Xuanqi Liu, Zhuotao Liu, Qi Li, Ke Xu, and Mingwei Xu. 2024. Pencil: Private and Extensible Collaborative Learning without the Non-Colluding Assumption. In *Network and Distributed System Security (NDSS) Symposium*.
- [84] Haohui Mai, Jiacheng Zhao, Hongren Zheng, Yiyang Zhao, Zibin Liu, Mingyu Gao, Cong Wang, Huimin Cui, Xiaobing Feng, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2023. Honeycomb: Secure and Efficient GPU Executions via Static Validation. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 23)*. 155–172.
- [85] Frank McKeen, Ilya Alexandrovich, Alex Berenson, Carlos V Rozas, Hisham Shafi, Vedvyas Shanbhogue, and Uday R Savagaonkar. 2013. Innovative instructions and software model for isolated execution. *Hasp@ isca* 10, 1 (2013).
- [86] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [87] H Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2016. Federated learning of deep networks using model averaging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.05629* 2, 2 (2016).
- [88] Benshan Mei, Saisai Xia, Wenhao Wang, and Dongdai Lin. 2024. Cabin: Confining Untrusted Programs within Confidential VMs. In *International Conference on Information and Communications Security*. Springer, 165–184.
- [89] Meta Llama . <https://llama.meta.com/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [90] Microsoft Azure Attestation . <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/azure-attestation>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [91] Microsoft Confidential Container with Tardev-snapshotter . <https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/blog/linuxandopensourceblog/inside-look-how-azure-linux-powers-confidential-containers-on-aks/3981296>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [92] Microsoft Kata Container . <https://github.com/microsoft/kata-containers>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [93] Ilya Mironov. 2017. Rényi Differential Privacy. In *2017 IEEE 30th Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*. 263–275. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSF.2017.11>
- [94] Fan Mo, Hamed Haddadi, Kleomenis Katevas, Eduard Marin, Diego Perino, and Nicolas Kourtellis. 2021. PPFL: Privacy-preserving federated learning with trusted execution environments. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*. 94–108.
- [95] Fan Mo, Ali Shahin Shamsabadi, Kleomenis Katevas, Soteris Demetriou, Ilias Leontiadis, Andrea Cavallaro, and Hamed Haddadi. 2020. DarkneTZ: Towards model privacy at the edge using Trusted Execution Environments. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*. 161–174.
- [96] Payman Mohassel and Peter Rindal. 2018. ABY3: A mixed protocol framework for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 35–52.
- [97] Payman Mohassel and Yupeng Zhang. 2017. SecureML: A system for scalable privacy-preserving machine learning. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 19–38.
- [98] Kit Murdock, David Oswald, Flavio D Garcia, Jo Van Bulck, Daniel Gruss, and Frank Piessens. 2020. Plundervolt: Software-based fault injection attacks against Intel SGX. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 1466–1482.
- [99] Karthik Nandakumar, Nalini Ratha, Sharath Pankanti, and Shai Halevi. 2019. Towards deep neural network training on encrypted data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition workshops*.
- [100] Milad Nasr, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr. 2019. Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 739–753.
- [101] Lucien KL Ng and Sherman SM Chow. 2023. SoK: Cryptographic neural-network computation. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 497–514.
- [102] NVIDIA Confidential Computing . <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/solutions/confidential-computing/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [103] Olga Ohrimenko, Felix Schuster, Cédric Fournet, Aastha Mehta, Sebastian Nowozin, Kapil Vaswani, and Manuel Costa. 2016. Oblivious Multi-Party machine learning on trusted processors. In *25th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 16)*. 619–636.
- [104] Nicolas Papernot, Andrew Galen, and Steven Chien. 2020. Tensorflow privacy. <https://github.com/tensorflow/privacy>

