

PoCoFL: POLICY-COMPLIANT Federated Learning

Dominik Roy George, Varesh Mishra, and Aysajan Abidin

COSIC, KU Leuven, Belgium

dgeorge@esat.kuleuven.be, varesh.mishra@esat.kuleuven.be, aysajan@kuleuven.be

Abstract—Federated Learning (FL) is a privacy-oriented learning paradigm that enables collaborative model training while keeping training data local to participating clients. However, it does not guarantee that clients submit policy-compliant contributions or that aggregators process admitted contributions correctly. Existing verifiable FL systems tailor validation rules to specific FL settings, learning workflows, and cryptographic constructions, limiting their applicability across network topologies, participant roles, and aggregation semantics. In this paper, we present *PoCoFL*, a policy-compliant federated learning framework that separates three aspects: (i) FL type, (ii) policy semantics, and (iii) cryptographic realisation. We provide a formalisation that captures client and aggregation requirements as policy-dependent relations. Clients prove compliance of their contributions using commitments and non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs, while aggregators prove that the recorded set of admitted contributions was processed according to the selected aggregation policy. We demonstrate *PoCoFL* through four formal instantiations: (i) vanilla, (ii) continual, (iii) personalised, and (iv) threshold-encrypted federated learning. We evaluate the effects of policy enforcement on the learning objectives of vanilla, personalised, and continual FL. We further implement proof-of-concept realisations of all four instantiations, demonstrating the versatility and practical feasibility of *PoCoFL*. Overall, these results show that *PoCoFL* can capture complex policy representations while remaining network-topology agnostic.

Index Terms—federated learning, verifiable computation, policy compliance, zero-knowledge proofs

I. INTRODUCTION

FL is well suited to privacy-sensitive domains such as healthcare because it enables several institutions to train a shared model without centrally collecting their patient data. Keeping data at its source can reduce unnecessary transfers and support data-protection principles such as data minimisation under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [1]. Nevertheless, data locality alone does not make the learning process trustworthy [2]. A coordinating server may omit, modify, or incorrectly aggregate client contributions, while a faulty, malicious, or compromised client may submit an unreliable update [3], [4]. Secure aggregation can conceal individual contributions, but does not establish that they were generated correctly or are suitable for inclusion [5], [6]. Likewise, an admissibility check certifies only the conditions it explicitly encodes. We therefore express the required guarantees as policies, making the scope of verification explicit and interpreting compliance relative to the selected conditions.

These policies depend on the federated-learning setting. Server-assisted, personalised, continual, decentralised, and other FL paradigms differ in participant roles, retained state, aggregation semantics, and trust assumptions [7]–[12]. For ex-

ample, server-assisted settings may require both confidentiality of client contributions and evidence of correct aggregation, while decentralised settings distribute these responsibilities among peers. Personalized and continual settings may additionally require policies over client-specific models or retained state. Hence, admissibility and aggregation correctness cannot be defined uniformly, but must reflect the selected execution context.

Existing work addresses individual parts of this problem through secure aggregation, validation mechanisms, and verifiable computation [2]. However, existing constructions commonly bind the verified conditions, learning workflow, and cryptographic techniques to a particular protocol. Supporting a different topology, state model, aggregation rule, or notion of admissibility may therefore require a new construction and security analysis. We use policies as a common abstraction. The FL setting fixes the execution context, policies specify the conditions to be enforced, and compatible cryptographic mechanisms provide evidence that these conditions hold.

We address this limitation by introducing *PoCoFL*, a generic policy-compliant FL framework. The central idea is to separate three aspects: (i) the FL type and participant roles that define the execution context, (ii) the policy requirements governing client and aggregation actions, and (iii) the cryptographic mechanisms used to prove compliance. Client contributions carry evidence that they satisfy the applicable client policy, while aggregation results carry evidence that the applicable aggregation policy was followed. This provides update admissibility, aggregation correctness with respect to the recorded set of admitted contributions, and policy-relative privacy. *PoCoFL* is network-topology agnostic because policies are instantiated according to the selected FL type, and cryptographically agile because policy semantics are separated from the compatible mechanisms used to enforce them. The framework does not assume that every mechanism can be replaced independently, but permits compatible cryptographic realisations that preserve the required functionality, security guarantees, and policy semantics. This separation also provides a common interface between machine learning and applied cryptography. Machine-learning researchers can define policies over local training, robustness, personalisation, retained state, or aggregation, while cryptographers can develop compatible components or secure-computation mechanisms that realise these policies under different security and efficiency requirements.

Contribution. Our contributions are as follows.

- We identify five requirements for policy-compliant and verifiable FL and introduce a generic proof-carrying framework




Fig. 1. *PoCoFL* system model linking FL settings, policy predicates, and verifiability guarantees.

that separates the FL type, policy semantics, and compatible cryptographic realisation.

- We formalise update admissibility, aggregation correctness, and policy-relative privacy through security games, and prove that the framework provides these properties under the stated cryptographic assumptions.
- We instantiate and implement *PoCoFL* for vanilla, personalised, continual, and threshold-Homomorphic Encryption (HE) FL, thereby demonstrating its practical feasibility. We evaluate the impact of policy enforcement on learning under model-poisoning attacks in the first three settings. We also benchmark the computational and communication overhead of policy verification across all four scenarios.

Roadmap. The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Sec. II presents the system model, requirements, and threat model. Sec. III introduces the framework, its components, and generic execution. Sec. IV formalises the security guarantees and provides the associated proofs in Appendix C. Sec. V presents representative framework instantiations and Sec. VI provides their evaluation. Secs. VII and VIII discuss the framework and related work, respectively. Finally, Sec. IX concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL, REQUIREMENTS, AND THREAT MODEL

This section establishes the setting in which the framework operates. We first describe the participating entities and FL settings, then derive the policy-compliance requirements, and finally define the adversarial model and the security properties targeted by the framework.

A. System Model

In our system model, we consider the standard entities involved in an FL setting, namely clients and aggregators. Depending on the selected FL type, a participant may realise one of these roles or both. A client holds a private local dataset and uses it to train a local model without directly disclosing the underlying data. An aggregator receives the resulting client contributions, such as local model parameters or updates, and combines them according to the prescribed aggregation rule. Whenever a client or an aggregator verifies a

proof, it additionally acts as a verifier. The verifier is therefore a logical role and does not require a separate trusted entity. We assume that communication between participating entities is established over authenticated and confidential channels.

Keeping the local data at the clients prevents its direct disclosure, but does not by itself guarantee that the resulting contribution is policy-compliant. A malicious client may submit a malformed or policy-violating contribution, while a malicious aggregator may omit, duplicate, substitute, modify, or incorrectly weight admitted contributions. Our framework therefore associates client-side and aggregation-side actions with policies that specify the conditions under which these actions are considered compliant. *PoCoFL* aims to make compliance with these policies verifiable while preserving the confidentiality of protected local data and other private policy-relevant inputs. For further adversarial details, we refer the reader to Sec. II-C.

Supported FL types. Our system model supports different FL types, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The selected type determines the participating roles, communication pattern, retained state, and aggregation semantics, while the corresponding policies determine which properties of these actions need to be verified. **Single server-assisted types.** In server-assisted types, a logical aggregation service coordinates the training rounds, communicates the shared training state to the clients, receives their contributions, and produces the state used in the subsequent round. The classic FL [7], [8] the clients collaboratively train a shared model. Each client computes a local contribution from its private data, and the aggregator combines the admitted contributions according to the prescribed aggregation rule. The corresponding policies can specify the conditions under which a client contribution is admissible and how the admitted contributions must be aggregated. In this work, we refer to this classic FL setting as VanillaFL. VanillaFL is applicable, e.g., in the healthcare domain, where multiple hospitals collaboratively train a common model on medical data such as X-ray images while keeping patient data local and contributing to the improvement of the shared global model.

Meanwhile, in PersonalizedFL [9], collaborative learning is extended with client-specific models or personalisation state. This allows each client to adapt the knowledge obtained through federation to its local data distribution, task, or application, while still benefiting from the contributions of other clients. Policies may additionally govern the relationship between the local personalised state and the shared global state. Personalisation is particularly relevant when hospitals serve populations with varying demographic characteristics or use distinct imaging protocols. Personalised FL enables models to adapt to each hospital’s local data distribution while leveraging knowledge shared across institutions [13].

