

# Cohere: Managing Differential Privacy in Large Scale Systems

Nicolas Küchler<sup>1</sup>, Emanuel Opel<sup>1</sup>, Hidde Lycklama<sup>1</sup>, Alexander Viand<sup>2</sup>, Anwar Hithnawi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ETH Zurich <sup>2</sup>Intel Labs

**Abstract**—The need for a privacy management layer in today’s systems started to manifest with the emergence of new systems for privacy-preserving analytics and privacy compliance. As a result, many independent efforts have emerged that try to provide system support for privacy. Recently, the scope of privacy solutions used in systems has expanded to encompass more complex techniques such as Differential Privacy (DP). The use of these solutions in large-scale systems imposes new challenges and requirements. Careful planning and coordination are necessary to ensure that privacy guarantees are maintained across a wide range of heterogeneous applications and data systems. This requires new solutions for managing and allocating scarce and non-replenishable privacy resources. In this paper, we introduce Cohere, a new system that simplifies the use of DP in large-scale systems. Cohere implements a unified interface that allows heterogeneous applications to operate on a unified view of users’ data. In this work, we further address two pressing system challenges that arise in the context of real-world deployments: ensuring the continuity of privacy-based applications (i.e., preventing privacy budget depletion) and effectively allocating scarce shared privacy resources (i.e., budget) under complex preferences. Our experiments show that Cohere achieves a 6.4–28x improvement in utility compared to the state-of-the-art across a range of complex workloads.

## 1. Introduction

Recent years have seen an exponential increase in the amount of sensitive user data that organizations collect. However, this accumulation leaves users vulnerable to privacy violations and data abuse [30], [32], [74]. This has raised societal concerns and led to a shift in public perception as well as an increase in regulatory demands to protect personal data [1], [4]. Ensuring compliance with new data privacy regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), introduces a variety of challenges for today’s data systems [89], [90], [91]. Additionally, a shift in general expectations of digital privacy has induced a demand for privacy-enhancing solutions that can protect sensitive data while retaining its value. The adoption of these solutions into current systems introduces further unique challenges. Privacy requirements sometimes fundamentally conflict with conventional systems’ design goals such as optimizing for availability, performance, and scalability. This further com-

plicates the integration of privacy solutions into existing systems [90]. The complexity of managing and integrating privacy into existing large-scale systems has spurred the development of numerous frameworks and tools that simplify both compliance with privacy regulations and the development of privacy-focused applications. More generally, a new domain of ‘Privacy Engineering’ is emerging to answer these new requirements. Tools such as data tagging for personally identifiable information (PII) [64], data cataloging and lineage [8], or privacy transformations [2], have made it easier for organizations to enforce compliance and develop privacy-focused technologies and practices. Recently, the scope of privacy-enhancing solutions has expanded alongside a demand for more rigorous privacy risk management.

Differential Privacy (DP) [41] is widely recognized as the gold standard for protecting personal information and provides a mathematically rigorous definition of privacy. It allows data to be processed and released while minimizing the risk of re-identification for individual users. DP is rapidly evolving from academic theory to real-world deployment in large-scale systems [19], [22], [23], [38], [80]. Today, DP is widely used in a variety of settings, including the US Census [96], and in user data collection at Apple [3]. The use of DP is expected to grow even further [12], [37]. While there has been significant work on the theoretical and technical aspects of DP, scant attention has been paid to the practical challenges of deploying DP-based solutions in complex, real-world systems.

**Differential Privacy Systems Challenges.** The complexity of using DP has led to a flurry of frameworks and libraries that focus on integrating DP into existing data frameworks and algorithms. Examples include TensorFlow Privacy [44], Tumult Analytics [15], and DP-SGD [18]. However, these focus primarily on improving the development experience for individual applications and ignore the complexities and challenges that arise when using DP in larger systems. In large-scale systems, careful planning and coordination are required to ensure that privacy guarantees are maintained across a wide range of heterogeneous applications and data systems. This raises new challenges in managing shared, scarce, and non-replenishable differentially private resources. Without careful management, DP can quickly become excessively restrictive. As DP matures and its adoption continues to increase, these deployment issues are rapidly moving to the foreground.

The community has recently acknowledged the crucial role of system infrastructure for DP in driving its adoption [34]. However, existing frameworks for DP fall short in this, as they generally only offer support for individual (types of) applications. While we can deploy multiple such frameworks in parallel, this requires making non-collusion assumptions that might be hard to justify in practice. Recent work by Luo et al. [65] was the first to recognize the need for managing privacy resources for workloads of machine learning pipelines in a unified way. They proposed a dedicated privacy resource scheduling algorithm that operates alongside a cluster hardware scheduler (i.e., Kubernetes). While this is an important first step in terms of addressing the lack of privacy management tailored to DP in current systems, their approach does not generalize well to broader organizational privacy management needs. In order to address these needs, we need to consider large-scale systems featuring a wide variety of independent applications. These must be coordinated and controlled in a centralized and unified manner to ensure the privacy of the entire system. Organizations require proactive control of how their privacy resources are distributed and utilized, taking into account applications’ relative priorities and ensuring that they can be easily integrated into existing data architectures.

In this paper, we present Cohere, a privacy management system designed to facilitate the operation of DP solutions in large-scale systems. Cohere addresses the above challenges via a new end-to-end DP platform design. Concretely, our work focuses on addressing the following challenges:

**① Unified System Architecture for Privacy.** Achieving a global DP guarantee across multiple systems necessitates a comprehensive view of data with consistent and accurate user association. Fortunately, other essential aspects of modern data systems, such as Data Governance, Compliance, and Data Discovery, also share these requirements. As a result, there has been an increasing interest in data management architectures that enable the discovery, tracking, and auditing of heterogeneous data in large-scale systems. These approaches frequently build upon data catalog systems [8], [10], [13], [17] that act as centralized metadata repositories documenting information about the available data assets within an organization. The unified global view they offer makes them ideal candidates for integrating security and privacy controls. Most data catalog systems already support basic access control and encryption [10], [13], [17], and there are efforts to extend their functionality with more fine-grained access control [7], [8], [9], data governance tools [7], [16], and basic privacy transformations [2], [9], [16] (e.g., data minimization). These systems can naturally support privacy techniques which can be achieved through pre-processing data to generate privacy-compliant views. DP mechanisms, however, cannot be accommodated purely through pre-processing. For example, modern differentially private machine learning training need to access raw data, with noise only being added to the model incrementally during training [18]. As a result, DP management requires new approaches beyond simple view-based access control.

Moreover, DP guarantees do not exist in isolation but depend on the whole history of DP applications applied to the data. Existing systems lack the ability to account for, and track, this shared global state and therefore cannot be easily extended with support for DP management. Cohere implements a unified abstraction that allows applications to generically express their privacy resource needs and allows a variety of DP systems to operate on a shared collection of data using a wide range of techniques. Applications remain agnostic of how data and privacy resources are shared and managed; hence allowing multiple private systems to operate on the same data; akin to how conventional (i.e., non-DP) applications operate today.

**② Effective Use of Privacy Resources.** Developing DP applications is a challenging task that requires careful consideration of algorithm design, privacy analysis, and hyper-parameters to provide meaningful privacy guarantees while maintaining acceptable utility and fairness [68], [77]. Furthermore, when moving to the multiple applications setting with diverse mechanisms, compatibility issues between privacy analysis tools arise, adding another layer of complexity. More specifically, determining an accurate bound on the privacy impact of many different DP mechanisms is a key challenge to the effective utilization of DP in large-scale real-world scenarios. Specifically, generic (approximate DP) composition [43], [58] generally introduces a significant gap between the actual privacy cost and the bounds they provide. While the DP literature has introduced many optimized accounting methods to improve the privacy analysis of individual applications [18], [39], [46], [82], most techniques do not apply to settings with mixed workloads of different DP applications.

Beyond the compatibility of privacy analysis tools, there is a more fundamental issue, when deploying multiple DP applications. Traditionally, the analysis of a single application has considered all data to be part of a single fixed dataset and then examined the impact of each query on the global privacy budget. However, real-world applications frequently consider subsets of users defined by their characteristics, which state-of-the-art DP approaches can leverage to reduce the privacy cost of such queries even when the characteristics themselves (e.g., age, or region) are privacy sensitive. In Cohere, we extend the privacy management with native support for such *partitioning* attributes, so that the privacy management layer can fully realize these privacy cost savings. However, a more detailed privacy analysis increases the management complexity, as it requires keeping track of additional metadata about data usage. In this paper, we show how to efficiently track fine-grained privacy budgets without the need to explicitly track all possible subsets (c.f. §4.1). We further show how to integrate this approach with the *privacy amplification via subsampling* technique, which Cohere utilizes to improve the privacy costs of queries over random subsets of the users. In combination, this enables Cohere to significantly improve the privacy analysis of varied workloads resulting in more utility under the same privacy budget, compared to the state-of-the-art [65].

③ **Sustaining Systems Continuity under DP.** Addressing the need of real-world systems to perform continuous operations on data is one of the most pressing challenges in real-world DP deployment. In this setting, the available (finite) privacy budget is bound to be depleted over time even with the most accurate privacy accounting. In practical deployments, this issue is often circumvented by periodically refreshing the privacy budget of users [3], however, this fundamentally undermines the guarantees of DP. Instead, we can exploit the fact that, in large real-world systems, there is virtually always a steady influx of new users. While privacy budgets for individual users must be finite (and comparatively small, in order to achieve strong guarantees), we can retire users and replace them with new users to replenish the overall available budget. However, this user rotation needs to be carefully implemented to minimize the need for additional tracking, maintain fairness over time, and provide clear semantics for DP applications. We show how to augment sliding-window-based user rotation with user activation and budget-unlocking strategies in order to achieve these properties. By combining these techniques, our system presents the first practical and comprehensive solution for managing privacy in the context of real-world, continuous, and diverse DP workloads.

**Cohere.** We design and implement Cohere, a privacy management system for large-scale deployments of DP. We evaluate our system on a diverse range of workloads, demonstrating its ability to handle a complex mix of applications and DP mechanisms. Our evaluation results show that Cohere improves upon the state-of-the-art significantly, providing a 6.4–28x improvement in utility. As part of this work, we also develop an evaluation framework and workload generator to evaluate large-scale mixed DP application deployments. We make Cohere, alongside our workload generator, available as open-source resources.

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Threat Model

We consider the global model of DP [36], where the party computing the DP mechanisms has access to the underlying data. We note that DP, by definition, holds against an unconstrained adversary with arbitrary computational power and background knowledge. We assume the individual DP mechanisms are implemented correctly, e.g., they do not contain floating point vulnerabilities [56], [69], under-estimate the required noise, or otherwise violate their stated privacy guarantees. Lastly, we assume that there is no (side-channel) leakage [55] beyond the intentional data releases.