- [105] Arpita Patra and Ajith Suresh. 2020. BLAZE: Blazing Fast Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. In *Proceedings 2020 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- [106] Do Le Quoc and Christof Fetzer. 2021. SecFL: Confidential federated learning using TEEs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00981* (2021).
- [107] Do Le Quoc, Franz Gregor, Sergei Arnautov, Roland Kunkel, Pramod Bhatotia, and Christof Fetzer. 2020. SecureTF: A Secure TensorFlow Framework. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Middleware Conference*. 44–59.
- [108] Sinem Sav, Apostolos Pyrgelis, Juan Ramón Troncoso-Pastoriza, David Froelicher, Jean-Philippe Bossuat, Joao Sa Sousa, and Jean-Pierre Hubaux. 2021. POSEIDON: Privacy-Preserving Federated Neural Network Learning. In *Proceedings 2021 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- [109] Vinnie Scarlata, Simon Johnson, James Beaney, and Piotr Zmijewski. 2018. Supporting third party attestation for Intel SGX with Intel data center attestation primitives. *White paper* 12 (2018).
- [110] Benedict Schlüter, Supraja Sridhara, Andrin Bertsch, and Shweta Shinde. 2024. WeSee: using malicious #VC interrupts to break AMD SEV-SNP. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 4220–4238.
- [111] Ming-Wei Shih, Sangho Lee, Taesoo Kim, and Marcus Peinado. 2017. T-SGX: Eradicating Controlled-Channel Attacks Against Enclave Programs. In *NDS*, Vol. 6. 15–43.
- [112] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 3–18.
- [113] Snowflake Data Clean Room: Machine Learning . <https://docs.snowflake.com/en/user-guide/cleanrooms/demos/flows/machine-learning>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [114] Snowflake Data Marketplace | Snowflake Data Cloud . <https://www.snowflake.com/en/data-cloud/marketplace/>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [115] David M Sommer, Sebastian Meiser, and Esfandiar Mohammadi. 2019. Privacy Loss Classes: The Central Limit Theorem in Differential Privacy. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2 (2019), 245–269.
- [116] Stability AI Image Models . <https://stability.ai/stable-image>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [117] Adrian Tang, Simha Sethumadhavan, and Salvatore Stolfo. 2017. CLKSCREW: Exposing the perils of Security-Oblivious energy management. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. 1057–1074.
- [118] The Status Quo of Confidential Computing Panel Discussion with AMD, Azure, Intel, & NVIDIA . <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BBpxx5JDmcl>. Accessed: 2025-04-10.
- [119] Han Tian, Chaoliang Zeng, Zhenghang Ren, Di Chai, Junxue Zhang, Kai Chen, and Qiang Yang. 2022. Sphinx: Enabling privacy-preserving online learning over the cloud. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, 2487–2501.
- [120] Florian Tramèr and Dan Boneh. 2018. Slalom: Fast, verifiable and private execution of neural networks in trusted hardware. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03287* (2018).
- [121] Anna Trikalinou and Dan Lake. 2017. Taking DMA attacks to the next level. *BlackHat USA* (2017), 22–27.
- [122] Jo Van Bulck, Marina Minkin, Ofir Weisse, Daniel Genkin, Baris Kasikci, Frank Piessens, Mark Silberstein, Thomas F Wenisch, Yuval Yarom, and Raoul Strackx. 2018. Foreshadow: Extracting the keys to the Intel SGX kingdom with transient Out-of-Order execution. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*. 991–1008.
- [123] Jo Van Bulck, Nico Weichbrodt, Rüdiger Kapitza, Frank Piessens, and Raoul Strackx. 2017. Telling your secrets without page faults: Stealthy page Table-Based attacks on enclaved execution. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. 1041–1056.
- [124] Daan Vanoverloop, Andres Sanchez, Flavio Toffalini, Frank Piessens, Mathias Payer, and Jo Van Bulck. 2025. TLBlur: Compiler-Assisted Automated Hardening against Controlled Channels on Off-the-Shelf Intel SGX Platforms. In *34th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 25)*.
- [125] Kapil Vaswani, Stavros Volos, Cedric Fournet, Antonio Nino Diaz, Ken Gordon, Balaji Vembu, Sam Webster, David Chisnall, Saurabh Kulkarni, Graham Cunningham, Richard Osborne, and Daniel Wilkinson. 2023. Confidential Computing within an AI Accelerator. In *2023 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 501–518. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc23/presentation/vaswani>
- [126] Sameer Wagh, Divya Gupta, and Nishanth Chandran. 2019. SecureNN: 3-party secure computation for neural network training. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* (2019).
- [127] Sameer Wagh, Shruti Tople, Fabrice Benhamouda, Eyal Kushilevitz, Prateek Mittal, and Tal Rabin. 2021. Falcon: Honest-Majority Maliciously Secure Framework for Private Deep Learning. In *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*.
- [128] Zihao Wang, Rui Zhu, Dongruo Zhou, Zhikun Zhang, John Mitchell, Haixu Tang, and Xiaofeng Wang. 2024. DPAdapter: Improving Differentially Private Deep Learning through Noise Tolerance Pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02571* (2024).
- [129] Luca Wilke and Gianluca Scopelliti. 2024. SNPGuard: Remote Attestation of SEV-SNP VMs Using Open Source Tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01186* (2024).
- [130] Xinwei Wu, Li Gong, and Deyi Xiong. 2022. Adaptive differential privacy for language model training. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Federated Learning for Natural Language Processing (FLANLP 2022)*. 21–26.
- [131] Yuanzhong Xu, Weidong Cui, and Marcus Peinado. 2015. Controlled-channel attacks: Deterministic side channels for untrusted operating systems. In *2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 640–656.
- [132] Hongxu Yin, Arun Mallya, Arash Vahdat, Jose M Alvarez, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. 2021. See through gradients: Image batch recovery via gradinversion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 16337–16346.
- [133] Ashkan Yousefpour, Igor Shilov, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Davide Testuggine, Karthik Prasad, Mani Malek, John Nguyen, Sayan Ghosh, Akash Bharadwaj, Jessica Zhao, Graham Cormode, and Ilya Mironov. 2021. Opacus: User-Friendly Differential Privacy Library in PyTorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12298* (2021).
- [134] Chengliang Zhang, Junzhe Xia, Baichen Yang, Huancheng Puyang, Wei Wang, Ruichuan Chen, Istemi Ekin Akkus, Paarijaat Aditya, and Feng Yan. 2021. Citadel: Protecting data privacy and model confidentiality for collaborative learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*. 546–561.
- [135] Shixuan Zhao, Pinshen Xu, Guoxing Chen, Mengya Zhang, Yinqian Zhang, and Zhiqiang Lin. 2023. Reusable enclaves for confidential serverless computing. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 4015–4032.
- [136] Ziqiao Zhou, Weiteng Chen, Sishuai Gong, Chris Hawblitzel, Weidong Cui, et al. 2024. VeriSMo: A verified security module for confidential VMs. In *18th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 24)*. 599–614.
- [137] Ligeng Zhu, Zhijian Liu, and Song Han. 2019. Deep leakage from gradients. *Advances in neural information processing systems (NeurIPS)* 32 (2019).
- [138] Ruofan Zhu, Ganhao Chen, Wenbo Shen, Xiaofei Xie, and Rui Chang. 2025. My Model is Malware to You: Transforming AI Models into Malware by Abusing TensorFlow APIs. In *Proceedings of the 2025 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*. IEEE, IEEE.