In ContinualFL [10], [14], [15], clients learn from a sequence of tasks or evolving data distributions. A client may therefore retain information across tasks or training rounds so that subsequent training can preserve previously acquired knowledge, limit forgetting, or enforce continuity between successive local states. When required, this retained state can

be included as policy-relevant state and governed by the corresponding verification policy. Healthcare can benefit from continual FL, where hospitals collaboratively extend diagnostic models to recognise new diseases by sharing knowledge across institutions. The objective is to learn successive tasks while limiting forgetting of previously acquired knowledge [16].

Decentralised and multi-aggregator types. *PoCoFL* is not restricted to a single distinguished aggregation server. For instance, participants may communicate directly with their peers, perform local training, aggregate received contributions, and therefore act as both clients and aggregators while maintaining their own evolving model states. The same policy abstraction can govern both the contributions produced by a participant and the aggregation actions it performs.

In such a setting, the aggregation or coordination functionality is shared among multiple parties. These parties may divide the aggregation task, jointly execute the prescribed computation, or collectively authorise the resulting model. A concrete realisation may additionally employ cryptographic mechanisms to prevent a single party from independently recovering protected client contributions or controlling the resulting aggregate. The corresponding policies can specify conditions on participation, admissibility, aggregation, quorum, and correctness.

The types above are representative rather than exhaustive. A further FL setting can be supported by defining its participating roles, round structure, policy-relevant state, communication pattern, and aggregation semantics. These elements determine the execution structure of the instantiation, while the policy layer determines which client-side and aggregation-side properties are required for compliance. We provide the formal framework in Sec. III.

Policy selection and verifiable evidence. Once the FL type has fixed the participating roles, round structure, retained state, communication pattern, and aggregation semantics, a realisation selects the policies governing its client and aggregation actions. Each policy associates an action with a policy predicate that specifies the conditions under which the action is considered policy-compliant. A predicate may combine multiple verification conditions over the policy-relevant inputs and state.

The participant performing the action attaches verifiable evidence showing that the corresponding predicate is satisfied. The designated verifier checks this evidence when processing the protocol message and accepts the action only if the required policy conditions hold. Depending on the instantiation, clients and aggregators may therefore act as both producers and verifiers of such evidence. In this way, *PoCoFL* separates the FL-specific execution structure from the policies that define compliance. The formal policy representation and generic verification procedures are defined in Sec. III.

B. Policy-Compliance Requirements

Based on the system model, we identify five requirements to realise the policy-compliant and verifiable FL Framework. The selected FL type determines the admissible learning, role,

state, and topology semantics, whereas the applicable policies determine which concrete client and aggregation actions are compliant within those semantics. We state the five requirements below:

(R1) Type-aware policy configuration. The framework supports different FL types and network topologies. Each FL type defines the basic execution structure, such as the participant roles, communication pattern, retained state, and aggregation semantics. Policies define the conditions that must be satisfied within this structure, for example, which participants are allowed and which aggregation rule must be followed. The framework also supports reusable policies that apply across different FL types, such as verifying that a score is computed correctly and satisfies a given threshold. Thus, policies may be either specific to an FL type or reusable across multiple settings.

(R2) Verifiable client-policy compliance. Every client contribution that may influence an aggregation result or a participant’s model state should be accompanied by verifiable evidence that it satisfies the selected client policy and the active protocol context. The policy may govern, for example, participant and round identifiers, model context, committed private data, update bounds, loss conditions, neighbourhood membership, or continuity with retained client state. This requirement is formalised by Property **(P1)**, *update admissibility*, in Sec. II-C.

(R3) Verifiable aggregation-policy compliance. Every aggregation result should be accompanied by verifiable evidence that the aggregator followed the policy applicable to the selected FL type. The policy may govern the recorded admitted set, eligible participants or neighbours, participation threshold, extracted aggregation values, assigned weights, aggregation rule, and resulting model-state transition. This requirement is formalised by Property **(P2)**, *aggregation correctness relative to the recorded set*, in Sec. II-C.

(R4) Private policy verification. A policy may depend on private assets, such as a client’s local data, retained state, commitment openings, randomness, or intermediate values. The designated verifier should be able to establish policy compliance without learning these assets beyond the public statement and the compliance outcome. This requirement is formalised by Property **(P3)**, *policy-relative privacy*, in Sec. II-C. Confidentiality of individual contributions during aggregation is separate and may be provided by an auxiliary mechanism selected by the realisation.

(R5) Cryptographic modularity and agility. The framework should separate policy logic from its cryptographic realisation. Cryptographic mechanisms should be defined through clear interfaces and may be replaced by compatible alternatives that provide the required functionality and security guarantees. Since some mechanisms depend on each other, replacing one component may also require replacing related components. The framework should also support cryptographic agility, allowing its cryptographic realisation to evolve with new security requirements and standards, including post-quantum alternatives where appropriate. Such changes should preserve

the security properties of the framework and the semantics of its policies.

C. Threat Model

We consider probabilistic polynomial-time (PPT) adversaries acting either as malicious clients or as a malicious aggregation server.

Malicious clients ($\mathcal{A}_1$). The adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$ controls the private inputs, state, randomness, and outgoing messages of one or more malicious clients. Its objective is to have a malformed or policy-violating contribution admitted for aggregation. Depending on the selected FL type and client policy, a bad contribution may, for example, be inconsistent with the active model or round, exceed an allowed bound, or violate a continual-learning condition. The adversary does not obtain the datasets or private states of honest clients.

Malicious server ($\mathcal{A}_2$). The adversary $\mathcal{A}_2$ controls the aggregation server and may output an arbitrary admitted-message record, aggregation result, and aggregation proof. It may attempt to replay or modify client messages, duplicate or substitute recorded contributions, change aggregation weights, or compute a result inconsistent with the prescribed aggregation policy. It receives the public client messages but does not obtain the private witnesses of honest clients.

Unless stated otherwise, we consider $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ separately and exclude collusion between malicious clients and the server. The public parameters are honestly generated, and protocol messages are bound to their claimed senders by the authenticated-channel assumption.

Out-of-Scope. Denial-of-service attacks and omission before an update becomes part of the public admitted-message record are outside the scope of this work. Thus, aggregation correctness is relative to the record Adm_t used for the round. It does not prove that every submitted update was placed in that record. A public append-only log or another auditable submission mechanism can provide that additional guarantee.

1) *Security Properties.*: Under the adversarial model above, the framework targets three guarantees.

(P1) Update admissibility. A client contribution is admitted only if its sender and public context match the active client, model, round, policy, and parameters. Its aggregation value is well formed and its statement belongs to the language $\mathcal{L}_\phi$ induced by the applicable client policy.

(P2) Aggregation correctness relative to the recorded set. An aggregation result is accepted only if the recorded list Adm_t contains pairwise-distinct admissible client messages and the output is obtained by extracting every recorded contribution exactly once, applying the prescribed aggregation rule and weights, and applying the prescribed model-update rule. This prevents omission, duplication, substitution, modification, or reweighting within the recorded set.

(P3) Policy-relative privacy. For any two private client inputs that satisfy the same policy and induce the same declared public information and compliance outcome, the resulting verification transcripts are computationally indistinguishable to any PPT verifier. Hence verification reveals no information

about the private policy witness beyond the public protocol inputs and the compliance outcome.

III. FRAMEWORK DESCRIPTION

We now present *PoCoFL*.

To develop an intuitive understanding of our framework, it is essential to first examine the rationale behind its design. Our framework follows three high-level design principles. First, it is *topology versatile*, meaning that it can support different FL types and network topologies, while the policies are configured for the selected setting. This reflects Requirement **(R1)**. Second, it is *cryptographically agile*, meaning that the cryptographic mechanisms used for verification can evolve with security requirements, provided that compatible mechanisms preserve the meaning of the policies and the required security guarantees. This reflects Requirement **(R5)**. Third, it provides *policy compliance*, meaning that client contributions and aggregation results can be checked against their applicable policies. This reflects Requirements **(R2)** and **(R3)**, while protecting private policy inputs as required by Requirement **(R4)**. These principles determine the six framework components defined next.