### 2.2. Differential Privacy

DP is considered the gold standard for the privacy-preserving release of data. In essence, a DP mechanism hides the contribution of an individual by introducing carefully calibrated randomness during the data analysis. More

formally, a randomized algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differentially private if for any set of results  $S \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{M})$  and any two neighboring datasets  $D, D'$  which only differ in a single individual,  $\Pr[\mathcal{M}(D) \in S] \leq \exp(\epsilon) \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{M}(D') \in S] + \delta$ . Two datasets are neighboring if  $D'$  can be constructed by adding or removing one single individual from  $D$ . The privacy parameters  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$  quantify the privacy cost of a data release. In addition to this definition, known as  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  - Differential Privacy (ADP), there are different notions of DP that analyze it using slightly different privacy parameters. The maximum privacy parameters (e.g.,  $\epsilon, \delta$ ) that one is willing to tolerate, are frequently referred to as the *privacy budget*. A wide variety of DP mechanisms allows computing aggregate statistics [45], [103], training ML models [18], or other applications [71], [84], [85], [86]. The majority of mechanisms are based on adding noise. For example, the Gaussian Mechanism takes a function  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with sensitivity  $\Delta_f$  and outputs  $\mathcal{M}(X) = f(x) + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2 = 2\Delta_f^2 \log(1.25/\delta)/\epsilon^2$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP [40].

### 2.3. Differential Privacy Composition

DP can formalize the cumulative privacy loss of multiple data releases, even when using different mechanisms. We briefly introduce three key types of composition and describe our setting and assumptions.

**Parallel composition** states that if we partition the dataset into  $m$  disjoint datasets, and then run an  $(\epsilon_i, \delta_i)$  differentially private mechanism  $M_i$  on each partition individually, the joint privacy loss is  $\max_i(\epsilon_i, \delta_i)$ . This formalizes the idea that releasing data on one set of users does not impact the DP guarantees for other users.

**Sequential Composition** states that for a fixed series of  $(\epsilon_i, \delta_i)$  differentially private mechanisms  $M_i$ , the cumulative privacy loss is bounded by  $(\sum_i \epsilon_i, \sum_i \delta_i)$ . This bound can be made tighter in practice through the use of more advanced composition theorems [43], [58], [102].

**Fully Adaptive Concurrent Setting.** The work on DP composition distinguishes between settings where the series of mechanisms and their privacy parameters are known a priori or can be chosen adaptively. *Fully adaptive concurrent composition* [57] is the most flexible setting that permits mechanisms to use previous results and adapt the choice of their privacy parameters based on them. Moreover, in this setting, queries can be arbitrarily interleaved among different concurrent mechanisms, rather than being restricted to a sequential order. Frequently, the goal is to ensure that a series of adaptively chosen mechanisms does not exceed a pre-specified budget, instead of bounding the privacy parameters afterward. This is achieved by a *privacy filter* [81], [102], which provides a stopping rule that prevents mechanisms from exceeding a fixed budget.

### 2.4. Rényi Differential Privacy

In recent years, several variants of DP have emerged that have more appealing composition properties than traditional ADP. This includes Rényi Differential Privacy

(RDP) [70], which has gained increasing popularity. A randomized mechanism  $M$  satisfies  $(\alpha, \epsilon^{(rdp)})$  RDP if:  $D_\alpha(M(D)||M(D')) \leq \epsilon^{(rdp)}$ , where  $D_\alpha$  is the Rényi Divergence of order  $\alpha$  for  $\alpha > 1$ . RDP has equivalent composition theorems for parallel, sequential, and concurrent composition [57], [70]. Specifically, for a series of  $(\alpha, \epsilon_i^{(rdp)})$  differentially private mechanisms, the composition satisfies  $(\alpha, \sum \epsilon_i^{(rdp)})$ . RDP typically allows for much tighter compositions, in particular when using the Gaussian mechanism. RDP privacy costs can be converted back to ADP, and  $(\alpha, \epsilon^{(rdp)})$ -RDP implies  $(\epsilon^{(rdp)} + \frac{\log 1/\delta}{\alpha-1}, \delta)$ -ADP.<sup>1</sup>

**Budget and Privacy Filter.** From a practical perspective, the above two properties of RDP composition allow tracking not only a single order  $\alpha$  but a set of orders  $\{\alpha_a\}$ . Given a fixed  $\delta$ , the best achievable  $\epsilon$  can then be determined by checking the conversion for every order  $\alpha$ . Since the optimal order  $\alpha$ , i.e., which yields the best  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -budget, is contingent upon the particular mechanisms employed in the composition, it is not possible to determine it beforehand. Nonetheless, by monitoring a limited number of orders, a tight privacy analysis can be attained [70]. Tracking this set of values allows building a simple privacy filter [46], [61] with an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -budget. Before answering a query, the filter checks whether there exists an order  $\alpha$  for which the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -budget is satisfied and only then answers the query.

### 3. Cohere Architecture

Cohere, shown in Figure 1, is a new privacy management architecture designed to facilitate the operation of DP solutions in large-scale systems. To enable the enforcement of system-wide DP privacy guarantees and effectively allocate privacy resources, a global view of data and its usage is required. Existing work proposes to co-locate privacy management with hardware resource allocation, viewing privacy budgets as special resources. However, hardware allocation systems do not necessarily provide a global view (i.e., are frequently deployed per cluster). We instead identify the emerging Lakehouse architecture as a more suitable basis for privacy management. Lakehouse architectures [5], [6], [20] add additional metadata that facilitates a centralized data view and provides a foundation for conventional data management (e.g., access control). In Cohere, we build upon this paradigm and introduce a new DP management layer on top of this foundation. Specifically, Cohere’s architecture comprises (i) an extension of the data layer with privacy-specific metadata, (ii) an application layer API that allows DP applications to express their privacy needs, and (iii) a privacy management layer providing tools to optimally distribute and manage shared privacy resources.

#### 3.1. Data Layer

In our design, we retain the existing data layer (i.e., storage layer) and extend it with privacy-specific metadata needed for privacy analysis and enforcement.

1. The other direction does not hold, i.e., RDP is strictly stronger.




Figure 1: Cohere’s Architecture.

**Data Tagging.** To support fine-grained privacy analysis, we require the means to precisely identify the user associated with a particular data item. In Cohere, each user is represented by a globally unique *user ID*, and we rely on a data tagging service that tags all user data with the user ID at ingest [24]. Such services are already present in many modern large-scale systems to ensure regulatory compliance (e.g., with the GDPR). In addition to tagging data items, we also introduce *partitioning attributes (PAs)*  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  over the users (e.g., year of birth, region) and a grouping of users with group IDs. Utilizing these attributes, we define a *block ID* as a tuple (group ID,  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ ). For example, (group51, 1975, ..., USA). These block IDs serve as the basis for our fine-grained privacy analysis (c.f. §4.1).

Each group consists of a set of users and  $|A_1| \times \dots \times |A_k|$  different block IDs. We store the corresponding block ID for each user in a dedicated *UserAttribute* table, which enables the system to filter users by predicates over the PAs. In Section 4.1, we demonstrate utilizing these fine-grained PAs to improve the privacy analysis for applications targeting overlapping user subsets without needing to track individual block IDs.

**Attribute-Based Access Control.** In order to ensure that data flows in the system are compliant with the decisions made by Cohere’s privacy management layer, we employ access control at the level of block IDs. We use Attribute-Based Access Control (ABAC) in order to express access policies without having to explicitly enumerate large numbers of block IDs. ABAC is already widely deployed in practice, and Cohere can be realized using any data layer that supports row-level ABAC. An ABAC policy specifies a combination of attributes that is necessary for a subject to be authorized to access a resource. In Figure 2b, we show how our design represents a decision made by the privacy management layer as an ABAC policy. The attributes of a subject identify an application and a DP system, the resource attributes identify the group IDs and optionally a number of PAs, and the action attributes encode the DP privacy budget together with subsampling instructions. The set of ABAC policies defines permitted data flows and implicitly records the history of data usage.

<pre>// metadata request_id: 237632134 ----- privacy_space: global ----- dp_system: TumultPlatform ----- desc: senior user behavior study  // privacy resources budget_requirements:   epsilon: 0.8 ----- data_requirements:   partitioning_attributes:     year_of_birth &lt; 1955   percentage: 0.25</pre>	<pre>// subject -- sub.request_id==237632134 &amp;&amp; -- sub.privacy_space==global &amp;&amp; -- sub.dp_system==TumultPlatform  // action act.op == read &amp;&amp; act.epsilon &lt;= 0.8 act.percentage == 0.25 &amp;&amp;  // object (row) obj.group_id &gt;= 500 &amp;&amp; obj.group_id &lt; 512 &amp;&amp; obj.year_of_birth &lt; 1955</pre>
--	---

(a) Data Access Request

(b) ABAC Policy

Figure 2: In Cohere, the accepted data access request on the left (a) corresponds to the ABAC policy on the right (b).

### 3.2. Application Layer

Cohere exposes an application-layer API where a variety of differentially private systems can express their privacy resource needs. Cohere allows all of those DP systems to operate on a unified view of the data while remaining agnostic of how data and privacy resources are shared and managed. These DP systems can be either existing off-the-shelf DP solutions [47], [66], [83], [103] targeting data analysts, or custom-built applications using DP libraries [14], [15], [44], [75], [104] designed for data custodians. Today, such DP applications are usually deployed as ad-hoc solutions operating on a fixed dataset, isolated from other applications. Cohere unifies these isolated DP applications and enables them to operate on the same underlying data without violating DP assumptions and guarantees. Towards this, we abstract DP applications to their data requirements and privacy costs, allowing us to support the wide variety of existing and potential future DP applications.

**Request Data API.** Today, analysts in large organizations often use data catalogs to explore data and request access to tables and columns. To enable support for DP applications in this workflow, Cohere exposes a request API to applications that allows (i) expressing precise *data requirements* to enable more fine-grained resource management (c.f. §3.1) and (ii) specifying DP *budget requirements*. In addition, a request contains a section of general metadata. In Figure 2a, we show an example of a request for privacy resources. Requests can only be granted by the privacy management layer if both requirements are satisfied, as access to less data or the need to increase the noise to achieve a lower privacy cost would invalidate the utility of the application.

Specifically, the *data requirements* define a subpopulation of users via a PA filter and a percentage for subsampling. For *budget requirements*, we support expressing privacy costs in  $\epsilon$ -DP [41], zero-Concentrated Differential Privacy ( $\rho$ -zCDP) [29], or RDP [70]. Internally, all privacy costs are converted to RDP using known conversions [29], [70], allowing us to use RDP composition across all applications. This simplifies the integration of existing DP systems and libraries, which use a variety of different notions. In addition, we offer an API that enables DP libraries to expose their computation as fundamental DP mechanisms

directly. In our prototype implementation of Cohere, we have integrated Tumult Analytics [15] for SQL-like queries and the DP version of PyTorch [104] to express resource requests seamlessly within Cohere.

**Accessing Data.** In traditional data management systems, analysts can use data processing frameworks such as Spark or Flink to connect to data they have been granted access to and interactively build applications [11]. Cohere can preserve this workflow even in the context of DP since our ABAC-based row-level access control inherently enforces compliance with the decisions made by the privacy management layer. However, DP marks a shift in access control for privacy. Prior techniques involved pre-processing data and restricting access to filtered views, but DP is a characteristic of the algorithm, not the data. Integrating every possible DP algorithm into the privacy management layer is infeasible and does not align with the separation of concerns principle. Cohere adopts a modular approach assigning access rights to raw data along with a budget, while the authorized DP system ensures the privacy budget is adhered to. This requires correct DP system implementation, which can be ensured through auditing or privacy budget enforcement mechanisms based on trusted hardware [99]. Note, not every new application requires a new DP system, as a single system can be deployed to expose a safe interface for analysts to run DP queries. Thus, most analysts do not need to be trusted to implement DP systems.