[139] Yuqing Zhu, Jinshuo Dong, and Yu-Xiang Wang. 2022. Optimal Accounting of Differential Privacy via Characteristic Function. *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (2022).

Appendix

A Differential Privacy Analysis

A.1 Background: Gaussian Mechanism and DP Accounting

In a DP ML training process, each gradient leaks some information about the training dataset. DP-SGD includes a privacy accounting scheme which tracks the total (ϵ, δ) -privacy loss over multiple iterations of the training process and ensures that the total cumulative effect of all successive gradient updates still satisfies the desired privacy guarantees.

In the basic case of full-batch gradient training, the privacy loss of DP-SGD is that of the Gaussian mechanism, where the randomized function \mathcal{M} is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}(X) = f(X) + Z,$$

where $f : \mathcal{X}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$, where σ denotes the noise scale parameter. Denote the sensitivity of the function f by

$$\Delta = \max_{X \simeq X'} \|f(X) - f(X')\|_2,$$

where $X \simeq X'$ denotes that X' is obtained from X by a change of a single data entry (similar to the neighboring datasets definition from §4.1). Then, \mathcal{M} is (ϵ, δ) -DP for $\delta(\epsilon)$ given by

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \Phi\left(-\frac{\epsilon\sigma}{\Delta} + \frac{\Delta}{2\sigma}\right) - e^\epsilon \Phi\left(-\frac{\epsilon\sigma}{\Delta} - \frac{\Delta}{2\sigma}\right), \quad (1)$$

where Φ denotes the CDF of the standard univariate Gaussian distribution [15]. The bound (1) for the Gaussian mechanism is tight, meaning that there is no $\delta' < \delta$ such that the mechanism would be (ϵ, δ') -DP. When we apply a Gaussian mechanism with sensitivity Δ and noise scale σ for T times (e.g., T iterations of DP-SGD will full data at each iteration), the privacy guarantee is given by Eq. (1) with Δ replaced by $\sqrt{T}\Delta$ [115].