A. Framework Components

PoCoFL consists of six components covering the FL setting, governed objects and policies, and cryptographic mechanisms. Formally, a framework instance is represented by the tuple

$$\mathfrak{F} = \langle \text{Type}, \text{Asset}, \text{CS}, \Pi, \text{Aux}, \Phi \rangle. \quad (1)$$

We define the six components below:

1) *FL Type (Type)*: The federated-learning type characterises the learning setting and determines the high-level structure of the training protocol. Different FL types may differ in their participants, local computation, maintained state, and aggregation behaviour.

Definition 1 (Federated learning type). *The component Type identifies the FL setting. It is selected from a family such as*

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{FL}} = \{\text{VanillaFL}, \text{PersonalizedFL}, \text{ContinualFL}, \dots\}.$$

The selected type fixes the participating roles, the round structure, the local state maintained by a client, and the aggregation semantics. It does not fix a particular cryptographic construction.

2) *Assets (Asset)*: A protocol operates on a collection of learning and cryptographic objects that are created, exchanged, or verified during execution. We refer to these objects collectively as the assets of the framework.

Definition 2 (Assets). *The set Asset contains the objects on which the framework operates:*

$$\text{Asset} = \{\text{Obj}^{\text{FL}}, \text{Obj}^{\text{Crypto}}\}.$$

Here, Obj^{FL} contains FL objects, such as a global model, a local model, a local update, a round identifier, and any state required by Type. The set $\text{Obj}^{\text{Crypto}}$ contains cryptographic objects, such as public parameters, commitments, proofs, keys, signatures, hashes, or ciphertexts.

3) *Commitment Schemes (CS)* : A commitment scheme allows a party to commit to a value while keeping the value hidden, while preventing the committed value from being changed later [17], [18]. We use commitments to bind private objects to the values subsequently certified by the protocol.

Definition 3 (Commitment scheme). *The commitment scheme is $CS = (\text{Setup}_{CS}, \text{Commit})$. It provides the following algorithms:*

$$\text{pp}_{CS} \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{CS}(1^\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad (c, r) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{CS}, m).$$

The value c binds a client to the message m , while r is the opening information. The scheme is required to satisfy correctness, hiding, and binding for the security parameter λ .

When a policy requires commitments to an ordered collection $M = (m^{(1)}, \dots, m^{(J)})$, we write

$$(C, R) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{CS}, M)$$

as shorthand for applying the same commitment algorithm independently to each entry, where

$$C = (c^{(1)}, \dots, c^{(J)}) \quad \text{and} \quad R = (r^{(1)}, \dots, r^{(J)}).$$

The Commit interface in our framework intentionally returns both the commitment and its opening information to support policy-dependent use across different realisations. The opening information can remain in a private proof witness or be explicitly provided to an aggregator with the committed value when the selected policy requires opening.

4) *Non-Interactive Zero-Knowledge (NIZK) proof system* (Π): A non-interactive zero-knowledge proof allows a prover to convince a verifier that a statement is true without revealing the corresponding private witness and without requiring interaction beyond the proof itself [19].

Definition 4 (Non-interactive zero-knowledge proof system). *The proof system is a NIZK system*

$$\Pi = (\text{Setup}_\Pi, \text{Prove}, \text{Verify})$$

for the policy-dependent relation family $\mathcal{R}_\Phi = \{\mathcal{R}_\phi\}_{\phi \in \Phi}$. For each $\phi \in \Phi$, its algorithms are

$$\text{pp}_\Pi \leftarrow \text{Setup}_\Pi(1^\lambda), \pi \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x, w) \text{ and}$$

$$b \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x, \pi).$$

The public statement x contains the public assets associated with a protocol action, while the witness w contains the corresponding private assets and commitment openings. For every $\phi \in \Phi$, the NIZK proves membership in the policy-dependent relation $\mathcal{R}_\phi$. In particular,

$$(x, w) \in \mathcal{R}_\phi \iff \text{Pred}_\phi(x, w) = 1.$$

The proof system is required to provide completeness, soundness, and zero knowledge.

5) *Auxiliary Objects (Aux)*: Some realisations require additional cryptographic primitives beyond the commitment scheme and NIZK proof system. We collect such optional realisation-specific functionality under the auxiliary component.

Definition 5 (Auxiliary objects). *The component Aux contains optional cryptographic primitives used by a realisation of the framework. Typical examples are*

$$\text{Aux} = (\text{Sig}, \text{H}, \text{HE}, \dots).$$

Here, Sig, H, and HE denote optional signature, hash, and homomorphic encryption mechanisms. A realisation may use any subset of these components as required by its selected policies. Each selected auxiliary primitive must specify the correctness and security properties required by the realisation. Any additional security guarantee provided through such a primitive is conditional on its corresponding primitive-specific assumptions, which must be stated by the concrete instantiation.

6) *Policy Set (Φ)*: Policies specify the conditions that protocol actions are required to satisfy. They provide a declarative way to express when a client contribution or an aggregation result is considered compliant.

Definition 6 (Policy). *Let Asset denote the space of federated-learning and cryptographic assets, including the public parameters used by the protocol, and let Aux denote the space of optional realisation-specific auxiliary objects. A policy family is a set $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N\}$. Each policy $\phi \in \Phi$ specifies a deterministic polynomial-time predicate*

$$\text{Pred}_\phi : \mathcal{X}_\phi \times \mathcal{W}_\phi \longrightarrow \{0, 1\},$$

where $\mathcal{X}_\phi \subseteq \text{Asset}^* \times \text{Aux}^*$ is the space of public statements, and $\mathcal{W}_\phi \subseteq \text{Asset}^* \times \text{Aux}^*$ is the space of private witnesses.

For $x \in \mathcal{X}_\phi$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}_\phi$, the value $\text{Pred}_\phi(x, w) = 1$ means that the assets and auxiliary objects represented by (x, w) satisfy policy ϕ . A policy may govern either a client action or an aggregation action. Its predicate includes any required consistency among the public and private assets represented by the statement and witness.

B. Framework Realisation

The components defined above specify the building blocks of a framework instance. A concrete realisation combines compatible choices for these components into an executable policy-compliant FL protocol and specifies how participants construct, certify, and verify policy-compliant actions. We first translate each policy predicate into the relation recognised by the proof system. We then describe the generic setup and the client- and aggregator-side procedures that use these relations during protocol execution.

1) *Policy Relation Transformation*: The proof system certifies membership in a relation. We therefore associate each policy predicate with a relation and its corresponding language.

Definition 7 (Policy relation). *For a policy $\phi \in \Phi$, the policy predicate Pred_ϕ induces the relation*

$$R_\phi = \{(x, w) \in \mathcal{X}_\phi \times \mathcal{W}_\phi \mid \text{Pred}_\phi(x, w) = 1\}.$$

The language associated with R_ϕ is

$$L_\phi = \{x \in \mathcal{X}_\phi \mid \exists w \in \mathcal{W}_\phi \text{ such that } (x, w) \in R_\phi\}.$$

Therefore, proving compliance with policy ϕ amounts to proving the statement $x \in L_\phi$, or equivalently,

$$\exists w \in \mathcal{W}_\phi : \text{Pred}_\phi(x, w) = 1.$$

The same transformation is used for client and aggregation policies. In the generic algorithms below, $\phi \in \Phi$ denotes the client policy and $\psi \in \Phi$ denotes the aggregation policy. Both belong to the same policy family Φ .

C. Framework Generic Algorithms

The policy relations defined above are used by the framework through three generic procedures: (i) a one-time setup procedure, (ii) a client-side procedure executed in each training round, and (iii) an aggregator-side procedure.

The named procedures appearing in the algorithms, such as LocalTrain, Aggregate, Update, and the auxiliary operations, are abstract interfaces. Their concrete behaviour is determined by the selected Type, policy family, and realisation. Thus, the algorithms specify how learning and cryptographic components are composed without fixing a particular FL algorithm or cryptographic implementation. The symbol $\perp$ denotes failure, or the absence of an optional output when indicated by the context.

1) *Generic framework Setup.*: Algorithm 1 initialises the framework before training begins. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{C}^{(i)}\}_{i \in I} \cup \{\mathcal{A}^{(j)}\}_{j \in J}$ denote the set of participating clients and aggregators. The setup derives the public parameters required by the selected realisation and initialises any participant-specific state required by its cryptographic mechanisms.

The realisation specification spec contains choices that are not fixed directly by the framework tuple, such as model dimensions, identifiers, thresholds, and realisation-specific procedure parameters. The procedure ParamGen derives the corresponding common parameters params. The commitment scheme and NIZK proof system are then initialised independently to obtain pp_{CS} and pp_{Π} .