### 3.3. The Privacy Management Layer

The management layer in Cohere consists of two entities: the *budget control system* and the *resource planner*.

**Budget control system.** Data catalogs built for modern data ecosystems offer a global policy interface to govern and manage data resources [8], [9]. In this interface, data stewards can express policies that control applications’ access to data. In Cohere, we provide the *budget control system* as an equivalent system to manage DP resources. We support the concurrent use of a variety of DP notions and privacy budgets to support real-world use cases occurring in organizations. For example, each team in an organization might have an independent privacy budget for their analytics. Such concessions are currently still frequently used to deploy DP in practice. Cohere supports such use cases through *privacy spaces*, a new abstraction that groups applications sharing a notion of DP (e.g. user- or user-time-DP<sup>2</sup> [65]) and a space-specific privacy budget<sup>3</sup>. Deploying multiple privacy spaces requires non-collusion assumptions, which might not hold in practice. At a minimum, traditional access control systems should be used to ensure members of one space do not have direct access to releases generated in another space. We recommend relying on this feature primarily as part of a migration strategy toward global budget accounting. Note

2. Extending Cohere to support user-time-DP, would require the privacy space definition to specify how the budget is refreshed.

3. In our privacy analysis, we assume that different privacy spaces are non-colluding.

that even when multiple privacy spaces are used, one can still draw conclusions about the overall budget use. In the following, we assume (without loss of generality) a ‘pure’ setting with a single privacy space, where all applications share the same global privacy budget.

**Resource planner.** In Cohere, the applications in each privacy space use the RequestAPI to formulate resource requests. The *resource planner* uses this information to allocate data and privacy budget to requests, creating a new allocation and associated access control policies for the data layer. The resource planner allocates the available privacy budget among (some of) the different candidate requests, taking into account their relative priorities. Each request can be assigned a weight to express the importance of the task it is associated with. This allows the resource planner to give higher priority to requests that are critical for the organization’s business needs while providing lower precedence to non-essential tasks such as supplemental analytics. However, beyond the priority of each request, the resource planner needs to consider a variety of other aspects, including the available privacy budget, and the cost of each request. In the following section, we describe our fine-grained privacy analysis and how the resource planner derives an allocation.

## 4. Differential Privacy in Cohere

In order to realize an effective DP management system, we need a fine-grained privacy analysis that determines a tight bound on the consumed privacy budget for real-world mixed workloads. However, even with an optimal privacy analysis, a continuously running system will inevitably deplete the entire budget. Consequently, there is a pressing need for additional techniques that effectively sustain the system’s continuity. Finally, we need an effective allocation mechanism that carefully balances the utility and cost of different requests so that the final system not only preserves privacy but also produces meaningful results. In this section, we elaborate on how we tackle these challenges.

### 4.1. Fine-grained Privacy Analysis

While the privacy costs of individual DP mechanisms are easy to derive, determining an accurate bound on the privacy impact of a multitude of DP mechanisms is more challenging. Specifically, both DP’s basic and advanced composition theorems [43] generally introduce a significant gap between the actual privacy cost and the bounds they provide. While the DP literature has introduced many optimized accounting methods to improve the privacy analysis of individual applications [18], [39], [46], [82], most techniques do not apply to settings with mixed workloads of different DP applications. In this setting, RDP provides the ability to more efficiently analyze a varied set of mechanisms without relying on mechanism-specific approaches by capturing more information about the underlying distributions than traditional  $\epsilon$ -DP or  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP. We base our privacy analysis on an RDP-based privacy filter (c.f. §2.2) and combine it with partitioning attributes and subsampling, which also

match well with the mixed workload setting. As a result, Cohere’s privacy analysis significantly outperforms prior work on privacy management systems [65].

**Partitioning Attributes.** In Cohere, we improve the privacy analysis by considering that many applications target only a subset of the users (e.g., only users of a certain age or from a certain region). As frequently noted in the literature on DP applications [62], [66], [92], this presents an opportunity for a tighter privacy analysis by tracking privacy budgets for these subsets separately. Intuitively, if a user’s data is not influencing the outcome of an application, then this user also does not incur any privacy cost. Specifically, we can employ block composition [62] for queries on different subsets. For example, two applications that only consider either users from region A or region B (where A and B are disjoint) need not consume the sum of their privacy costs but only the maximum of either (by parallel composition c.f. §2.3). Note that applying block composition requires the partitioning scheme (e.g. the set of regions) to be publicly known. However, the resulting partitions can remain private (e.g., what region a user belongs to) [62].

The introduction of PAs allows applications to express that they are only interested in users with certain attributes. Resource planners without support for PAs cannot utilize parallel composition and must deduct the privacy cost from all users assigned to the application (c.f. Figure 3a). Here, the application would need to filter out users from Region B itself before computing and releasing the differentially private count. However, a resource planner with support for PAs can integrate this information into the accounting process and apply the same filter before the data reaches the application layer (c.f. Figure 3b), enabling more efficient accounting. Note that the results of the applications will be identical between the two settings. While PAs improve the privacy analysis, they complicate the tracking of privacy budgets since the resource planner needs to keep track of the privacy budget for each partition separately. In the setting considered by Luo et al. [65], this is especially problematic since they already track a privacy budget per user and thus they would have to track a privacy budget for each user-partition pair. However, the subsampling approach employed to improve the privacy analysis for applications operating on the same partition also simplifies tracking significantly.

**Subsampling.** Frequently, applications in large organizations do not need to run over the entire database but can already produce accurate results when run on a fraction of the users (e.g., many metrics). Where this is the case, we can apply a technique known as *amplification via subsampling* [21], [28] to reduce the privacy cost that is incurred. Privacy amplification shows that it is both correct and generally more effective to account for the (reduced) cost of the query across the entire database rather than accounting for the exact cost of the query only on the selected users. Specifically, given a population  $\mathcal{U}$  of users in Poisson subsampling, we perform an independent Bernoulli trial for each user  $i$  with probability  $\gamma_i$  to include them in the sample. The DP mechanism is then applied to the sample, but the (significantly reduced) RDP cost is accounted for across all






Figure 3: Using PAs allows for more fine-grained budget accounting if the filtering happens in the management layer instead of the application.

users [107]. This also enables our system to omit the per-user tracking present in existing work [65]. In Section 5, we show the counter-intuitive benefits of subsampling, especially when considering many different such queries running over the same database. DP applications could request more users and then apply subsampling internally, reporting the reduced privacy cost for the application. Instead, Cohere, integrates subsampling with PAs, and allows requests to specify subsampling probabilities for partitions. Integrating both partitioning attributes and subsampling within the privacy management layer enables a significantly tighter privacy analysis, as demonstrated in our evaluation (c.f. §5).

## 4.2. Privacy for Continuously Running Systems

Even the most fine-grained privacy analysis will eventually deplete the available (finite) privacy budget in the context of a system continuously applying DP mechanisms. However, in large real-world systems, there is virtually always a significant influx of new users. While privacy budgets for users must be finite (and comparatively small, in order to achieve strong guarantees), we can retire users and replace them with new users to replenish the overall available budget, as proposed in existing work [65]. However, user rotation introduces new challenges, especially if we want to both avoid the need to track individual user budgets and want to maximize how the budget can be used.

**User Rotation.** While there are many possible ways to implement user rotation, we need to consider the semantics (or lack thereof) that different approaches provide. In addition, there are requirements for user rotation to maintain DP guarantees (c.f. Section 4.4). As a result, we consider three crucial properties: (i) a user must be selected at most once, (ii) the assignment of a user to an active set must be independent of other users, and (iii) applications should have clear semantics for the active set that they are operating on. Existing approaches suggest retiring users when their past privacy consumption reaches a certain threshold [62], [65].

However, this method is problematic because it can lead to a biased population of active users without clear semantics, as the number of active users is dependent on prior queries. The issue is amplified when paired with PAs: if queries are mainly directed at specific subpopulations, then running queries across all users introduces a bias towards users who are queried less frequently since these users are the ones who remain.

In Cohere, we instead propose a gradual and interpretable user rotation based on a *sliding window* approach, where we consider the users to be partitioned into groups, and in each round, retire the group that was active the longest and activate a new one.<sup>4</sup> This approach removes the dependency on prior queries and thus eliminates the potential bias. Given  $K$  active groups, the budget in each round should be roughly  $\frac{1}{K}$  of the overall budget. One trivial instantiation would be to group users by the round during which they joined, however, limiting queries to only data from the last  $K$  round is too restrictive for many scenarios. Instead, we can randomly assign users that join during the current round to groups corresponding to the next  $T$  rounds (for  $T \gg K$ ). With this approach, a group is always an unbiased sample of the user base joining in the last  $T$  rounds. For example, with weekly allocations,  $T = 104$  and  $K = 12$ , we always have data spanning the last two years, with (on average) as many users as the system sees joining in a quarter. In essence, Cohere provides sliding window semantics for users across all applications. While a certain distribution shift is inevitable when retiring and introducing new users, our careful user-to-group assignment prevents sudden distribution shifts. This represents a significant improvement over the existing state-of-the-art that activates users in arrival order, potentially leading to an arbitrarily biased active user set. For instance, consider a marketing campaign targeting a specific country, resulting in a temporary sudden surge of users from that region. In Cohere, these users would be distributed evenly across the next  $T$  groups, rather than being disproportionately concentrated in a single group.

**Budget Unlocking.** Whenever a new group is added to the active set, the budget for these users becomes available and should then be consumed roughly evenly across the next  $K$  rounds. Specifically, we always want the oldest (technically, the most depleted) group in the active set to have roughly  $\frac{1}{K}$  budget left, so that we can guarantee a certain level of budget is always available for requests in each round. To provide such guarantees, we need to keep part of the budget locked for future rounds. If  $\epsilon$  is the total budget, then the obvious strategy is to unlock  $\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  per round.<sup>5</sup> Since in every round additional budget is unlocked for all active groups, we are guaranteed to have at least  $\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  of the budget available, satisfying our balancing concerns. In the context of Poisson subsampling, we will in fact always have *exactly* this much

4. Retired groups with any remaining budget can be moved to a separate pool of resources available on a first-come, first-served basis by applications without the necessity of clear semantics.

5. We illustrate budget unlocking with a scalar budget  $\epsilon$ , but in reality, we have a vector of budgets due to RDP accounting.

budget available, as subsampling is limited by the lowest available budget in the active set<sup>6</sup>. As a result, any unused budget from one round cannot be used in later rounds as that would cause a round to consume more than  $\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ .

We address this issue by introducing a novel budget-unlocking strategy, which biases the unlocking of the budget towards the first half of the rounds a group remains active. Essentially, we can use the budget from future rounds “on credit”. Clearly, the bias should be subtle to provide fairness across rounds, but even a subtle bias is sufficient to allow leftover budget from older groups to be consumed (c.f. §5). In the first half of the rounds, we unlock  $(1 + \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in every round, and in the second half of the rounds, we unlock  $(1 - \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in every round where  $\Delta \in [0, 1]$ . More formally the unlocked budget in round  $1 \leq k \leq K$  is then given by:

$$\epsilon_k = \frac{\epsilon}{K} \cdot \left( k + \sum_{i=1}^{\min(k, \lfloor \frac{K}{2} \rfloor)} \Delta - \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{K}{2} \rceil + 1}^k \Delta \right) \quad (1)$$

At  $k = K$ , the budget is fully unlocked, i.e.,  $\epsilon$ .