For more complex mechanisms such as DP-SGD with random mini-batches, analytical formulas such as (1) do not exist, and one has to employ *privacy accounting*. The so-called Rényi Differential Privacy (RDP) [1, 93] was the first approach to accurately compute the privacy bounds for DP-SGD, and it is implemented in frameworks such as Opacus [133] and Tensorflow Privacy [104]. RDP has certain inherent inaccuracy and commonly still slightly overestimates the ϵ -values. Recently, so-called numerical accounting methods [48, 70, 139] have been proposed which give tight ϵ -bounds for several methods including DP-SGD. These are based on so-called privacy loss random variables.

A.2 DP Accounting Using Privacy Loss Random Variables

We can generally find (ϵ, δ) -bounds for DP mechanisms by analysing so-called dominating pairs of distributions:

Definition 1 ([139]). *A pair of distributions (P, Q) is a dominating pair of distributions for mechanism \mathcal{M} if for all $\alpha \geq 0$,*

$$\max_{X \sim X'} H_\alpha(\mathcal{M}(X) || \mathcal{M}(X')) \leq H_\alpha(P || Q),$$

where $H_\alpha(\cdot || \cdot)$ denotes the hockey-stick divergence, i.e., for distributions P and Q ,

$$H_\alpha(P || Q) = \int [P(t) - \alpha \cdot Q(t)]_+ dt.$$

When evaluating the privacy guarantees of DP-SGD iterations and Gaussian mechanisms we know exactly the dominating pairs of distributions in both cases [139], and their compositions can be evaluated accurately using the methods presented in [48, 70] via mature software implementations such as that of Opacus [133].

Having dominating pairs of distributions for each individual mechanism in a composition, the hockey-stick divergence can be transformed into a more easily computable form by using the privacy loss random variables (PLRVs). PLRV for a pair of distributions (P, Q) is defined as follows.

Definition 2. *Let $P(t)$ and $Q(t)$ be probability density functions. We define the PLRV $Y_{P/Q}$ as*

$$Y_{P/Q} = \log \frac{P(t)}{Q(t)}, \quad t \sim P(t),$$

where $t \sim P(t)$ means that t is distributed according to $P(t)$.

The $\delta(\epsilon)$ -bounds can be stated using the following representation that involves the PLRV.

Theorem 1 ([48]). *We have:*

$$H_{e^\epsilon}(P || Q) = \mathbb{E}_{Y_{P/Q}} [1 - e^{\epsilon - Y_{P/Q}}]_+, \quad (2)$$

Moreover, by the results of [48] and [139] we have the following result for an adaptive composition of DP mechanisms.

Theorem 2 ([48, 139]). *In case of an adaptive composition of T mechanisms $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_T$, where each mechanism \mathcal{M}_i , $i \in [T]$, has a dominating pair of distributions (P_i, Q_i) , the total DP guarantees $(\epsilon, \delta(\epsilon))$ are given by the expression*

$$\mathbb{E}_Y [1 - e^{\epsilon - Y}]_+,$$

where $Y = Y_1 + \dots + Y_T$ and each Y_i is a PLRV determined by the dominating pair of distributions (P_i, Q_i) , respectively.

The DP-SGD privacy accounting can be seen as an adaptive composition of DP mechanisms (e.g., Gaussian mechanisms or subsampled Gaussian mechanisms), each with independent randomness. Therefore, these compositions can be evaluated using PLRVs determined by the individual mechanisms, i.e., using Theorem 2.

We also get from Theorem 2 the following theorem for privacy accounting of DP-SGD combined with dynamic gradient clipping.