A realisation may additionally use optional mechanisms from Aux. We write $\text{Aux} = (\text{Aux}_1, \dots, \text{Aux}_\ell)$, where Aux_k denotes the k -th optional mechanism used by the realisation. For each such mechanism, $\text{Setup}_{\text{Aux}_k}$ produces its public parameters pp_{Aux_k} and, when required, private state $\text{st}_P^{\text{Aux}_k}$ for each participant $P \in \mathcal{P}$. A component that requires no participant-specific state returns $\perp$ for that state, while a component requiring no setup may return a fixed public description.

The framework combines these outputs into the public parameter set $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and the participant-specific setup state

Algorithm 1 Generic Setup for PoCoFL

Input: Security param 1^λ , $\mathcal{F} = (\text{Type}, \text{Asset}, \text{CS}, \Pi, \text{Aux}, \Phi)$, participant sets $\{\mathcal{C}^{(i)}\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}^{(j)}\}_{j \in J}$, realisation specification spec

Output: $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\{\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$

```

1:  $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \{\mathcal{C}^{(i)}\}_{i \in I} \cup \{\mathcal{A}^{(j)}\}_{j \in J}$ 
2: Establish the required secure channels among  $\mathcal{P}$ 
3:  $\text{params} \leftarrow \text{ParamGen}(1^\lambda, \text{Type}, \text{Asset}, \Phi, \text{spec})$ 
4:  $\text{pp}_{\text{CS}} \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\text{CS}}(1^\lambda)$ 
5:  $\text{pp}_{\Pi} \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\Pi}(1^\lambda)$ 
6: for  $k = 1, \dots, \ell$  do
7:    $(\text{pp}_{\text{Aux}_k}, \{\text{st}_P^{\text{Aux}_k}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}) \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\text{Aux}_k}(1^\lambda, \mathcal{P}, \text{params})$ 
8:   if  $\text{Setup}_{\text{Aux}_k}$  fails then
9:     return  $\perp$ 
10:  end if
11: end for
12:  $\text{pp}_{\text{Aux}} \leftarrow (\text{pp}_{\text{Aux}_1}, \dots, \text{pp}_{\text{Aux}_\ell})$ 
13: for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  do
14:    $\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}} \leftarrow (\text{st}_P^{\text{Aux}_1}, \dots, \text{st}_P^{\text{Aux}_\ell})$ 
15: end for
16:  $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{F}} \leftarrow (\text{params}, \text{pp}_{\text{CS}}, \text{pp}_{\Pi}, \text{pp}_{\text{Aux}})$ 
17: Publish  $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{F}}$  and securely provide  $\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}$  to each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ 
18: Erase temporary setup randomness and unprescribed trapdoors
19: return  $(\text{pp}_{\mathcal{F}}, \{\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}})$ 

```

$\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}$. Public parameters are made available to all participants, whereas private setup state is delivered only to the participant for which it was generated. We assume authenticated and confidential channels for this setup distribution and their concrete establishment is deployment-specific and lies outside the generic framework.

After setup, params denotes the public portion of $\text{pp}_{\mathcal{F}}$ required by a particular round operation. Temporary setup randomness and any trapdoor information not explicitly assigned to a participant are erased. In the round algorithms below, a participant is understood to have access to its assigned setup state $\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}$ whenever required by a selected auxiliary mechanism and this state is suppressed from the algorithm inputs for readability.

2) *Client Side execution.*: Algorithm 2 describes how client $\mathcal{C}^{(i)}$ constructs a proof-carrying message for round t . The client first executes the local learning procedure prescribed by Type to obtain its local contribution

$$u_{i,t} \leftarrow \text{LocalTrain}(\text{Type}, \theta_t, D_{i,t}, \text{params}).$$

The object $\text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}$ collects the learning state relevant to the client policy, including the current model, local data, resulting contribution, client identity, and round identifier.

For a client policy ϕ , let $M_{i,t} = (m_{i,t}^{(1)}, \dots, m_{i,t}^{(J_\phi)})$ denote the ordered collection of objects that the policy requires the client to commit to. Both the number of entries J_ϕ and their meaning are determined by ϕ . The commitment procedure produces the public commitments $C_{i,t}$ and the corresponding private opening information $R_{i,t}$.

The policy may also require auxiliary mechanisms. We write Aux_ϕ for the subset of auxiliary mechanisms used by ϕ . Applying these mechanisms to $\text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}$ produces public outputs

Algorithm 2 Client $C^{(i)}$ in round t

Input: $\mathcal{F}, \phi \in \Phi, \theta_t$, and $D_{i,t}$
Output: Client message $\mu_{i,t}$ or $\perp$
1: $u_{i,t} \leftarrow \text{LocalTrain}(\text{Type}, \theta_t, D_{i,t}, \text{params})$
2: Construct $\text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}$ from $(\theta_t, D_{i,t}, u_{i,t}, i, t)$
3: Construct $M_{i,t}$ from $\text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}$ as prescribed by ϕ
4: $(C_{i,t}, R_{i,t}) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{\text{CS}}, M_{i,t})$
5: $(Z_{i,t}^{\text{pub}}, Z_{i,t}^{\text{priv}}) \leftarrow \text{Apply}(\text{Aux}_{\phi}, \text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}, \text{params})$
6: $x_{i,t} \leftarrow (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, C_{i,t}, Z_{i,t}^{\text{pub}}, \text{params})$
7: $w_{i,t} \leftarrow (\text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}, M_{i,t}, R_{i,t}, Z_{i,t}^{\text{priv}})$
8: **if** $\mathcal{R}_{\phi}(x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) = 0$ **then**
9: **return** $\perp$
10: **end if**
11: $\pi_{i,t} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\phi}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_{i,t}, w_{i,t})$
12: **return** $\mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t})$

$Z_{i,t}^{\text{pub}}$ and private outputs $Z_{i,t}^{\text{priv}}$ and either collection may be empty when no such output is required.

The client then forms the public statement

$$x_{i,t} = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, C_{i,t}, Z_{i,t}^{\text{pub}}, \text{params})$$

and the private witness $w_{i,t} = (\text{Obj}_{i,t}^{\text{FL}}, M_{i,t}, R_{i,t}, Z_{i,t}^{\text{priv}})$. This separation ensures that the verifier receives only the public context, commitments, and permitted auxiliary outputs, while the underlying learning objects, commitment openings, and private auxiliary state remain in the witness.

Before producing a proof, the client checks that $(x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\phi}$. If the relation is not satisfied, the client aborts and returns $\perp$. Otherwise, it generates a NIZK proof $\pi_{i,t}$ for $\mathcal{R}_{\phi}$ and sends $\mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t})$. The witness $w_{i,t}$ is never transmitted.

3) *Aggregator side execution.*: Algorithm 3 describes the execution of aggregator $A^{(\ell)}$ in round t . It uses the client policy ϕ to determine which submitted client messages may be admitted and the aggregation policy ψ to determine whether the resulting aggregation action is compliant. The aggregator maintains three synchronised records. The set I_t^{adm} contains the identifiers of admitted clients, Adm_t is the ordered record of their accepted proof-carrying messages, and V_t contains the corresponding values used for numerical aggregation.

For each received message $\mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t})$, the aggregator first rejects duplicate client identifiers. It then checks that the public statement is bound to the expected client, round, policy, current model, and public parameters through Ctx . The accompanying NIZK proof is verified under Π . Only after these checks succeed does the aggregator call $\text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{Type}, \phi}(x_{i,t})$ to obtain the contribution $v_{i,t}$ prescribed by the selected FL type and client policy. If no valid aggregation value can be obtained, the message is discarded. Otherwise, the client identifier, message, and extracted value are added consistently to I_t^{adm} , Adm_t , and V_t .

Once all candidate messages have been processed, the participation predicate $\text{Part}_{\text{Type}, \psi}$ checks whether the admitted set satisfies the participation requirements of the selected FL type and aggregation policy. If this condition fails, the round aborts. The aggregator then computes the round aggregate.