**Theorem 1.** *The available budget in any round is always in between  $(1 - \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  and  $(1 + \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$ .*

The proof is straightforward. The most recent active group has an unlocked budget of  $(1 + \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$ . Since any allocation always needs to satisfy the constraints of all groups, no more than  $(1 + \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  budget can be consumed in a round. For any active group we unlock at least  $(1 - \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  additional budget and thus we have at least  $(1 - \Delta) \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  budget available in every round. In Appendix A, we provide more detailed proofs of our approach’s properties.

**Setting Hyperparameters.** Cohere introduces several hyperparameters that warrant careful consideration in practical deployments. Of these, the global target  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  privacy guarantee is certainly the most important hyperparameter. Yet, the strategies for user rotation and budget unlocking also introduce new hyperparameters, which may seem challenging to configure. To aid in this process, we provide a tool that enables practitioners to specify their requirements - for instance, the expected number of active users needed in each round - and visualize the effects of different hyperparameter combinations on the system. Additionally, practitioners can utilize our workload generator (c.f. §5.1) to explore combinations of mechanisms permitted within a round.

### 4.3. Privacy Request Allocation

DP naturally limits the number of requests that can be executed on the data of a given active set of users. Due to the complex and non-linear nature of DP composition, especially in the context of partitioning attributes, it is a non-trivial optimization problem to determine which combination of requests will make the best use of the budget. In fact, we would not want to optimize for the fullest use of

the budget, but rather for a more meaningful metric. While maximizing the *number of allocated requests* might seem natural, the results of DP applications frequently improve exponentially with linear increases in budget, making this metric undesirable. Instead, we aim to maximize the total *utility* of the accepted requests, which also provides a way to express priorities between different applications which might be critical for real-world deployments.

**Optimization Problem.** Choosing a set of requests that maximizes utility under a budget constraint resembles a type of Knapsack problem. The non-linear composition of privacy budgets, especially with partitioning attributes, requires us to consider a *multidimensional* Knapsack, where each partition is its own dimension. In addition, RDP-composition tracks many different variants of the DP bounds (different  $\alpha$ -orders) for each partition and it is sufficient for only one to be satisfied. Tholoniati et al. present an efficient heuristic for this optimization problem [94]. However, naively incorporating PAs along with subsampling, user rotation, and budget unlocking would result in a significantly higher-dimensional problem instance compared to prior work with a simpler setting [65], [94]. We counter-act this expansion with optimizations that allow us to collapse many of the newly introduced dimensions, e.g., by considering only the PAs present in the current set of requests. We first present a formal definition of the optimization problem in Cohere and then discuss our optimizations.

Let  $\mathcal{R} := \{1, \dots, R_{max}\}$  be the index set of requests. A request  $R_i$  for  $i \in \mathcal{R}$  is a tuple  $(\Phi_i, \mathbf{C}_i, W_i)$  consisting of a *data requirement* defining a subpopulation encoded as a propositional formula  $\Phi_i$  over the PAs, a *budget requirement* expressed as a vector  $\mathbf{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$  of RDP costs for different orders  $\alpha_a$  (for  $a \in \mathcal{A} := \{1, \dots, A_{max}\}$ ), and a *weight*  $W_i \in \mathbb{N}$ . We introduce decision variables  $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{R}$ , where  $y_i = 1$  means the request  $R_i$  is accepted, and  $y_i = 0$  means the request has been rejected. Let  $\mathcal{S} := \{1, \dots, S_{max}\}$  denote the index set over all *blocks*. A block  $S_j$  for  $j \in \mathcal{S}$  is a tuple  $(groupID, \Psi_j, \mathbf{B}_j)$  consisting of a group ID, a propositional formula  $\Psi_j$  over the PAs and a remaining budget  $\mathbf{B}_j \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$  for this block in this group. The remaining budget  $\mathbf{B}_j$  of a block is determined by the difference of the unlocked budget according to Equation (1), and the accumulated allocation history.

We set the demand for a block  $d_{ij}^{(\alpha)} = \mathbf{C}_i^{(\alpha)}$  if  $\Phi_i \wedge \Psi_j$  is satisfiable, and 0 otherwise. This captures the fact that the demand for a block outside the selected subpopulation of a request is 0. Finally, to find the optimal set of requests to accept, we solve the optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} y_i \cdot W_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} d_{ij}^{(\alpha)} y_i \leq B_j^{(\alpha)} \quad [\forall j \in \mathcal{S} \quad \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{A}] \end{aligned}$$

We also formulate a more general optimization problem (as an Integer Linear Program (ILP)) that supports alternative

6. We could apply non-uniform subsampling with different sampling probabilities across groups, however, this could result in unclear semantics.






Figure 4: An example of three requests R1, R2, and R3 selecting four blocks. Vertically, we show the set of blocks selected by a request. Horizontally, we show blocks grouped into segments defined by a unique set of interested requests.

allocation approaches in Appendix B. Practical instances of this optimization problem are within the scope of commercial ILP solvers [54]. Alternatively, Tholoniati et al. propose a heuristic for the knapsack problem variant which arises in RDP block composition [94]. However, we present optimizations that reduce the dimensionality of the problem which makes solving it significantly more efficient.

**Solving the Scalability Issues.** The number of dimensions in the optimization problem as described above is equal to  $K \cdot (|A_1| \times \dots \times |A_k|)$ , where  $|A_i|$  is the domain size of the  $i$ th PA. As a result, this can quickly explode for fine-grained partitioning attributes. We introduce two optimizations to reduce the problem size: (i) we consolidate block IDs into *segments* based on the current batch of requests, and (ii) we identify segments and requests that can safely be excluded from the optimization problem. Cohere computes *segments* that succinctly represent groups of block IDs relevant to the current set of candidate requests, drastically reducing the number of privacy budgets we need to consider.

Our solution exploits that the number of unique combinations of the PAs in the current requests is significantly smaller than the number of total possible combinations. A request’s selection of PAs directly defines a set of ‘compatible’ blocks (shown vertically in Figure 4). *Segments* are sets of blocks which (for the current set of requests) will be treated identically by any allocation. For example, in Figure 4, where segments are illustrated using horizontal lines, we see that if the ● block is allocated to a given request, so will the ▲ block. Therefore, those two blocks form a segment (S2). Since the blocks in a segment behave identically under allocation, Cohere’s resource planner only requires the per-segment privacy budget for each group, significantly reducing the constraints it has to consider.

Additionally, we reduce the number of segments that we need to consider by focusing only on *contested* segments. A segment is contested if accepting all requests associated with it would exceed the privacy budget of the segment (e.g., S3 in Figure 4). We ignore non-contested segments in our problem formulation since their privacy budgets will be satisfied no matter the chosen allocation. Further, we always

accept requests that are associated with only uncontested segments. Conversely, we always reject requests that by themselves violate the privacy budget of any associated segment. Therefore, we eliminate both groups of requests.

#### 4.4. Privacy Analysis

Cohere uses block composition [62] and instantiates it with an RDP privacy filter for each block. Under block composition, the overall mechanism satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, as long as the  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP budget is not exceeded on any block. In Cohere, each block, i.e., partition, corresponds to a block ID and there is a block for every possible combination of PAs and for each group. The assignment from users into groups (c.f. §4.2) and to a block within that group based on the users’ PAs is immutable and every user is only assigned to one block. The PAs (i.e., years, regions) have a public domain, and the assignment from users to groups is only based on their arrival time, and importantly, independent of other users’ assignments. As a result, every user only influences data releases computed on that user’s block, satisfying the requirements of block composition [62].

Cohere’s resource planner is data-independent, meaning it never touches sensitive data. More concretely, the inputs are always public knowledge (schema of PAs, request batch, and the currently available groups, and their allocation history). Consequently, the resource planner always sees the same number of blocks in each round. Considering that future mechanisms and budget choices can depend on previous results, our privacy analysis for the data releases must consider the fully adaptive setting (c.f. §2.3). Moreover, as we allocate budgets to various mechanisms without enforcing a sequential consumption of these budgets, our privacy analysis is in the concurrent composition setting [97]. The RDP-based filter we employ meets the requirements for fully adaptive concurrent composition [57], [61].

### 5. Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of Cohere’s fine-grained privacy analysis across different workloads. We focus our evaluation on the planning phase (i.e., the resource planner), which is the core component of Cohere’s design and effectively handles most of the complexity of DP management. Note that other components in our system correspond to widely deployed existing tools (e.g., Lakehouse, Data tagging, ABAC enforcement).

#### 5.1. Evaluation Setup

**DP Workload Generator.** Benchmarking DP systems remains a major challenge [34] and this difficulty is exacerbated when dealing with mixed workloads. Our work tackles this challenge by introducing a configurable DP workload generator that can accommodate various request types and workload characteristics. The key to its flexibility lies in recognizing that any DP application can be represented

as a combination of a small number of fundamental DP mechanisms. For example, training an ML model with DP-SGD [18] can be represented as a combination of Gaussian mechanisms. By doing so, we are able to abstract a diverse range of real-world use cases into a more generalized setting. We make our workload generator available as an open-source tool, as we believe better benchmarks for complex mixed DP workloads are of independent interest.

Our workload generator offers parameters that enable users to fine-tune workload characteristics, tailoring them to specific deployment scenarios. These parameters offer control over aspects such as the frequency of allocation rounds, arrival rates of users and requests, and the schema of PAs. At the core of our generator is the request distribution, which models diverse request families as a categorical distribution over request types. Request types are parameterized with data and privacy requirements, allowing for granular customization and fine-grained management of workload dynamics. Data requirements are sampled from a categorical distribution over partitioning attributes, defining a target population, and a categorical distribution over the percentage of that population to be requested. For example, a request type might require either 10% or 50% of all active users above age 50 with equal probability. Privacy requirements specify a DP mechanism (e.g., Laplace Mechanism) with privacy costs sampled from a categorical distribution of possible costs. For example, a request type might specify the DP-SGD mechanism and an equal split between low and high privacy costs, modeling, e.g., different numbers of epochs. DP mechanisms are represented using the Auto DP library [100]. Using a discrete event simulator [67], we generate random workload instances for a specific deployment scenario. Finally, we provide adapters that transform samples into concrete requests for specific budget management systems (e.g., Cohere or PrivateKube [65]).

**Instantiating the Utility Distribution.** We assign each request a scalar *utility* to represent its expected utility to the organization. We model their distribution as a Cobb-Douglas production function [31]  $Y = A \cdot L^\beta K^\alpha$ , which is traditionally used to model production output as a function of labor (L) and capital (K) at a given total factor of productivity (A). We instantiate L with the privacy cost and K with the amount of data requested. Then, the function correctly predicts that with no budget or no data, no utility can be generated and that utility increases as either one or both increase. In the function,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  describe the elasticity of the relation, and we set  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = 2$ , which roughly models that increase in privacy budget are usually more impactful than increases in the amount of data.<sup>7</sup> For the privacy cost, we employ a mechanism-dependent correction factor in the utility assignment applied to each request’s privacy cost, such that requests from the same cost category also share the same privacy cost to calculate utility. We vary the productivity  $A$  randomly according to the following distribution  $A \sim \text{Beta}(0.25, 0.25)$  to model application-level

variations in utility. For example, recommender systems can be useful even when relatively inaccurate, while fraud detection systems must achieve higher accuracy to provide value. Finally, we normalize the sum of the utility of each workload to ensure comparability between workloads.