Theorem 3. Consider a model training with T iterations of DP-SGD with noise scale σ and subsampling ratio q (batch size divided by the total dataset size) and suppose there are in total n_g noisy aggregations of the histograms for gradient clipping, each with the noise parameter σ_g . Then, for the final model, an (ϵ, δ) -upper bound is given by the expression

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \mathbf{E}_Y[1 - e^{\epsilon - Y}]_+, \quad (3)$$

where $[z]_+ = \max\{z, 0\}$ and the random variable

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^T Y_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \tilde{Y}_i,$$

where each random variable Y_i is a PLRV of DP-SGD for the parameters σ and q and each random variable \tilde{Y}_i is a PLRV of the Gaussian mechanism for the parameter σ_g .

We remark that the privacy guarantees of the expression given in Theorem 3 can be readily evaluated using the implementation of the numerical accounting given in Opacus library.

A.3 DP Analysis for Error Correction

A.3.1 Proof of Error Correction Formula. As stated in §4.4, assuming that the admin component computed private noise $\xi_t, \xi_{t+1} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 C^2 \mathbf{I})$ during training round t , we then compute the noise to be added at time $t + 1$ as $\xi_{t+1} - \lambda \cdot \xi_t$, where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. This technique removes the noise added at time t by subtracting it at time $t + 1$. Because this value is computed inside the admin component, an attacker cannot know which part of the noise visible at $t + 1$ comes from ξ_{t+1} and which part comes from subtracting the previous noise, thus this technique does not leak the value $\lambda \xi_t$. For $i = 1$, the output is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_1(X) = \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) + \xi_1, \quad (4)$$

and for $i > 1$, the subsequent outputs (subsequent randomized mechanisms) are of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_i(X) = \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_{i-1}) + \xi_i - \lambda \cdot \xi_{i-1}, \quad (5)$$

where $\xi_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2 C^2 \mathbf{I})$, and ξ_i 's are mutually independent. In our case, the function $f(x, t)$ corresponds to the gradient of the loss function evaluated at data point x and model t , and t_i 's denote the model weights at iteration i , obtained using the outputs $\mathcal{M}_j(X)$, $j \leq i$. t_0 is a some random initialization of the model weights.

If we repeatedly would call the function \mathcal{M}_1 , in total T times (e.g., the plain DP gradient descent training with T

iterations), then the δ as a function of ϵ from section A.1 is given by

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \Phi\left(-\frac{\epsilon\sigma}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2\sigma}\right) - e^\epsilon \Phi\left(-\frac{\epsilon\sigma}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2\sigma}\right). \quad (6)$$

For the corrected formula we can derive the following DP guarantee.

Theorem 4. Consider the sequence of mechanisms $\mathcal{M}(X) = (\mathcal{M}_1(X), \dots, \mathcal{M}_T(X))$, where each \mathcal{M}_i is a randomized mechanism as described in Eq. (4) and (5), where $0 < \lambda < 1$. Without loss of generality, suppose the function f has sensitivity 1. Then, for the DP analysis of the correction formula, an (ϵ, δ) -upper bound is given by the expression

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \Phi\left(-\frac{\epsilon\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2\tilde{\sigma}}\right) - e^\epsilon \Phi\left(-\frac{\epsilon\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2\tilde{\sigma}}\right), \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma} = (1 - \lambda) \cdot \sigma$.

Proof. We may write for \mathcal{M}_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_2(X) &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \xi_2 - \lambda \cdot \xi_1 \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) + \xi_2 \\ &\quad - \lambda \left(\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) + \xi_1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) + \xi_2 - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{M}_1(X). \end{aligned}$$

We see that analyzing $\mathcal{M}_2(X)$ is equivalent to analyzing

$$\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) + \xi_2$$

since $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ was already released (post-processing, does not affect the DP guarantees). We also see that the sensitivity of the deterministic part

$$\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0)$$

is $(1 + \lambda)$. Continuing, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_3(X) &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_2) + \xi_3 - \lambda \cdot \xi_2 \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_2) + \xi_3 - \lambda \cdot \left(\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{M}_1(X) + \xi_2 \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda^2 \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) - \lambda^2 \cdot \mathcal{M}_1(X) \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_2) + \xi_3 - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{M}_2(X) \\ &\quad + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda^2 \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) - \lambda^2 \cdot \mathcal{M}_1(X). \end{aligned}$$

We see that analyzing $\mathcal{M}_3(X)$ is equivalent to analyzing

$$\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_2) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda^2 \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0) + \xi_3,$$

since $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{M}_2(X)$ were already released (post-processing). We also see that the deterministic term

$$\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_2) + \lambda \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_1) + \lambda^2 \cdot \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_0)$$

has sensitivity $1 + \lambda + \lambda^2$.

