Trustworthy ML Reading Group

31 Jan 2024

About Us

- Focus on technical and non-technical works
 - Work can be your own or others
- Modeled loosely on <u>ML Collective</u> groups
 - Focus on informal and interdisciplinary work
- Meetings are meant to be informal and accessible for different experience levels
- Ask "stupid questions"
 - Explore your own ideas and get critical feedback

About Us

- Go deep!
 - Since we have similar interests, it is very helpful to be as technical as needed to explain an idea
- We are fully collaborative. Papers discussions are meant to be shared among members

Conduct

- From Ethos of MLC...
 - <u>https://mlcollective.org/wiki/code-of-conduct/</u>
- Highlights
 - Expectation of Confidentiality
 - Reporting -> send me a direct message

Happening Today



Machine Unlearning

Bourtoule, L., Chandrasekaran, V., Choquette-Choo, C. A., Jia, H., Travers, A., Zhang, B.,
Lie, D., & Papernot, N. (2019, December
9). *Machine unlearning*.
arXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.03817.
IEEE S&P

Motivations

- Aspects of Data Governance
 - Security, availability, integrity
 - Data should remain consistent
 - Must comply with Laws (e.g., GDPR, CA Consumer Privacy Act, etc.)
- GDPR's provides data subject rights provide legal basis and motivation for Trustworthy Al systems



Source: https://dataprivacymanager.net/what-are-data-subject-rights-according-to-the-gdpr/

Motivations

- Naïve Approaches to "the Right to Forget":
 - Retrain model from scratch
 - Train model in increments, use saved parameters as "check points"
- Both approaches may result in a long time to unlearn data points
- "The Right to Forget" produces large time overhead
 - ^a key critique from people (e.g., Google)

Problem

- Online Learning
 - A machine learning model is continually updated
 - Individuals reserve the right to have data deleted (EU GDPR, CCPA)
 - ML models make are complicated due to:
 - Memorization
 - Black-box nature

Problem

• ... Unlearning guarantees that training on a point and unlearning it afterwards will produce the same distribution of models that not training on the point at all, in the first place, would have produced

Approach

- Sharded Isolated Sliced Aggregated training Key point: Limit the influence of individual data points. Train model in increments
- Models are trained on separate shards. An aggregation mechanism outputs the popular prediction

Approach

- Data is split into disjoint groups (shards).
- Models are trained on Disjoint shards. Information is not shared among shards. Shards can further divided into slices (batch like)
- Key Idea: multiple checkpoints may be saved within a shard. We can start from closest checkpoint not including the data to unlearn



Interesting

• Approach is similar to mixture of experts model



Problems to Consider

- "Weak Learners"
 - Training on small datasets hurts complex tasks
- Generalization ability of model
- Tradeoffs
 - Accuracy vs Time (to retrain)
 - Small Shards and Complex Learning Tasks
 - How to verify unlearning to end-users
 - External auditing
 - Core Question: How much do individual points influence a model?

Personal Takeaways

- Affirms that privacy should not be "one size fits all"
 - E.g. Reiterates that Differential privacy can't solve all privacy problems
- I like that they consider solution scalability (e.g., simple and complex tasks)
- They are vocal about using an iterative design. They are very transparent on their research approach
- Practicality vs Novelty

Read more

- Y. Cao and J. Yang, "Towards making systems forget with machine unlearning," in 2015 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. IEEE, 2015, pp. 463–480. [Online]. Available: <u>https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7163042/</u>
- Papernot, Nicolas et al. "Scalable Private Learning with PATE." ArXiv abs/1802.08908 (2018): n. pag.
- A. Ginart, M. Y. Guan, G. Valiant, and J. Zou, "Making Al forget you: Data deletion in machine learning," CoRR, vol. abs/1907.05012, 2019. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.05012