**Evaluation Scenario.** For our evaluation, we instantiate the workload generator in a setting modeling weekly allocations. We simulate a total of 40 weeks using a sliding window of 12 rounds (i.e., weeks) to demonstrate the continuous operation of Cohere. Request arrivals are modeled as a Poisson process with a mean inter-arrival time of 20 minutes, resulting in an expected 504 requests per allocation round. We also model user arrivals as a Poisson process (inter-arrival time 10s), however, we note that the frequency and absolute number of users joining the system does not affect the number of groups that need to be tracked (c.f. §4.2).

For data requirements, we instantiate the PA domain as a vector of size  $204 \times 800$ .<sup>8</sup> We generate the PA selection for a request as a consecutive range of  $\lfloor s \cdot 100 \rfloor$  elements in the PA vector, at a location chosen uniformly at random and wrapping around the edges, with  $s \sim \text{Beta}(a, b)$ . Since real-world workloads do not all partition equally well in practice, we explore different distributions for selecting the requested population based on PAs. The parameters  $a$  and  $b$  allow precise control over the distribution of PA overlaps. Requests require either 25% or 100% of the selected population with equal probability.

We enforce a global user-level DP guarantee with a budget of  $\epsilon = 3$  and  $\delta = 10^{-7}$ , and we instantiate the RDP privacy filter with the following orders  $\{1.5, 1.75, 2, 2.5, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, 32, 64, 10^6, 10^{10}\}$ . We construct our workloads as combinations of the Gaussian Mechanism [40] (GM), Laplace Mechanism [41] (LM), Sparse Vector Technique [42] (SVT), Randomized Response [101] (RR), NoisySGD Mechanism [18] (N-SGD), and PATE [76] (PATE), capturing common mechanisms from a wide range of domains. We group requests into three categories occurring with equal probability: mice, hares, and elephants, representing low, medium, and high privacy costs, respectively. For GM, N-SGD, and PATE, we use  $\epsilon = 0.05, 0.2, 0.75$  for mice, hares, and elephants, respectively. While for LM, SVT, and RR, we use  $\epsilon = 0.01, 0.1, 0.25$  to compensate for the less efficient accounting under RDP. We keep  $\delta$  fixed at  $10^{-9}$  for all mechanisms. Given an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  target, we derive a corresponding RDP vector for each mechanism [100].

**Workloads.** We evaluate four workloads combining different data and privacy requirements modeling a range of real-world scenarios in which Cohere might be deployed.

**(W1:GM):** The first workload consists purely of requests using the Gaussian Mechanism (GM) representing, e.g., the predicate counting queries over the Census dataset [59], [88]. These queries are of the form `SELECT Count(*) FROM x WHERE  $\Phi$` , where  $\Phi$  is a predicate over the PAs. This is a best-case setting, as the GM is especially amenable to RDP composition. Further, this workload is

7. A linear change in  $\epsilon$  translates to an exponential increase in the range of allowed distributions.

8. Note any number of PAs can be flattened to a single but larger PA.




Figure 5: Comparing UPC with Poisson subsampling on two workloads, varying the fraction of the selected population.

heavily partitioned, i.e.,  $s \sim \text{Beta}(1, 10)$ , and can, therefore fully use parallel composition.

(W2:Mix): We consider a more varied mix of mechanisms in the second workload. Specifically, the workload uses an equal distribution of GM, LM, SVT, and RR mechanisms, representing important key building blocks for instance, used in database query tasks. For GM and LM, we consider the heavily partitioned predicate counting queries from the previous workload. For SVT and RR, we consider requests that cannot be easily partitioned (i.e.,  $s \sim \text{Beta}(1, 0.5)$ ) as this naturally matches these systems. This workload represents a more realistic challenge as these mechanisms do not always compose efficiently, and half of the requests barely exploit PAs.

(W3:ML): The third workload features a machine learning workload consisting of an equal mix between N-SGD and PATE based ML training. In this workload, a typical query selects half the domain, i.e.,  $s \sim \text{Beta}(2, 2)$ , and thus generates a significant overlap between requests. This models the fact that ML tasks usually do not have as many natural restrictions on the data they consider and tend to require large amounts of data in order to achieve acceptable results. We thus expect that, despite the same privacy costs, fewer of the requests in this workload can be allocated.

(W4:All): For the last workload, we consider an equal combination of requests from all other workloads. Each mechanism is instantiated using the same parameters as described in the respective workloads. This workload models the wide variety of different types of DP applications that we would expect in a practical deployment in a large organization.

**Implementation & Experimental Setup.** We implement a prototype of Cohere in Rust, consisting of roughly 13k SLOC.<sup>9</sup> Given the set of candidate requests of an allocation round (generated by the workload generator), the resource planner computes the segments (c.f. §4.1), formulates the optimization problem (c.f. §4.3), and uses an allocation al-

9. Cohere’s code available at: <https://github.com/pps-lab/cohere>




Figure 6: The effect of budget unlocking on utility per round achieved by the DPK algorithm on the GM workload.

gorithm to accept requests. Where we solve an ILP optimization problem (c.f. §B), we employ the Gurobi solver [54].

We run Cohere on 16 virtual cores with 16 GB of memory on a scientific cluster backed by host machines with 128-core AMD EPYC CPUs (2.60GHz), with 256 GB memory running CentOS 7. We evaluate the performance of the allocation algorithms on two main objectives: maximizing the percentage of requests and maximizing the percentage of total utility. We perform the allocation for each workload on five instances randomly sampled by the workload generator and report the mean and standard deviation across the five instances of each workload.

## 5.2. Evaluation Results

We compare Cohere against PrivateKube [65], [94], which currently stands as the state-of-the-art solution for DP resource management across multiple workloads. First, we highlight the benefits of subsampling users as opposed to conducting a privacy analysis based on parallel composition at the individual user level, as used in PrivateKube. Subsequently, we show the advantages of implementing our new budget-unlocking strategy within a continuously running system with clean query semantics. Finally, we compare Cohere against PrivateKube [65], [94] across a wide range of mixed workloads. We evaluate both systems with different allocation algorithms: a greedy First Come, First Served (FCFS) baseline and two heuristic algorithms: (weighted) Dominant Private Block Fairness (DPF) [94] and DPK [65], [94]. For PrivateKube, we remove PA information from requests, as it does not support them. Since PrivateKube requires requests to specify a concrete set of blocks (i.e., users), we follow the approach in their evaluation [65], [94] and select either all recent blocks (i.e., last 12 weeks) or uniformly sample from this population when smaller percentages are requested. Note that a request that is accepted will be allocated (in expectation) the same number of users in Cohere and PrivateKube, ensuring a fair comparison.




Figure 7: Evaluation of Cohere compared to PrivateKube on four allocation approaches on our four workloads. The performance of Cohere with PAs is shown as a darker shade.

**Benefits of Subsampling.** We show the benefits of privacy amplification via subsampling by considering variants of the workloads mentioned above. We replace the equal split of 25% and 100% of users being requested with a single percentage varying from 5% to 85%. PrivateKube utilizes parallel composition on the user level (User-Parallel Composition (UPC)), i.e., they account for the privacy cost of the request only on the selected users. Subsampling, by contrast, achieves lower overall privacy costs by distributing (significantly reduced) privacy costs across all users in the population (c.f. §4.1). Figure 5 presents the results for the W1:GM and W2:Mix workloads, with allocations determined via the DPK algorithm. Due to space constraints, we omit W3:ML and W4:All but note that the observed behavior remains consistent. The relative improvement is highest when the percentage of expected users is low, but the Poisson subsampling outperforms UPC consistently across all percentages of expected users for both request volume and utility. For the 25% setting we will use in the remainder of the evaluation, we see improvements ranging from 1.17x to 1.51x in allocated requests and from 4.44x to 4.98x improvement in utility across the workloads (Figure 5). This shows that subsampling’s theoretical benefits [107] translate into practical improvements, highlighting the importance of native subsampling support for effective privacy accounting.

**Benefits of our Budget Unlocking.** In Cohere, we employ budget unlocking to impose guarantees on the availability of budget in each round, preventing a single set of requests from consuming the entire budget available in the sliding window. The obvious strategy of unlocking  $\frac{1}{12}$  of a block’s budget for each round it is active does not compose well with subsampling: requests could never use more than  $\frac{1}{12}$  of the budget as they are limited by the budget of the most recent

active block. Our novel unlocking strategy, as described in Section 4.2, helps to alleviate this issue by relaxing the available budget per round by a factor  $\Delta$ . In Figure 6, we show the effect of different  $\Delta$ s for the GM workload, as it is the most heavily partitioned one and PAs introduce greater variability in the allocated utility for different partitions. We consider naive unlocking ( $\Delta = 0$ ),  $\Delta = 0.4$  and  $\Delta = 0.8$  and also show a no-unlocking baseline, where we observe a large imbalance across rounds because the budget of the active set is consumed immediately in the first round. Introducing some slack results in a total utility of 42% for  $\Delta = 0.4$ , compared to 25% observed for  $\Delta = 0$ . However, higher slack, such as  $\Delta = 0.8$ , causes excessive fluctuations in utility and thus violates fairness across rounds. We choose  $\Delta = 0.4$  for the remainder of the evaluation, as it strikes a good balance between ensuring stability and maximizing utility across all workloads.

**Comparison to PrivateKube.** In the remainder of the evaluation, we will focus on comparing Cohere with PrivateKube across all different workloads. In Figures 7a to 7d, we present the fraction of allocated requests and the overall utility achieved by PrivateKube and Cohere using each of the three allocation algorithms (FCFS, DPF, DPK). In addition to the performance, we also show the fraction of mice, hares, and elephants accepted in each allocation. Note, that 100% utility is not achievable due to privacy budget constraints. Therefore, we use an ILP solver to compute the maximum achievable performance, shown as the dashed line.

We observe that the DPF and DPK heuristics significantly outperform the FCFS baseline across all workloads. Note that, for the FCFS algorithm, the UPC accounting approach (PrivateKube) sometimes outperforms our Poisson subsampling when optimizing for request volume. Subsam-

pling’s tighter analysis forces FCFS to accept high-cost requests which would be rejected under UPC, harming total request volume. More sophisticated allocation algorithms can benefit from the tighter analysis while avoiding this pitfall. For example, the DPF and DPK heuristics tend to allocate more mice than FCFS when optimizing for request volume and more elephants when optimizing for utility. Overall, the DPK heuristic achieves within 96% and 98% of optimal request volume and utility, respectively.

Across all workloads, Cohere significantly outperforms the prior state-of-the-art PrivateKube [65] in both request volume and utility. Note, the maximum allocatable requests and utility are higher for the first workload (see Figure 7a) compared to the other workloads, which is expected because the GM workload encodes the ideal case for Cohere, with a heavily partitioned workload and only efficient composition across the Gaussian mechanism. Even without considering PAs in the resource planning, Cohere improves the prior approach with DPK by 1.1–1.2x in request volume and 3.2–4.8x in utility due to the use of Poisson subsampling. PAs further increase this improvement to 1.5–2.0x in request volume and 6.4–28x in utility due to the more fine-grained privacy analysis. Our results highlight the importance of a fine-grained privacy analysis in DP resource management systems. Moreover, our evaluation shows that integrating a more efficient and more fine-grained privacy analysis is more influential than the choice of the allocation algorithm.