We see the pattern and show the general case by induction. Suppose, $\mathcal{M}_i(X)$, $i \geq 3$, is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_i(X) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda^j \left(\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_{i-1-j}) \right) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \lambda^j \mathcal{M}_{i-j} + \xi_i. \quad (8)$$

Then, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{i+1}(X) &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_i) + \xi_{i+1} - \lambda \xi_{i-1} \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_i) + \xi_{i+1} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-2} \lambda^{j+1} \cdot \left(\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_{i-2-j}) \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} \lambda^{j+1} \mathcal{M}_{i-1-j} - \lambda \cdot \mathcal{M}_{i-1}(X) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^i \lambda^j \left(\sum_{x \in X} f(x, t_{i-j}) \right) - \sum_{j=1}^i \lambda^j \mathcal{M}_{i+1-j} + \xi_{i+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

i.e., (8) really holds.

By the reasoning above, the analysis of $\mathcal{M}_i(X)$ is equivalent to analysis of Gaussian mechanism with noise variance σ^2 and sensitivity $\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda^j$, since the term $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \lambda^j \mathcal{M}_{i-j}$ is simply the output of previously released mechanisms and can be discarded.

So, for large i , the sensitivity of the deterministic part is

$$\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda^j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^j = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}.$$

Thus, we get an upper bound for the (ϵ, δ) -DP guarantee by considering a composition of T Gaussian mechanisms, each with sensitivity $\frac{1}{1-\lambda}$ and noise scale σ . Then, using the formula (6), we arrive at the result. \square

Because the DP guarantees of the noise correction are also those of the Gaussian mechanism for a suitably chosen noise scale parameter, we can apply Theorem 5 to state the following privacy accounting in noise correction:

Theorem 5. Consider a model training where we have T noise correction training steps $(\mathcal{M}_1(X), \dots, \mathcal{M}_T(X))$, where each \mathcal{M}_i is a randomized mechanism, where $0 < \lambda < 1$, and

suppose there are in total n_g aggregation steps. Then, for the final model, an (ϵ, δ) -upper bound is given by the expression

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \Phi \left(-\epsilon \sigma_{\text{total}} + \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\text{total}}} \right) - e^\epsilon \Phi \left(-\epsilon \sigma_{\text{total}} - \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\text{total}}} \right), \quad (10)$$

where Φ denotes the CDF of the standard univariate Gaussian distribution, $\sigma_{\text{total}} = \sqrt{\frac{T}{\sigma^2} + \frac{n_g}{\sigma_g^2}}$ denotes the standard deviation of the resulting PLRV and $\tilde{\sigma} = (1 - \lambda) \cdot \sigma$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 5 follows directly from Theorem 2 above. The analytical expression of Theorem 5 follows from the fact that the PLRV for the Gaussian mechanism with noise scale σ and L_2 -sensitivity Δ is distributed as $\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{\Delta^2}{2\sigma^2}, \frac{\Delta^2}{\sigma^2} \right)$ [115] and from the fact that the means and variance in the sums of Gaussian random variables sum up, and by plugging in the resulting Gaussian random variable in the formula (3). The analytical form of Eq. (10) for a Gaussian PLRV with noise variance σ_{total}^2 is shown, e.g., in [15, 115]. \square

A.3.2 Comparison of Total Amount of Injected Noise: With and Without Noise Correction. Each DP gradient descent update is of the form

$$\theta_{i+1} = \theta_i - \eta \cdot \frac{1}{|X|} \left(\sum_{x \in X} \tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(x, \theta_i) + \xi_i \right) \quad (11)$$

where θ_i denotes the model parameter vector at iteration i , X denotes the dataset, $|X|$ the dataset size, and $\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f$'s the clipped sample-wise gradients, and $\xi_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 C^2)$ is the DP noise, where C denotes the clipping bound (i.e., $\|\tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(x, \theta_i)\|_2 \leq C$ for all x , due to clipping).