Algorithm 3 Aggregator $A^{(\ell)}$ in round t

Input: $\mathcal{F}, \phi, \psi \in \Phi, \theta_t$, and $\{\mu_{i,t}\}_{i \in I_t}$
Output: Aggregation message ν_t or $\perp$
1: $I_t^{\text{adm}} \leftarrow \emptyset, \text{Adm}_t \leftarrow ()$, and $V_t \leftarrow ()$
2: **for all** $\mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t})$ **do**
3: **if** $i \in I_t^{\text{adm}} \vee \text{Ctx}(x_{i,t}) \neq (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, \text{params})$ **then**
4: **skip to next client message**
5: **end if**
6: **if** $\Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_{\phi}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}) = 0$ **then**
7: **skip to next client message**
8: **end if**
9: $v_{i,t} \leftarrow \text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{Type}, \phi}(x_{i,t})$
10: **if** $v_{i,t} = \perp$ **then**
11: **skip to next client message**
12: **end if**
13: $I_t^{\text{adm}} \leftarrow I_t^{\text{adm}} \cup \{i\}$ and $V_t[i] \leftarrow v_{i,t}$
14: Append $\mu_{i,t}$ to Adm_t
15: **end for**
16: **if** $\text{Part}_{\text{Type}, \psi}(I_t^{\text{adm}}, \text{params}) = 0$ **then**
17: **return** $\perp$
18: **end if**
19: $\Delta_t \leftarrow \text{ApplyAgg}(\text{Aux}_{\psi}, \text{Aggregate}_{\text{Type}, \psi}, V_t, \text{params})$
20: $\theta_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{Update}_{\text{Type}}(\theta_t, \Delta_t, \text{params})$
21: $(Z_t^{\text{pub}}, Z_t^{\text{priv}}) \leftarrow \text{Apply}(\text{Aux}_{\psi}, \theta_t, \text{Adm}_t, V_t, \Delta_t, \theta_{t+1}, \text{params})$
22: $x_t^{\text{agg}} \leftarrow (\ell, t, \phi, \psi, \theta_t, \text{Adm}_t, \theta_{t+1}, Z_t^{\text{pub}}, \text{params})$
23: $w_t^{\text{agg}} \leftarrow (V_t, \Delta_t, Z_t^{\text{priv}})$
24: **if** $\mathcal{R}_{\psi}(x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}) = 0$ **then**
25: **return** $\perp$
26: **end if**
27: $\pi_t^{\text{agg}} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\psi}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}})$
28: **return** $\nu_t = (\ell, t, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}})$

The procedure $\text{Aggregate}_{\text{Type}, \psi}$ specifies the aggregation rule prescribed by the FL type and policy, while ApplyAgg allows the realisation to carry out that rule using any auxiliary mechanism required by ψ . When no auxiliary mechanism is required, it reduces to the prescribed aggregation computation itself. The resulting aggregate Δ_t is applied to the current model by $\text{Update}_{\text{Type}}$ to obtain θ_{t+1} .

The aggregation policy may require additional auxiliary evidence or state. The subsequent call to Apply therefore produces public outputs Z_t^{pub} and private outputs Z_t^{priv} used in the aggregation statement and witness. The aggregator forms $x_t^{\text{agg}} = (\ell, t, \phi, \psi, \theta_t, \text{Adm}_t, \theta_{t+1}, Z_t^{\text{pub}}, \text{params})$ and $w_t^{\text{agg}} = (V_t, \Delta_t, Z_t^{\text{priv}})$.

The relation $\mathcal{R}_{\psi}$ binds the aggregation result to the admitted record and to the computation prescribed by the aggregation policy. If $(x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}) \notin \mathcal{R}_{\psi}$, the aggregator aborts. Otherwise, it generates π_t^{agg} and returns the proof-carrying aggregation message $\nu_t = (\ell, t, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}})$. A verifier of ν_t first verifies the client proofs contained in Adm_t and then verifies the aggregation proof π_t^{agg} . Hence, the aggregation proof certifies the aggregation action relative to the publicly recorded admitted messages and it does not need to recursively verify the client proofs within the aggregation circuit.

IV. SECURITY ANALYSIS

We establish update admissibility, aggregation correctness, and policy-relative privacy for one protocol round. The defini-

tions extend to polynomially many clients and rounds by the standard union-bound and hybrid arguments. Sender identities are authenticated as specified in the threat model, and a corrupted participant receives its prescribed setup state.

a) Cryptographic assumptions.: Our generic guarantees rely on standard properties of the commitment scheme and NIZK proof system. Soundness of Π is used to establish update admissibility and aggregation correctness, while zero knowledge of Π together with hiding of CS establishes policy-relative privacy. Completeness and correctness ensure acceptance of honestly generated messages. These are the assumptions used by the generic security reductions below. When a concrete realisation provides an additional guarantee through an auxiliary cryptographic primitive, that guarantee is additionally subject to the primitive-specific assumptions stated by that realisation. Formal definitions of the cryptographic notions are given in Appendix C-A. Shared notation used by the framework security games is given in Appendix C-B.

Update admissibility. A malicious client succeeds if it produces a message that passes the framework's client-verification procedure while being semantically invalid under the active client policy. The formal experiment is given in Appendix C-C.

Theorem 1 (Update admissibility). *For every PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$, there exists a PPT adversary $\mathcal{B}_{\text{adm}}$ such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}_1}^{\text{adm}}(\lambda) \leq \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_{\text{adm}}}^{\text{snd}}(\lambda).$$

Consequently, the framework provides update admissibility whenever Π is sound.

The formal experiment, advantage definition, and proof are given in Appendix C-C.

Aggregation correctness. A malicious aggregator succeeds if it produces an aggregation message that passes framework verification but is not semantically valid with respect to the active aggregation policy and recorded admitted set. The formal experiment is given in Appendix C-D.

Theorem 2 (Aggregation correctness). *Let at most $q(\lambda)$ client messages appear in Rec_t . For every PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}_2$, there exist PPT adversaries $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_q$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{agg}}$ such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{agg}}(\lambda) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{q(\lambda)} \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_j}^{\text{snd}}(\lambda) + \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_{\text{agg}}}^{\text{snd}}(\lambda).$$

Hence the aggregation-correctness advantage is negligible when q is polynomial and Π is sound.

The formal experiment, advantage definition, and proof are given in Appendix C-D.

Policy-relative privacy. The privacy experiment compares two valid private client inputs that induce the same permitted public context and asks whether a verifier can distinguish which input generated the proof-carrying message. The formal experiment is given in Appendix C-E.

Theorem 3 (Policy-relative privacy). *For every PPT verifier $\mathcal{A}_2$, there exist PPT adversaries $\mathcal{B}_{\text{zk},0}$, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{hid}}$, and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{zk},1}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{priv}}(\lambda) &\leq \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_{\text{zk},0}}^{\text{zk}}(\lambda) + \text{Adv}_{\text{CS}, \mathcal{B}_{\text{hid}}}^{\text{hid}}(\lambda) \\ &\quad + \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_{\text{zk},1}}^{\text{zk}}(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the framework provides policy-relative privacy when Π is zero knowledge and CS is hiding.

The formal experiment, advantage definition, and proof are given in Appendix C-E.

V. INSTANTIATION

We use these instantiations to show how the abstract interfaces of Sec. III are specialised for different FL settings. VanillaFL is presented here, while ContinualFL, PersonalizedFL and a Threshold-HE realisation are given in Appendix B. For each realisation, we specify the type-specific learning and state semantics, the client policy, the value extracted for aggregation, the aggregation policy, and any required auxiliary mechanism. Generic proof and message construction follow Algorithms 2 and 3.

a) Vanilla Federated Learning.: We instantiate Type = VanillaFL with clients $\{C^{(i)}\}_{i \in I}$ and one aggregator $A^{(1)}$ [7]. In round t , the aggregator distributes the current global model θ_t . Each client $C^{(i)}$ holds a local dataset D_i of size $n_i = |D_i|$ and computes $u_{i,t} \leftarrow \text{LocalTrain}(\text{VanillaFL}, \theta_t, D_i, \text{params})$, and $\theta_{i,t} = \theta_t + u_{i,t}$.

Client policy. The client policy $\phi_{\text{loss}} \in \Phi$ requires the submitted update to be bound to the client's private dataset and the resulting local model to satisfy a public loss threshold. The committed collection is $M_{i,t} = (D_i, u_{i,t})$ and $(C_{i,t}, R_{i,t}) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{\text{CS}}, M_{i,t})$. The update $u_{i,t}$ and dataset size n_i are public, whereas D_i and $R_{i,t}$ remain private. No auxiliary mechanism is required.