**Performance Benchmark.** Finally, we discuss the runtime and memory consumption of Cohere’s planner. Note, that Cohere’s planning system is not on the critical path for daily system usage, and that investing (usually abundant) computational resources for better management of the very scarce privacy budget is an attractive trade-off. We find that it is feasible to solve the optimized version of the ILP problem formulation across all our workload instances. The ILP takes an average of 48 minutes in total and a maximum memory consumption of 1.3GB. However, predicting the complexity of solving an ILP instance is non-trivial and depends on a variety of factors. The heuristic algorithms provide a good tradeoff in terms of performance and runtime. With our optimizations, the total runtime of simulating 40 rounds for DPK is only around 3.5 minutes without PAs. With PAs, the runtime increases to 5.3 minutes for W1:GM and 22 minutes for W4:All. This is expected, as more complex workloads also increase the complexity of the optimization problem. The requirement of PAs to track multiple budgets per group results in a somewhat higher maximum memory consumption of around 550MB for all workloads, compared to the 85MB required without PAs.

## 6. Related Work

**Privacy Management for DP.** PrivateKube [65], [94] is the most similar to our work, as it manages privacy resources for multiple ML pipelines. However, its design falls short of addressing broader organizational needs, since it ties privacy management to hardware resource scheduling rather than providing a central privacy management layer. PrivateKube

prioritizes fairness by adapting the DRF [49] scheduling algorithm and follow-up work extended it to provide support for utility optimization [94]. In comparison, our system focuses on improving the underlying privacy analysis by natively supporting subsampling and providing more granular resource allocation with partitioning attributes. In addition, our user rotation provides clear query semantics and removes a source of bias compared to PrivateKube.

Sage [62] introduced block composition on user streams but only supports event-level DP and relies on inefficient ADP composition. Additionally, Sage does not cover resource allocation. The planner by Li et al. [63] also uses ADP composition but considers user-to-application importance in the allocation. While promising for some ML workloads, its general applicability is unclear, as most non-ML workloads do not have a notion of user importance, and the resulting non-uniform budget consumption requires specialized DP algorithms [25], [26]. Some DP platforms [9], [47], [83], [106] provide limited budget management APIs but they lack support for resource allocation.

**Resource Allocation.** Previous research explored heuristic-based [27], [33], [49], [50], [98], [105], ML-based [78], [79], [87], [105], and solver-based [35], [48], [51], [52], [53], [72], [73], [95] methods for computational resource allocation. Our system focuses on utility-oriented privacy budget allocation, emphasizing allocation quality over speed due to the non-replenishable nature of DP budgets. Moreover, in the context of RDP, privacy budget allocation diverges from (multi) resource allocation problems in other domains because costs and capacities cannot be efficiently represented as a single numerical value. Instead, RDP introduces a unique OR-semantic based on a set of costs and capacities.

## 7. Conclusion

DP offers significant potential for protecting privacy-sensitive information, but deploying it in large-scale systems remains challenging. Managing shared application state and allocating non-replenishable privacy resources requires careful planning and coordination. As DP transitions from theory to practice, these deployment considerations become more critical. This work sheds light on these new system challenges and presents Cohere, a system that streamlines the use of DP in large-scale systems. Our more fine-grained privacy analysis enables more applications within a given privacy budget, expanding DP’s applicability without compromising guarantees. We hope this work will enhance the understanding of the many systems challenges in this space and generate further work considering the challenges involved in deploying DP in practice.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Lukas Burkhalter for his invaluable help in the early stages of the project and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful input and feedback. We would also like to acknowledge our sponsors for their generous support, including Meta, Google, and SNSF through an Ambizione Grant No. PZ00P2\_186050.

## References

- [1] General data protection regulation (GDPR) – official legal text. <https://gdpr-info.eu/>, 2016. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [2] Privitar: Enterprise data privacy software. <https://www.privitar.com/>, November 2016. Accessed: 2021-9-27.
- [3] Learning with privacy at scale. <https://machinelearning.apple.com/research/learning-with-privacy-at-scale>, 2017. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [4] California consumer privacy act (CCPA). <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa>, October 2018. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [5] Apache hudi. <https://hudi.apache.org/>, 2021. Accessed: 2022-11-28.
- [6] Apache iceberg. <https://iceberg.apache.org/>, 2021. Accessed: 2022-11-28.
- [7] Data privacy software & CCPA compliance software. <https://ethyca.com/>, November 2021. Accessed: 2021-12-15.
- [8] Unity catalog. <https://www.databricks.com/product/unity-catalog>, December 2021. Accessed: 2022-12-1.
- [9] Universal cloud data access control. <https://www.immuta.com/>, 2021. Accessed: 2021-12-15.
- [10] Dataplex. <https://cloud.google.com/dataplex>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [11] Delta lake integrations. <https://delta.io/integrations/>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-11-22.
- [12] Hype cycle for privacy, 2022. <https://www.gartner.com/en/documents/4017216>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [13] Microsoft purview data governance documentation. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/purview/>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [14] PipelineDP. <https://pipelinedp.io/>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-6-24.
- [15] Tumult labs. <https://www.tmlt.io/>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-6-24.
- [16] Unified data security & access control - privacy compliance. <https://privacera.com/>, August 2022. Accessed: 2022-11-21.
- [17] What is a data catalog. <https://www.ibm.com/topics/data-catalog>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [18] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, et al. Deep learning with differential privacy. July 2016.
- [19] Ahmet Aktay and others. Google COVID-19 community mobility reports: Anonymization process description (version 1.1). April 2020.
- [20] Michael Armbrust and others. Delta lake: high-performance ACID table storage over cloud object stores. *Proceedings VLDB Endowment*, 13(12):3411–3424, August 2020.
- [21] Borja Balle, Gilles Barthe, and Marco Gaboardi. Privacy amplification by subsampling: Tight analyses via couplings and divergences. July 2018.
- [22] Shailesh Bavadekar and others. Google COVID-19 search trends symptoms dataset: Anonymization process description (version 1.0). September 2020.
- [23] Shailesh Bavadekar and others. Google COVID-19 vaccination search insights: Anonymization process description. July 2021.
- [24] Nishant Bhajaria. Data privacy: A runbook for engineers. 2021.
- [25] Franziska Boenisch, Christopher Mühl, Adam Dziedzic, et al. Have it your way: Individualized privacy assignment for DP-SGD. March 2023.
- [26] Franziska Boenisch, Christopher Mühl, Roy Rinberg, et al. Individualized PATE: Differentially private machine learning with individual privacy guarantees. February 2022.
- [27] Eric Boutin, Jaliya Ekanayake, Wei Lin, et al. Apollo: scalable and coordinated scheduling for cloud-scale computing. In *Proceedings of the 11th USENIX conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, OSDI’14, pages 285–300, USA, October 2014. USENIX Association.
- [28] Mark Bun, Jörg Drechsler, Marco Gaboardi, et al. Controlling privacy loss in sampling schemes: An analysis of stratified and cluster sampling. *Symposium on Foundations of Responsible Computing*, 2022.
- [29] Mark Bun and Thomas Steinke. Concentrated differential privacy: Simplifications, extensions, and lower bounds. May 2016.
- [30] Long Cheng, Fang Liu, and Danfeng Daphne Yao. Enterprise data breach: causes, challenges, prevention, and future directions. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, 7(5):e1211, September 2017.
- [31] Charles W Cobb and Paul H Douglas. A theory of production. *Am. Econ. Rev.*, 18(1):139–165, 1928.
- [32] Nicholas Confessore. Cambridge Analytica and Facebook: The Scandal and the Fallout So Far. The New York Times, Online: <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/04/us/politics/cambridge-analytica-scandal-fallout.html>, April 2018.
- [33] Eli Cortez, Anand Bonde, Alexandre Muzio, et al. Resource central: Understanding and predicting workloads for improved resource management in large cloud platforms. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP ’17, pages 153–167, New York, NY, USA, October 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [34] Rachel Cummings, Damien Desfontaines, David Evans, et al. Challenges towards the next frontier in privacy, 2023.
- [35] Carlo Curino, Djellel E Difallah, Chris Douglas, et al. Reservation-based scheduling: If you’re late don’t blame us! In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, SOCC ’14, pages 1–14, New York, NY, USA, November 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [36] Damien Desfontaines. Local vs. central differential privacy. <https://desfontain.es/privacy/local-global-differential-privacy.html>, 2019.
- [37] Damien Desfontaines. A bottom-up approach to making differential privacy ubiquitous. <https://desfontain.es/privacy/bottom-up-differential-privacy.html>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-6-7.
- [38] Damien Desfontaines. A list of real-world uses of differential privacy. <https://desfontain.es/privacy/real-world-differential-privacy.html>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-NA-NA.
- [39] Jinshuo Dong, David Durfee, and Ryan Rogers. Optimal differential privacy composition for exponential mechanisms and the cost of adaptivity. September 2019.
- [40] Cynthia Dwork, Krishnamurthy Kenthapadi, Frank McSherry, et al. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2006*, pages 486–503. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [41] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Proceedings of the Third conference on Theory of Cryptography*, TCC’06, pages 265–284, Berlin, Heidelberg, March 2006. Springer-Verlag.
- [42] Cynthia Dwork, Moni Naor, Omer Reingold, et al. On the complexity of differentially private data release. In *Proceedings of the 41st annual ACM symposium on Symposium on theory of computing - STOC ’09*, New York, New York, USA, 2009. ACM Press.
- [43] Cynthia Dwork, Guy N Rothblum, and Salil Vadhan. Boosting and differential privacy. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 51–60, October 2010.
- [44] Úlfar Erlingsson. Introducing TensorFlow privacy: Learning with differential privacy for training data. <https://blog.tensorflow.org/2019/03/introducing-tensorflow-privacy-learning.html>, 2019. Accessed: 2022-6-24.