Assume, without loss of generality, that $C = 1.0$ (otherwise we can scale σ). If we run DP gradient descent (DP-GD) (11) for T iterations, we see that the total amount of noise we inject in the model is

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{i=1}^T \xi_i \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{T \cdot \sigma^2}{|X|^2} \mathbf{I} \right) \quad (12)$$

DP-GD with the correction is of the form

$$\theta_{i+1} = \theta_i - \eta \cdot \frac{1}{|X|} \left(\sum_{x \in X} \tilde{\nabla}_\theta f(x, \theta_i) + \xi_i - \lambda \cdot \xi_{i-1} \right) \quad (13)$$

and we see that after T iterations the total amount of noise injected in the model is approximately

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{i=1}^T (1 - \lambda) \cdot \xi_i \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{T \cdot (1 - \lambda)^2 \cdot \sigma^2}{|X|^2} \mathbf{I} \right). \quad (14)$$

We see that when using the noise correction with the scaled noise $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma \cdot (1 - \lambda)$, we get both equal privacy guarantees (Thm. 5 vs. Eq. (6)) and an equal amount of injected noise (Eq. (12) vs. Eq. (14)). as when using DP-GD with noise scale $\tilde{\sigma}$. Thus, we may expect a similar privacy-utility ratio for both DP gradient descent and DP-GD with noise correction.




Figure 12. MNIST classification problem and a two hidden layers feedforward neural network, trained using the DP Gradient Descent and using the DP Gradient Descent with Noise Correction

Figure 12 shows the performance of the error correction mechanism on the model presented in 10.1 with $\lambda = 0.7$ and $\lambda = 0.9$. We observe that the model utility remains very similar to no-error correction training with $\lambda = 0.7$, while it slightly degrades with large noise correction.

Some inaccuracy arise with large noise correction, when the model used to compute the updates, which has received noise ξ_{i-1} , and the corrected model after the next iteration, which has received noise $(1 - \lambda)\xi_{i-1}$, differ significantly, i.e., when the correction is so large that the computed model update is no longer valid for the corrected model.

Figure 13 illustrates the increased privacy protection for sequences of updates (of different lengths), when $\lambda = 0.7$ and $\lambda = 0.9$ respectively, computed using the equations derived in Appendix A.3.3.

A.3.3 DP Guarantees for Bounded-Length Sequences of Updates Using Noise Correction. We next analyze how the correction scheme improves the DP protection of individual updates and sequences of subsequent updates, when compared to the plain DP gradient descent.

Let $\sigma > 0$ be the noise scale. If the adversary obtains n subsequent updates, it essentially obtains a vector

$$\begin{bmatrix} f_1(X) + \xi_1 \\ f_2(X) + \xi_2 - \lambda \cdot \xi_1 \\ f_3(X) + \xi_3 - \lambda \cdot \xi_2 \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X) + \xi_n - \lambda \cdot \xi_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

where each function $f_i(X)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, has sensitivity 1 (without loss of generality), and each $\xi_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$.

We can also write Eq. (15) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} f_1(X) \\ f_2(X) \\ f_3(X) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & & & & \\ -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & & & \\ & -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \\ \xi_3 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_n \end{bmatrix}$$

DP guarantees are both multiplicative and translation-invariant, allowing us to multiply the output vector from the

left with any invertible matrix. Multiplying with

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & & & & \\ -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & & & \\ & -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & & & & \\ \lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & & & \\ \lambda^2 \mathbf{I} & \lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \lambda^{n-1} \mathbf{I} & \dots & \dots & \lambda \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

from the left, we see that we may analyze the vector

$$\begin{bmatrix} f_1(X) \\ f_2(X) + \lambda \cdot f_1(X) \\ f_3(X) + \lambda \cdot f_2(X) + \lambda^2 \cdot f_1(X) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(X) + \dots + \lambda^{n-1} \cdot f_1(X) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \\ \xi_3 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (17)$$