The client predicate is

$\begin{aligned} \text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{loss}}}(x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) = 1 &\iff C_{i,t} \text{ binds } (D_i, u_{i,t}) \\ &\quad \wedge n_i = D_i \\ &\quad \wedge \text{Loss}(\theta_t + u_{i,t}, D_i) \leq \tau. \end{aligned}$
--

Thus, the relation binds the submitted update to the committed dataset and checks the loss condition on the resulting local model. Execution of LocalTrain itself is outside this policy.

Following Algorithm 2, the client proves the corresponding relation and returns the proof-carrying message

$$\pi_{i,t} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{\text{loss}}}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}), \mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}).$$

Aggregation policy. For every admitted client, the type-and-policy extraction interface returns $v_{i,t} = \text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{VanillaFL}, \phi_{\text{loss}}}(x_{i,t}) = (u_{i,t}, n_i)$, and $V_t[i] = (u_{i,t}, n_i)$. The aggregation policy $\psi_{\text{FedAvg}} \in \Phi$ applies weighted FedAvg [8] to these extracted values. Let $N_t = \sum_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}} n_i$. The prescribed aggregate and next global model are $\Delta_t = \sum_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}} \frac{n_i}{N_t} u_{i,t}$, and $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \Delta_t$.

Accordingly, $\text{Pred}_{\psi/\text{FedAvg}}(x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}) = 1$ requires V_t to contain exactly the values extracted from Adm_t , Δ_t to equal the prescribed FedAvg aggregate, and θ_{t+1} to be obtained from θ_t and Δ_t . Following Algorithm 3, the aggregator proves $\mathcal{R}_{\psi/\text{FedAvg}}$ and returns $\pi_t^{\text{agg}} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\psi/\text{FedAvg}}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}})$ and $\nu_t = (1, t, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}})$.

VI. EVALUATION

We evaluate four proof-of-concept realisations of the framework described in Sec. V and Appendix B. Our objective is to demonstrate end-to-end policy verification and quantify its computational and communication overhead, rather than to optimise model accuracy or network performance.

A. Proof-of-Concept Implementation

Implementation. We implement the VanillaFL, ContinualFL, and PersonalizedFL realisations using Flower [20] for FL execution and EZKL [21] for policy-proof generation and verification. The orchestration and experimental logic are implemented in Python, while EZKL uses its Rust backend to construct circuits and generate proofs. The Threshold-HE realisation instead uses its native group, range, and threshold-decryption proof mechanisms. Further implementation details are given in Appendix B-C. The Threshold-HE research prototype uses trusted-dealer key generation, and key-generation and setup costs are excluded from the reported round-level measurements.

Testbed and dataset. We evaluate the impact of policy enforcement on model accuracy on a local laptop with an Intel Core Ultra 7 165H processor and 32 GB RAM. Cryptographic microbenchmarks run separately on an AWS EC2 instance with an Intel Xeon Platinum 8488C processor, 32 vCPUs, and approximately 248 GiB RAM. Clients execute sequentially, generating one proof at a time with EZKL using 32 CPU threads. We evaluate our implementation on MNIST [22] with 28×28 grayscale images across 100 clients. For policy-aware testing, each client receives 600 distinct training images and uses a batch size of 6 fresh images per round, without cross-client overlap or reuse. VanillaFL uses an IID partition, while PersonalizedFL uses two label-sorted shards per client, with test data matching each client’s training-label distribution and remaining disjoint from training data. ContinualFL uses IID partitions with four sequential Permuted-MNIST tasks of 25 rounds each, where the first retains the original pixel order and subsequent tasks use fixed permutations with unchanged labels; earlier tasks are reevaluated to measure forgetting. For EZKL benchmarks, the circuit input uses 4 images for VanillaFL and ContinualFL, and 2 images for PersonalizedFL.

Experimental settings. We have two experimental settings:

(i) *Policy-Aware Setting.* In this setting, we execute 100 clients over 100 FL rounds to present the changes in accuracy with *policy compliance* and without policy enforcement. These experiments do not include cryptographic proof generation and verification, and they are evaluated separately through the microbenchmarks. To demonstrate this, we allow 20% of the

clients to behave maliciously in two separate rounds and introduce a fixed-target model-poisoning attack. Each malicious client replaces its trained end model with an input-independent classifier that always predicts digit 0, while retaining the update structure required by the associated FL type, e.g., the recurrence state in PersonalizedFL or the Fisher-information state in ContinualFL. We fix the attack rounds across both the policy-enforced and non-policy-enforced settings to ensure a fair comparison. In the policy-enforced setting, the server aggregates only updates that are policy-compliant, whereas without policy enforcement, the server aggregates every received update. Furthermore, the policy threshold is selected by repetitive experiments. However, identifying an optimal threshold for every FL type is outside the scope of this paper. Instead, *PoCoFL* demonstrates the necessity of enforcing policy compliance and its effect on preventing non-compliant updates from influencing the global learning process.

(ii) *Microbenchmarking.* We benchmark our Proof-of-Concept (PoC) with 5 clients and 5 rounds due to resource limitations and we report the mean and sample standard deviation for each measurement. Consequently, the client-proof results are based on 25 proof-generation measurements (five clients in each of 5 rounds), whereas the aggregation-proof and cohort-admission results are each based on 5 round-level measurements (one measurement per round). Throughout the evaluation, we use the term *evidence* to denote proofs and supporting cryptographic data. Proof generation includes witness construction and proving, but excludes circuit setup, local training, and prover-side proof verification. Cohort admission measures verification of all five client submissions in a round. Threshold-HE uses five clients over five measured rounds, yielding 25 client measurements. Three helpers participate in 3-of-3 threshold decryption, and aggregation and independent saved-round validation each provide five measurements. All roles execute sequentially on one machine, and all measurements exclude transport and network costs. The reported timings therefore represent computational overhead rather than parallel, end-to-end round latency.

B. Protocol Overhead Analysis

Accuracy evaluation. Fig. 2 presents a comparison of VanillaFL, ContinualFL, and PersonalizedFL under conditions with policy enforcement (blue) and without enforcement (orange), using five paired seeds. The shading indicates standard deviation. In all paired comparisons, we list policy-enforced results first. For VanillaFL (Fig. 2(a)), accuracy at round 100 is 49.4% with enforcement and 33.1% without, representing a gain of 16.3 percentage points. Under the evaluated attack, *PoCoFL* enhances stability, whereas the absence of enforcement leads to repeated declines and slower recovery. For PersonalizedFL (Figs. 2(b–d)), enforcement stabilizes client-averaged personalized accuracy at approximately 90.5%, compared to 83.7% without enforcement (Fig. 2(b)). In contrast, shared-reference accuracy is 36.9% with enforcement and 55.7% without (Fig. 2(c)). The personalisation gain, defined as personalised minus reference accuracy (Fig. 2(b) minus




Fig. 2. Effect of policy enforcement under model-poisoning attacks in vanilla (a), personalised (b-d), and continual (e-h) FL. Shading denotes standard deviation across five paired seeds. In (h), upper/lower triangles show policy enforcement on/off, respectively.

Fig. 2(c)), is 53.6 percentage points with enforcement and 28.0 without (Fig. 2(d)). These results indicate that, without enforcement, improvements in global-reference accuracy are accompanied by declines in personalised accuracy and personalisation gain. In contrast, enforcement yields higher personalised accuracy and a larger gain, demonstrating better preservation of client-specific learning under attack and aligning with the intended personalization behavior. ContinualFL (Figs. 2(e-h)) operates in a domain-incremental setting, where clients train on each of four sequential tasks for 25 rounds before transitioning to the next. Current-task accuracy after Tasks 1 through 4 (Fig. 2(e)) is 34.4% with enforcement *vs* 28.9% without, 33.6% *vs* 23.5%, 29.3% *vs* 28.7%, and 21.4% versus 28.5%, respectively. Enforcement maintains higher or comparable accuracy for Tasks 1 to 3 but yields lower accuracy for Task 4, reflecting a trade-off between retention and adaptation. The mean seen-task accuracy (Fig. 2(f)) after Tasks 1 to 4 is approximately (34.4, 33.9, 31.9, 28.1)% with enforcement and (28.9, 20.0, 24.3, 27.7)% without. Thus, enforcement enhances stability in earlier stages, although the difference declines by Task 4. Forgetting (Fig. 2(g)) after Tasks 2 to 4 is approximately (0, 1, 2.5) percentage points with enforcement, compared to (12, 5, 3.5) without enforcement. Although forgetting increases with enforcement as tasks accumulate, it remains lower at every evaluated task end, indicating better preservation of prior knowledge under attack, rather than consistently higher current-task accuracy. Figure 2(h) illustrates this retention pattern: the upper and lower triangles represent results with and without enforcement, respectively. With enforcement, Task 1 accuracy declines modestly from 34.4% after Task 1 to 32.9% after Task 4. In contrast, without enforcement, Task 1 accuracy drops from 28.9% to 16.5%,




Fig. 3. EZKL timing over five rounds at $K = 5$: (a) mean client-proof generation, (b) aggregation-proof generation, (c) five-client cohort admission, and (d) mean proof-verification time. Shading in (a) and error bars in (d) show $\pm$ one sample standard deviation.