- [45] Úlfar Erlingsson, Vasyl Pihur, and Aleksandra Korolova. RAPPOR: Randomized aggregatable Privacy-Preserving ordinal response. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, Scottsdale, Arizona, 2014.
- [46] Vitaly Feldman and Tijana Zrnic. Individual privacy accounting via a renyi filter. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, 2020.
- [47] Marco Gaboardi, James Honaker, Gary King, et al. PSI ( $\Psi$ ): a private data sharing interface. September 2016.
- [48] Panagiotis Garefalakis, Konstantinos Karanasos, Peter Pietzuch, et al. Medea: scheduling of long running applications in shared production clusters. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth EuroSys Conference*, number Article 4 in EuroSys '18, pages 1–13, New York, NY, USA, April 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [49] Ali Ghodsi, Matei Zaharia, Benjamin Hindman, et al. Dominant resource fairness: fair allocation of multiple resource types. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX conference on Networked systems design and implementation*, NSDI'11, pages 323–336, USA, March 2011. USENIX Association.
- [50] Alim Ul Gias, Giuliano Casale, and Murray Woodside. ATOM: Model-Driven autoscaling for microservices. In *2019 IEEE 39th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, pages 1994–2004, July 2019.
- [51] Robert Grandl, Ganesh Ananthanarayanan, Srikanth Kandula, et al. Multi-resource packing for cluster schedulers. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM conference on SIGCOMM*, SIGCOMM '14, pages 455–466, New York, NY, USA, August 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [52] Robert Grandl, Mosharaf Chowdhury, Aditya Akella, and Ganesh Ananthanarayanan. Altruistic scheduling in multi-resource clusters. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, OSDI'16, pages 65–80, USA, November 2016. USENIX Association.
- [53] Robert Grandl, Srikanth Kandula, Sriram Rao, et al. Graphene: packing and dependency-aware scheduling for data-parallel clusters. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, OSDI'16, pages 81–97, USA, November 2016. USENIX Association.
- [54] L L C Gurobi Optimization. Gurobi optimizer reference manual, 2022.
- [55] Andreas Haeberlen, Benjamin C Pierce, and Arjun Narayan. Differential privacy under fire. In *20th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 11)*, 2011.
- [56] Samuel Haney, Damien Desfontaines, Luke Hartman, et al. Precision-based attacks and interval refining: how to break, then fix, differential privacy on finite computers. July 2022.
- [57] Samuel Haney, Michael Shoemate, Grace Tian, et al. Concurrent composition for interactive differential privacy with adaptive Privacy-Loss parameters. September 2023.
- [58] Peter Kairouz, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. The composition theorem for differential privacy. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(6):4037–4049, June 2017.
- [59] Ios Kotsogiannis, Yuchao Tao, Xi He, et al. PrivateSQL: a differentially private SQL query engine. *Proceedings VLDB Endowment*, 12(11):1371–1384, July 2019.
- [60] Soukaina Laabadi, Mohamed Naimi, Hassan El Amri, and Boujemâa Achhab. The 0/1 multidimensional knapsack problem and its variants: A survey of practical models and heuristic approaches. *American Journal of Operations Research*, 08(05):395, September 2018.
- [61] Mathias Lécuyer. Practical privacy filters and odometers with rényi differential privacy and applications to differentially private deep learning. March 2021.
- [62] Mathias Lécuyer, Riley Spahn, Kiran Vodrahalli, et al. Privacy accounting and quality control in the sage differentially private ML platform. SOSP '19, pages 181–195, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [63] Weiting Li, Liyao Xiang, Bin Guo, et al. DPlanner: A privacy budgeting system for utility. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, 18:1196–1210, 2023.
- [64] Justina Logozzo. PII compliance tool: Data classification & security. <https://www.alation.com/solutions/privacy-risk-and-compliance/pii-discovery-and-classification/>, June 2020. Accessed: 2022-12-13.
- [65] Tao Luo, Mingen Pan, Pierre Tholoniati, et al. Privacy budget scheduling. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '21)*, pages 55–74. USENIX Association, July 2021.
- [66] Frank D McSherry. Privacy integrated queries: an extensible platform for privacy-preserving data analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*, SIGMOD '09, pages 19–30, New York, NY, USA, June 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [67] Aaron et al. Meurer. Sympy: symbolic computing in python. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 3:e103, January 2017.
- [68] Gerome Miklau. Negotiating Privacy/Utility Trade-Offs under differential privacy. Santa Clara, CA, June 2022. USENIX Association.
- [69] Ilya Mironov. On significance of the least significant bits for differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, CCS '12, pages 650–661, New York, NY, USA, October 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [70] Ilya Mironov. Rényi differential privacy. February 2017.
- [71] Tamara T Mueller, Dmitrii Usynin, Johannes C Paetzold, et al. SoK: Differential privacy on Graph-Structured data. March 2022.
- [72] Deepak Narayanan, Fiodar Kazhamiaka, Firas Abuzaid, et al. Solving Large-Scale granular resource allocation problems efficiently with POP. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '21, pages 521–537, New York, NY, USA, October 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [73] Andrew Newell, Dimitrios Skarlatos, Jingyuan Fan, et al. RAS: Continuously optimized Region-Wide datacenter resource allocation. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '21, pages 505–520, New York, NY, USA, October 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [74] Lily Hay Newman. The alleged capital one hacker didn't cover her tracks. <https://www.wired.com/story/capital-one-hack-credit-card-application-data/>. Accessed: 2022-12-13.
- [75] Team OpenDP. The OpenDP white paper, 2020.
- [76] Nicolas Papernot, Shuang Song, Ilya Mironov, et al. Scalable private learning with PATE. February 2018.
- [77] Nicolas Papernot and Thomas Steinke. Hyperparameter tuning with renyi differential privacy. October 2021.
- [78] Anish Pimpley, Shuo Li, Anubha Srivastava, et al. Optimal resource allocation for serverless queries. July 2021.
- [79] Haoran Qiu, Subho S Banerjee, Saurabh Jha, et al. FIRM: An intelligent fine-grained resource management framework for slo-oriented microservices. In *Proceedings of The 14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '20)*, 2020.
- [80] Ryan Rogers, Adrian Rivera Cardoso, Koray Mancuhan, et al. A members first approach to enabling LinkedIn's labor market insights at scale. October 2020.
- [81] Ryan Rogers, Aaron Roth, Jonathan Ullman, and Salil Vadhan. Privacy odometers and filters: Pay-as-you-Go composition. May 2016.

- [82] Ryan Rogers and Thomas Steinke. A better privacy analysis of the exponential mechanism. <https://differentialprivacy.org/exponential-mechanism-bounded-range/>, July 2021. Accessed: 2022-11-1.
- [83] Ryan Rogers, Subbu Subramaniam, Sean Peng, et al. LinkedIn’s audience engagements API. *JPC J. Planar Chromatogr. - Mod. TLC*, 11(3), December 2021.
- [84] Edo Roth, Karan Newatia, and Yiping Ma. Mycelium: Large-Scale distributed graph queries with differential privacy. 2021.
- [85] Edo Roth, Daniel Noble, Brett Hemenway Falk, and Andreas Haeberlen. Honeycrisp: Large-Scale differentially private aggregation without a trusted core. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP ’19*, pages 196–210, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [86] Edo Roth, Hengchu Zhang, Andreas Haeberlen, and Benjamin C Pierce. Orchard: Differentially private analytics at scale. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*, pages 1065–1081. USENIX Association, November 2020.
- [87] Krzysztof Rzacca, Paweł Findeisen, Jacek Świdarski, et al. Autopilot: Workload autoscaling at google scale. 2020.
- [88] William Sexton, John M Abowd, Ian M Schmutte, and Lars Vilhuber. Synthetic population housing and person records for the united states, May 2017.
- [89] Aashaka Shah, Vinay Banakar, Supreeth Shastri, et al. Analyzing the impact of GDPR on storage systems. In *Proceedings of the 11th USENIX Conference on Hot Topics in Storage and File Systems, HotStorage’19*, page 4, USA, July 2019. USENIX Association.
- [90] Supreeth Shastri, Vinay Banakar, Melissa Wasserman, et al. Understanding and benchmarking the impact of GDPR on database systems. *Proceedings VLDB Endowment*, 13(7):1064–1077, March 2020.
- [91] Supreeth Shastri, Melissa Wasserman, and Vijay Chidambaram. The seven sins of personal-data processing systems under GDPR. In *Proceedings of the 11th USENIX Conference on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing, HotCloud’19*, page 1, USA, July 2019. USENIX Association.
- [92] Josh Smith, Hassan Jameel Asghar, Gianpaolo Gioiosa, et al. Making the most of parallel composition in differential privacy. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.*, 2022(1):253–273, January 2022.
- [93] Yang Song, Chi Zhang, and Yuguang Fang. Multiple multidimensional knapsack problem and its applications in cognitive radio networks. In *MILCOM 2008 - 2008 IEEE Military Communications Conference*, pages 1–7, November 2008.
- [94] Pierre Tholoniat, Kelly Kostopoulou, Mosharaf Chowdhury, et al. Packing privacy budget efficiently. December 2022.
- [95] Alexey Tumanov, Timothy Zhu, Jun Woo Park, et al. TetriSched: global rescheduling with adaptive plan-ahead in dynamic heterogeneous clusters. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh European Conference on Computer Systems*, number Article 35 in EuroSys ’16, pages 1–16, New York, NY, USA, April 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [96] US Census Bureau. Census.gov. <https://www.census.gov/>, 2022. Accessed: 2022-12-21.
- [97] Salil Vadhan and Wanrong Zhang. Concurrent composition theorems for all standard variants of differential privacy. July 2022.
- [98] Vinod Kumar Vavilapalli, Arun C Murthy, Chris Douglas, et al. Apache hadoop YARN: yet another resource negotiator. In *Proceedings of the 4th annual Symposium on Cloud Computing*, number Article 5 in SOCC ’13, pages 1–16, New York, NY, USA, October 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [99] Lun Wang, Usman Khan, Georgia Tech, et al. PrivGuard: Privacy regulation compliance made easier. 2022.
- [100] Yu-Xiang Wang. AutoDP: A flexible and easy-to-use package for differential privacy. <https://github.com/yuxiangw/autodp>, 2021. Accessed: 2022-11-30.
- [101] Stanley Warner. Randomized response: a survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 60(309):63–66, March 1965.
- [102] Justin Whitehouse, Aaditya Ramdas, Ryan Rogers, and Zhiwei Steven Wu. Fully adaptive composition in differential privacy. March 2022.
- [103] Royce J Wilson, Celia Yuxin Zhang, William Lam, et al. Differentially private SQL with bounded user contribution. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, 2020(2):230–250, April 2020.
- [104] Ashkan Yousefpour, Igor Shilov, Alexandre Sablayrolles, et al. Opaacus: User-Friendly differential privacy library in PyTorch. September 2021.
- [105] Guangba Yu, Pengfei Chen, and Zibin Zheng. Microscaler: Automatic scaling for microservices with an online learning approach. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, pages 68–75. unknown, July 2019.
- [106] Shufan Zhang and Xi He. DProvDB: Differentially private query processing with Multi-Analyst provenance. September 2023.
- [107] Yuqing Zhu and Yu-Xiang Wang. Poission subsampled rényi differential privacy. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7634–7642. PMLR, 2019.

## Appendix A. Budget Unlocking Cohere

This section analyzes the process of unlocking budgets for each block ID. Recall that we have a sliding window over groups  $G_i$ , and each group is subdivided into block IDs. To simplify, we consider only the case with a single block ID per group. However, the unlocking process remains identical with multiple block IDs, and analogous properties hold. In addition, we assume  $\epsilon$ -DP. Later, we will expand budget unlocking to RDP. For each allocation  $i$ , we consider the last  $K$  groups (i.e.,  $G_{i-K+1}$  until  $G_i$ ) and we assume  $K$  is even. Each request selects all currently active groups and, upon allocation, assigns the same cost to every selected group. The total allocated budget in round  $i$  is denoted as  $c_i$ .

The budget-unlocking process functions as follows: During the initial  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds of each group’s lifetime, a budget of  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  is unlocked. Subsequently, in the latter  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds, a budget of  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  per round is unlocked, where  $\Delta \in [0, 1]$ . After  $K$  rounds, the group is retired.

This process now fulfills several desirable properties:

**P1: Maximum Budget:** We never exceed the overall budget of  $\epsilon$  for each group.

*Proof:* Consider that the unlocked budget in the final round of the allocation for each group equals:  $\sum_{i=1}^{K/2} ((1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}) + \sum_{i=\frac{K}{2}+1}^K ((1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}) = \frac{K}{2}(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K} + \frac{K}{2}(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K} = \frac{K}{2}(2 + \Delta - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K} = \epsilon$ .  $\square$

**P2.1: Fairness 1:** For every allocation, there is at least  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  of the budget available.