Analyzing (17) is equivalent to analysing a Gaussian mechanism with noise variance σ^2 and sensitivity bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + (1 + \lambda)^2 + (1 + \lambda + \lambda^2)^2 + \dots \\ & \quad (1 + \lambda + \dots + \lambda^{n-1})^2)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} (1 + \lambda + \dots + \lambda^\ell)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1 - \lambda^{\ell+1}}{1 - \lambda} \right)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{n(1 - \lambda^2) - \lambda(1 - \lambda^n)(2 + \lambda - \lambda^{n+1})}{(1 - \lambda)^3(\lambda + 1)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

When analyzing the vector (15), we have assumed that the adversary obtains the first n updates. In case the adversary obtains a sequence of n subsequent updates that do not include the first update, there will be an additional $-\lambda Z$ noise term in the first update, and, by the data-processing inequality the guarantees derived here give an upper bound then as well.

Using the calculated sensitivity of Eq. (18), we can analyze how well the bounded-length sequences of subsequent updates are protected using the noise correction as compared to the vanilla DP Gradient Descent (Figure 13).




Figure 13. ϵ values for sequences of subsequent updates for the DP Gradient Descent with and without noise correction, $\delta = 10^{-5}$.

A.4 Noise Correction as a Matrix Mechanism

The proposed noise correction given in Eq. (4) and Eq. (5) can also be seen as a so-called matrix mechanism [36]. These mechanisms are defined by matrices $A, B, C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $A = BC$, and are of the form

$$\widetilde{Ax} = B(Cx + Z),$$

where the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is called the workload matrix, B the decoder matrix and C the encoder matrix. Here the rows of the matrix $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ correspond in our case to the model gradients and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is appropriately scaled isotropic Gaussian noise.

Writing

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} f(x, t_0)^T \\ f(x, t_1)^T \\ \vdots \\ f(x, t_{n-1})^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1^T \\ \xi_2^T \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{n-1}^T \end{bmatrix},$$

we see that n steps of the error correction formula can be written as a matrix mechanism $B(Cx + Z)$ for

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ -\lambda & 1 & & & \\ & -\lambda & 1 & & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & & -\lambda & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = B^{-1},$$

where the matrix inverse B^{-1} is given in Eq. (16).

B Evaluation Setup

Testbed Configuration. For system performance evaluation using CPU TEEs, we deploy AMD SEV-SNP VMs on an AMD server equipped with an AMD EPYC 7763 64-Core (128 vCPUs) processor operating at 3.5GHz. Each AMD SEV-SNP VM is configured with 12 vCPUs and 64GB of memory. As we do not have bare-metal access to local servers with NVIDIA H100 GPUs, we set up a cloud evaluation cluster on Azure to assess the system performance with GPU TEE acceleration. This cluster consists of 6 nodes: one CVM with

32 vCPUs and 128 GB of memory, and five CVMs each featuring 40 vCPUs, 300GB of memory, and one H100 GPU in TEE mode. The bandwidth between Azure CVM and H100 GPU is approximately 8 GB/s due to the GPU traffic encryption/decryption [23].

Workloads. We evaluate the following three models:

- **MLP3:** A three-layer MLP model suitable for simple tasks like MNIST, though small in size. This model is trained over the MNIST dataset [74], which contains 70K grayscale images (60K for training, 10K for testing) of handwritten digits (0–9), each 28×28 pixels.
- **CNN6:** A six-layer CNN model, commonly used in differential privacy experiments [119]. This model is trained over the CIFAR-10 dataset [72], which contains 60K RGB images (50K for training, 10K for testing) of objects in ten categories (e.g., airplane, automobile, bird), each 32×32 pixels.
- **Roberta-base:** A pre-trained large language model with 12 transformer layers [41]. Dataset is AG-News [4], which is constructed by assembling titles and description fields of articles from the 4 largest classes (“World”, “Sports”, “Business”, “Sci/Tech”) of AG’s Corpus and has 120K training samples and 7.6K testing samples.

We trained the MLP3 and CNN6 models from scratch using the batch sizes of 64, 256, and 1024 per worker (i.e., data handling component), and different numbers of iterations ranging from 100 to 5000, with a learning rate of 0.01. We fine-tuned the Roberta-base model with LoRA using the batch sizes of 32, 64, and 128 per worker, and different numbers of iterations ranging from 1000 to 2500, with a learning rate of 0.01. We launched one admin, one model handling, and four data handling components for our experiments.