13.7%, and then partially recovers to 18.8% after Tasks 1 to 4. Enforced Task 2 accuracy similarly decreases from 33.6% after Task 2 to 32.0% after Task 3 and 30.0% after Task 4. The results for later tasks are subtle. For instance, after Task 4, Task 3 accuracy is lower with enforcement (28.0%) compared to without (33.3%). Overall, enforcement primarily enhances retention and stability for earlier tasks rather than improving accuracy for every task. The observed degradation in later tasks may reflect the continual-learning strategy’s inherent balance between stability and adaptation. It is important to state that the scope of this work emphasizes policy compliance rather than improving the local-learning and aggregation strategies of each individual FL paradigm.

EZKL realisations. Fig. 3 reports the timing results for the three EZKL-based realisations over five federated-learning rounds. Fig. 3(a) shows the mean client-proof generation time in each round for $K = 5$ clients, where each point averages the five client proofs generated sequentially in that round. Across all observations, the mean proof-generation time is 80.349 ± 0.333 s for VanillaFL, 541.652 ± 73.508 s for ContinualFL, and 640.166 ± 17.073 s for PersonalizedFL. The round-level means remain relatively stable across the five rounds. Fig. 3(b) reports one aggregation-proof generation measurement per round. The corresponding means are 121.175 ± 0.506 s for VanillaFL, 568.800 ± 2.764 s for ContinualFL, and 523.948 ± 0.765 s for PersonalizedFL. Thus, the specialised ContinualFL and PersonalizedFL aggregation relations require approximately $4.69\times$ and $4.32\times$ the proving time of the VanillaFL relation, respectively. Fig. 3(c) shows the total server-admission time for verifying all five client submissions in each round. Mean cohort-admission time is 8.900 ± 0.043 s for VanillaFL, 28.332 ± 0.218 s for ContinualFL, and 28.412 ± 0.152 s for PersonalizedFL. Finally, Fig. 3(d) reports the mean proof-verification time. Client-side proof verification takes 0.907 ± 0.009 s for VanillaFL, 3.911 ± 0.051 s for ContinualFL, and 3.917 ± 0.039 s for PersonalizedFL. Aggregation-proof verification takes 1.357 ± 0.016 s, 2.810 ± 0.048 s, and 2.837 ± 0.037 s, respectively. These per-proof measurements are distinct from the complete cohort admission shown in Fig. 3(c). Error bars in Fig. 3(d) show one sample standard deviation across 25 client proofs or five aggregation proofs. Table I complements these timing results with the circuit and communication costs. Client evidence occupies 41.59 KiB for VanillaFL, 2,188.70 KiB for ContinualFL, and 2,189.16 KiB for PersonalizedFL, while aggregation evidence occupies 1,103.54 KiB, 2,176.80 KiB, and 2,174.72 KiB, respectively. The table shows that the ContinualFL and PersonalizedFL policy relations require larger circuits and application payloads (detailed discussion in App. A).

Threshold-HE realisation. The Threshold-HE implementation results are also reported in Table I. This implementation uses native group, range, and threshold-decryption proofs instead of an EZKL circuit. For 3-of-3 decryption, client encryption and evidence generation require 2.491 ± 0.019 s and yield 199.98 KiB of decoded evidence within a 622.54 KiB submission. The aggregator operation, which includes leader aggregation and three helper authorisation/share-generation calls, requires 31.274 ± 0.155 s, while independent saved-round validation requires 7.274 ± 0.080 s. Aggregator-side evidence consists of the three helper-shares and occupies 772.31 KiB. The reported leader-helper exchange involves 9,940.97 KiB sent and 772.31 KiB received. Circuit rows and the EZKL capacity parameter k are not applicable to this native realisation, and its different proof mechanism and measurement scope prevent direct comparison with the EZKL results.

VII. DISCUSSION

PoCoFL separates FL type, policy semantics, and cryptographic realisation, which allows learning requirements and enforcement mechanisms to evolve within a unified framework. The four instantiations demonstrate modularity across various learning paradigms and participant topologies, including multi-aggregator Threshold HE. The process of verifying selected training and aggregation properties balances verification coverage and proving cost, with the latter determined by policy encoding rather than solely by the number of checks. This separation gives machine learning researchers a common interface to specify verifiable properties and cryptographers a common interface to develop compatible enforcement mechanisms. Finally, the guarantees remain policy-relative and adhere to the threat model described in Sec. II-C, including aggregation correctness with respect to the recorded admitted set. Ensuring confidentiality of individual contributions requires appropriate auxiliary mechanisms when necessitated by the chosen realisation. The ability to replace compatible components establishes a foundation for crypto-agility, including potential post-quantum realisations, although this aspect is not evaluated experimentally. Appendix A provides further discussion of policy costs, optimisation opportunities, modularity, and adversarial scope.

VIII. RELATED WORK

In this work, we consider policy-compliant verifiability in FL, where clients provide evidence that their contributions satisfy the applicable client policies and aggregators provide evidence that the admitted contributions were processed according to the prescribed aggregation policies. Recent work systematises verifiability in privacy-preserving FL by distinguishing claims about submission, admission, local computation, aggregation, and finalisation [2]. We summarise the systems most closely related to our work in Table II (see Appendices), with reference to Requirements (R1)–(R5) introduced in Sec. II-B. Requirements (R2)–(R4) capture verifiable client-policy compliance, verifiable aggregation-policy compliance, and private policy verification, whereas Requirements (R1) and (R5) capture type-aware policy configuration and cryptographic modularity.

Several works combine secure aggregation with privacy-preserving validation of client contributions. EIFFeL evaluates programmable validity predicates using secret sharing, secret-shared proofs, and verifiable secret sharing, and aggregates only inputs that satisfy the selected predicate [6]. RoFL uses homomorphic commitments and zero-knowledge arguments to enforce norm bounds on protected updates [23], while ACORN combines secure aggregation, vector commitments, and Bulletproofs to verify L_0 , L_2 , and L_∞ constraints [24]. Similarly, BPFL and NoV encode magnitude, distance, and direction conditions into privacy-preserving verification procedures [25], [26]. These systems provide verifiable update admissibility for concrete validity or robustness conditions. However, they do not establish that the declared local training

TABLE I
AWS MICROBENCHMARKS WITH 28×28 INPUTS, FIVE CLIENTS AND FIVE MEASURED ROUNDS, WITH BOTH POLICIES ENABLED. TIMES ARE MEAN $\pm$ SAMPLE STANDARD DEVIATION; SIZES ARE MEANS. $\uparrow/\downarrow$ DENOTE SENT/RECEIVED PAYLOADS.