*Proof:* Before every allocation, we unlock either  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  or  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  of budget in each group.  $\square$

**P2.2: Fairness 2:** We never allocate more than  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in a single allocation round.

*Proof:* We have only  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  unlocked budget for the newest group. As each allocation must adhere to the unlocked budget on every active group, the available budget in each allocation round cannot exceed  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ .  $\square$

The allocation in each round depends on the available requests and the allocation algorithm. However, the budget-unlocking strategy should possess the flexibility to enable as many allocations as possible. First, we discuss two possible allocation series, and then we show what determines the available budget in each round.

**(P3.1: Greedy Optimal Allocation)** If we consistently allocate the entire available budget, then the allocation pattern follows a periodic sequence. Assuming, that we start with a set of  $K$  active groups without any budget consumed, then we can allocate  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in the first  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds, and  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in the later  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds.

*Proof:* In the first  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds, we can allocate  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  per round, as the unlocking step of the respective first group is always the limiting factor, i.e.,  $G_1$  in round 1,  $G_2$  in round 2, etc. After these  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds, the group  $G_1$ , which was newly added to the active set in the first round, has all the available budget consumed, i.e.,  $\frac{K}{2} \cdot (1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ . In round  $\frac{K}{2} + k$  for  $k = 1 \dots \frac{K}{2}$ , this group still has all available budget consumed and subsequently unlocks additional  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  budget. Consequently, our allocation during these rounds is constrained to  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ , as by P2.1, this is always available. After these  $\frac{K}{2}$  rounds, the cost of the first round exits the active window, allowing us to resume allocating  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ . In essence, whenever the cost of a certain magnitude exits the active window, we can reallocate this cost, creating a recurring pattern.  $\square$

**(P3.2: Balanced Optimal Allocation)** The unlocking strategy allows for balanced allocations of  $\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in each round.

*Proof:* The respective initial  $\frac{K}{2}$  groups impose no restriction since we unlock  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{K}$  per round. For a group active for  $k \geq \frac{K}{2}$  rounds, the past consumed budget is  $\frac{(k-1) \cdot \epsilon}{K}$ , and the unlocked budget is:  $B_k = \left[\frac{K}{2}(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}\right] + \left[(k - \frac{K}{2})(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}\right] = (k + (K - k)\Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ . To show that we can allocate  $\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ , we need to show that  $B_k - \frac{(k-1) \cdot \epsilon}{K} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{K}$ . Simplifying, this becomes  $\frac{(K-k)\Delta\epsilon}{K} + \frac{\epsilon}{K} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{K}$ , which holds true as  $K > 0$ ,  $k \leq K$ ,  $\Delta \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ , ensuring the first term is non-negative.  $\square$

**(P4: Available Budget)** Given the allocation of at least  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  in every round, the available budget  $b_i$  can be expressed as:  $b_i = \min\left(\epsilon - \sum_{j=i-K+1}^{i-1} c_j, (1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}\right)$ .

Before showing P4, we show that when each allocation incurs a cost of at least  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ , it suffices to address the budget constraints of the newest and the oldest group.

*Proof:* We collapse the budget constraints of the newer half of the groups into the constraint of the newest group, which allows  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  per round. Next, we demonstrate that the budget constraints of the older half of the groups can be collapsed into the constraint of the oldest group in the active window. Within the older half of groups, for simplicity denoted by  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{K/2}$  (where  $G_1$  is the oldest), the available budget for group  $G_i$  is the difference between

the total budget  $\epsilon$ , the locked budget, and the consumed budget. This can be expressed as  $\epsilon - [(i - 1) \cdot (1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}] - [c_i + \dots + c_{K-1}]$ , where  $c_i$  corresponds to the allocation cost when group  $G_i$  was the newest group in the active window. As all  $c_k \geq (1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$ , the available budget in group  $G_1$  is the most restricted.  $\square$

*Proof P4:* As shown above, we only need to consider the budget constraints of the newest and the oldest group to determine the overall available budget. The newest group allows an allocation of up to  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K}$  but no more, leading to the  $\min(\cdot, (1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon}{K})$  condition. In the case of the oldest group, no budget is locked. Therefore, the available budget is the difference between the total budget and the sum of the last  $K - 1$  allocations, represented as  $\epsilon - \sum_{j=i-K+1}^{i-1} c_j$ .  $\square$

To extend the budget unlocking strategy to RDP, we unlock the budget as we described for  $\epsilon$ -DP, but for each  $\alpha_a$  for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  individually, in steps of  $(1 \pm \Delta)\frac{\epsilon_{\alpha_a}}{K}$ .  $\epsilon_{\alpha_a}$  is the budget for  $\alpha_a$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, A_{max}\}$  is the index set of tracked values of  $\alpha_a$ . The described properties hold, however, slightly modified:

- P1: Budget  $\epsilon_{\alpha_a}$  is not exceeded at least for a single value of  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , which means the budget overall is not exceeded by RDP semantics.
- P2.1: For every allocation, we have at least  $(1 - \Delta)\frac{\epsilon_{\alpha_a}}{K}$  in budget available for some  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  (we might have less available for other values of  $a$ ).
- P2.2: For every allocation, we allocate at most  $(1 + \Delta)\frac{\epsilon_{\alpha_a}}{K}$  in budget for some  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  (we might allocate more for other values of  $a$ ).
- P3.1/P3.2: Holds for some value of  $\alpha_a$ , i.e., the active  $\alpha_a$ .
- P4: Holds for all  $\alpha_a$ , however, for some the available budget may be negative, i.e., inactive  $\alpha_a$ .

## Appendix B.

### Privacy Resource Allocation ILP

We want to automatically compute an optimal assignment of groups to requests which maximizes the utility while maintaining the privacy budgets for each block ID (grouped into segments). We define our optimization problem as an ILP, i.e., a mathematical optimization problem, in which the objective function and the constraints are linear, and the variables are all integers. We present an ILP formulation that supports multiple allocation approaches for RDP block composition. In addition to addressing the optimization problem outlined in Section 4.3, this formulation can accommodate an alternative allocation approach where certain requests might require only a specific number of the active groups, rather than all of them. The optimization problem shares similarities with the 0/1 multiple multidimensional knapsack problem (0/1 MMKP) [60], [93], where items have costs in multiple dimensions and must be (optionally) packed into one of several knapsacks with scalar capacities for each dimension. In our case, requests represent items, groups are the knapsacks, and segments are dimensions. Our problem differs in two aspects. First, assignments must be made

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} y_i \cdot W_i \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{ij} \geq y_i \cdot D_i & [\forall i \in \mathcal{R}] \\
& \sum_{x_{ij} \in \mathcal{X}(S_k)} (x_{ij} - z_{ka}) \cdot C_i^{(a)} \leq B_k^{(a)} & [\forall k \in \mathcal{S}][\forall a \in \mathcal{A}] \\
& \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} z_{ka} < |\mathcal{A}| & [\forall k \in \mathcal{S}] \\
& y_i \in \{0, 1\} & [\forall i \in \mathcal{R}] \\
& x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} & [\forall i \in \mathcal{R}][\forall j \in \mathcal{N}] \\
& z_{ka} \in \{0, 1\} & [\forall k \in \mathcal{S}][\forall a \in \mathcal{A}]
\end{aligned}$$

Listing 8: Integer Linear Program (ILP) formulation to find an optimal allocation.

to multiple knapsacks due to requests requiring multiple groups. Moreover, RDP composition introduces a novel logical OR-semantic for segment capacities. Instead of using scalar capacities for each dimension as in 0/1 MMKP, our ILP tracks for each dimension a set of costs and capacities for different orders  $\alpha_a$ . The semantic is that the budget constraint of a dimension is satisfied, if the budget constraint for a single order is satisfied.

In Figure 8, we provide a complete formulation of the ILP. Below, we provide explanations for each part.

**Notation.** Let  $\mathcal{R} := \{1, \dots, R_{max}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{N} := \{1, \dots, N_{max}\}$  and  $\mathcal{S} := \{1, \dots, S_{max}\}$  denote index sets of the requests, groups and segments respectively. A request  $R_i$  for  $i \in \mathcal{R}$  is a tuple  $(D_i, \Phi_i, \mathbf{C}_i, W_i)$  consisting of a *data requirement* requesting  $D_i \in \mathbb{N}$  groups<sup>10</sup> filtered by a propositional formula  $\Phi_i$  over the PAs, a *budget requirement* expressed as a vector  $\mathbf{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$  of RDP costs for different orders  $\alpha_a$  (for  $a \in \mathcal{A} := \{1, \dots, A_{max}\}$ ), and a *weight*<sup>11</sup>  $W_i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Groups are uniquely identified by their global ID  $j \in \mathcal{N}$ , thus we do not differentiate between groups and their IDs (not to be confused with block IDs). The notion of segments is introduced in Section 4.3.

**Decision Variables & Objective.** We introduce two main types of decision variables. First,  $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{R}$ , where  $y_i = 1$  means the request  $R_i$  is accepted, and  $y_i = 0$  means the request has been rejected. Second, the decision

10. Note, when using Poisson subsampling, we set the data requirements such that all active groups are required for a request to be fulfilled, i.e.,  $D_i = N_{max}$ . Technically, this problem corresponds to the 0/1 multidimensional knapsack problem (0/1 MKP) with the same logical OR-semantic for capacities (c.f. §4.3).

11. Weights are determined either by utility or set to  $W_i = 1 \forall i \in \mathcal{R}$  when maximizing the number of requests.

variables  $x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{N}$  indicate whether or not group  $j$  is allocated to request  $R_i$ . The *objective* is to maximize the sum of weights of the accepted requests.

**Constraints.** Finally, there are two main types of constraints: *data constraints* that ensure that an accepted request is assigned sufficient groups, and *budget constraints* that enforce correct privacy budget accounting given the PAs and budget requirement of each request. The *data constraints* (line 2 in Figure 8) ensure that request  $R_i$  is only allocated if the number of assigned groups is greater or equal to the demand  $D_i$ . The *budget constraints* are more complex, as they rely on the notion of segments.  $\mathcal{X}(S_k)$  indirectly encodes the propositional formulas  $\Phi_i$ . The core idea is that the ILP ensures that for each segment, there is at least one value of  $\alpha$  (line 4) such that we do not use more  $\epsilon^{(rdp)}$  (line 3) than the budget for that value of  $\alpha$ .

## Appendix C. Meta-Review

The following meta-review was prepared by the program committee for the 2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P) as part of the review process as detailed in the call for papers.

### C.1. Summary

This paper presents Cohere, a system for efficiently managing differential privacy in large-scale systems where coordination and planning is required to support applications with diverse workloads and privacy requirements.

### C.2. Scientific Contributions

- Addresses a Long-Known Issue
- Provides a Valuable Step Forward in an Established Field

### C.3. Reasons for Acceptance

- 1) The paper presents a complete framework and system for managing differential privacy applications in real-world scenarios. Handling applications with different privacy constraints is a known challenge for differential privacy.
- 2) The paper provides a valuable step forward in an established field. Compared to existing solutions to manage privacy resources (e.g., PrivateKube), Cohere empirically claims significantly improved utility. This is achieved through several novel elements, including the combination of user rotation with standard differential privacy techniques such as partitioning and sampling.