Type	Participant	Policy	k	Rows	N	Gen./op. (s)	Server-side validation (s)	Evidence (KiB)	Payload (KiB)
Vanilla FL	Client	$\text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{loss}}}$	20	455,104	25	80.349 ± 0.333	–	41.59	$\uparrow 104.80/\text{client}$
	Aggregator	$\text{Pred}_{\psi_{\text{FedAvg}}}$	21	1,619,920	5	121.175 ± 0.506	8.900 ± 0.043	1103.54	$\downarrow 523.99/\text{cohort}$ $\uparrow 309.94/\text{cohort}$
Continual FL	Client	$\text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{EWC}}}$	22	3,320,727	25	541.652 ± 73.508	–	2188.70	$\uparrow 2,283.06/\text{client}$
	Aggregator	$\text{Pred}_{\psi_{\text{FedAvg}}}$	22	3,229,170	5	568.800 ± 2.764	28.332 ± 0.218	2176.80	$\downarrow 11,415.32/\text{cohort}$ $\uparrow 310.47/\text{cohort}$
Personalized FL	Client	$\text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{pFedMe}}}$	22	3,102,752	25	640.166 ± 17.073	–	2189.16	$\uparrow 2,283.59/\text{client}$
	Aggregator	$\text{Pred}_{\psi_{\text{pFedMe}}}$	22	3,230,605	5	523.948 ± 0.765	28.412 ± 0.152	2174.72	$\downarrow 11,417.94/\text{cohort}$ $\uparrow 311.51/\text{cohort}$
Threshold HE FL	Client	$\text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{HE-L2}}}$	–	–	25	2.491 ± 0.019	–	199.98	$\uparrow 622.54/\text{submission}$
	Aggregators	$\text{Pred}_{\psi_{\text{HE-FedAvg}}}$	–	–	5	31.274 ± 0.155	7.274 ± 0.080	772.31	$\uparrow 9,940.97/\text{requests}$ $\downarrow 772.31/\text{shares}$

procedure produced the submitted contribution, and their predicates and aggregation procedures are designed for a particular FL workflow.

A second line of work verifies the computation used to produce a local model. PZKP-FL represents local training and aggregation as zk-SNARK circuits and uses a smart contract for proof verification [27]. Federify combines zk-SNARKs, threshold ElGamal encryption, and blockchain contracts to verify a specific Gaussian Naive Bayes training and aggregation procedure [28]. VeriDP proves the gradient, clipping, averaging, and noise-generation steps of DP-SGD [29], whereas VerifiableFL/ExclaveFL uses integrity-protected execution and remote attestation to construct an attested dataflow over training and aggregation tasks [30]. These approaches provide stronger evidence about procedure execution, but their verification is bound to a particular learning algorithm, circuit, or trusted-execution substrate.

Other works mainly address deviations by the aggregation service. VerifyNet allows clients to check the algebraic consistency of a returned aggregate using homomorphic hashing, masking, and secret sharing [31]. However, under Requirement (R3), this does not prove the complete aggregation procedure over an explicitly identified admitted set. zkFL instead uses commitments, signatures, and Halo2 proofs to certify aggregation over committed client contributions [3]. Takagi and Hasegawa combine secure aggregation, trusted execution, and client auditing to verify the actions of a stateful private-FL server [32]. These systems protect against different forms of aggregator deviation, but each considers a prescribed aggregation workflow. Overall, existing proposals provide different combinations of update validation, local-computation verification, aggregation verification, and privacy. EIFFeL is particularly close to our work regarding programmable client-side predicates, while PZKP-FL, Federify, and VerifiableFL provide evidence for both local and aggregation computations. Our distinction is therefore not that prior work lacks configurable checks or verifiable computation. Rather, to the best

of our knowledge, none of the systems considered provides a common abstraction in which both client and aggregation requirements are represented as policy-dependent relations, the selected FL type, topology, and state semantics form part of the policy context (Requirement (R1)), and the policy semantics are separated from the compatible cryptographic mechanisms used to enforce them (Requirement (R5)). Our instantiations apply this abstraction across vanilla, personalised, continual, and threshold-encrypted FL (multiple aggregator topology-setting). The resulting guarantees remain policy-relative, since the framework proves the execution of `LocalTrain` only when that computation is explicitly encoded by the selected policy, and aggregation correctness is established relative to the recorded admitted set. In tandem, our solution provides crypto-agility, i.e., by preserving the same policy while interchanging the underlying cryptographic scheme provided that schemes compose together.

IX. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced *PoCoFL*, a framework that allows the definition of policies based on which policy-compliant FL settings can be instantiated. To this end, we provided a thorough formalisation of *PoCoFL* by specifying the necessary components and abstractions to support *modularity* and *crypto-agility*. In addition, we demonstrated the versatility of the framework through several FL instantiations, namely Vanilla FL, Continual FL, Personalised FL, and Threshold HE-based FL. In tandem, we provided a thorough security analysis showing that *PoCoFL* achieves three main security properties: (i) update admissibility, (ii) aggregation correctness relative to the recorded set, and (iii) policy-relative privacy. Finally, to demonstrate that *PoCoFL* is not only a theoretical construction, we implemented proof-of-concept realisations of all presented instantiations, benchmarked their performance, and reported the resulting computational and verification overheads.

We provide an anonymised prototype and scripts for reproducing the experiments at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Verifiable-FL-Framework-E6BB/>. The artefact contains the implementations used in the evaluation together with scripts for reproducing the reported timing, proof-size, payload, and circuit measurements.

LLM USAGE CONSIDERATIONS

The authors used AI-based tools to revise text, improve flow, check grammar, remove awkward phrasings and check notation consistency. We also used AI-based tools to generate some icons for Fig. 1. During artefact development, AI-based tools were used for implementation support, including scripting, debugging, resolving syntax and integration issues, and assisting with the processing and visualization of experimental data. In particular, such assistance was used when integrating the Flower and EZKL frameworks. All technical decisions, implementations, experimental configurations, analyses, and conclusions were reviewed and validated by the authors. The authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the final work, including its text, citations, definitions, proofs, implementation, and experimental results.

REFERENCES

- [1] European Parliament and Council of the European Union, “Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation).” Official Journal of the European Union, L 119, pp. 1–88, May 2016.
- [2] A. Rizzini, M. Esposito, T. Gagliardoni, and F. Bruschi, “SoK: Verifiable integrity claims for privacy-preserving federated learning,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2026, no. 4, pp. 248–271, 2026.
- [3] Z. Wang, N. Dong, J. Sun, W. Knottenbelt, and Y. Guo, “zkFL: Zero-knowledge proof-based gradient aggregation for federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 447–460, 2025.
- [4] E. Bagdasaryan, A. Veit, Y. Hua, D. Estrin, and V. Shmatikov, “How to backdoor federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (S. Chiappa and R. Calandra, eds.), vol. 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2938–2948, PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020.
- [5] K. Bonawitz, V. Ivanov, B. Kreuter, A. Marcedone, H. B. McMahan, S. Patel, D. Ramage, A. Segal, and K. Seth, “Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 1175–1191, ACM, 2017.
- [6] A. R. Chowdhury, C. Guo, S. Jha, and L. van der Maaten, “EIFFeL: Ensuring integrity for federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 2535–2549, ACM, 2022.
- [7] Q. Yang, Y. Liu, T. Chen, and Y. Tong, “Federated machine learning: Concept and applications,” *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, vol. 10, Jan. 2019.
- [8] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y. Arcas, “Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data,” in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (A. Singh and J. Zhu, eds.), vol. 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1273–1282, PMLR, 20–22 Apr 2017.
- [9] C. T. Dinh, N. H. Tran, and T. D. Nguyen, “Personalized federated learning with moreau envelopes,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 21394–21405, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [10] J. Kim, M. H. Lim, K. Kim, and H.-J. Yoon, “Continual learning framework for a multicenter study with an application to electrocardiogram,” *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, vol. 24, p. 67, Mar 2024.
- [11] M. Fang, Z. Zhang, Hairi, P. Khanduri, J. Liu, S. Lu, Y. Liu, and N. Gong, “Byzantine-robust decentralized federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2024 on ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, CCS ’24, (New York, NY, USA), p. 2874–2888, Association for Computing Machinery, 2024.
- [12] H. Zhu, R. Wang, Y. Jin, K. Liang, and J. Ning, “Distributed additive encryption and quantization for privacy preserving federated deep learning,” *Neurocomput.*, vol. 463, p. 309–327, Nov. 2021.
- [13] M. Jiang, H. Yang, C. Cheng, and Q. Dou, “Top-fl: Inside-outside personalization for federated medical image segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 2106–2117, 2023.
- [14] J. Kirkpatrick, R. Pascanu, N. Rabinowitz, J. Veness, G. Desjardins, A. A. Rusu, K. Milan, J. Quan, T. Ramalho, A. Grabska-Barwinska, D. Hassabis, C. Clopath, D. Kumaran, and R. Hadsell, “Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 114, no. 13, pp. 3521–3526, 2017.
- [15] A. Aich, “Elastic weight consolidation (ewc): Nuts and bolts,” 2021.
- [16] J. Yoon, W. Jeong, G. Lee, E. Yang, and S. J. Hwang, “Federated continual learning with weighted inter-client transfer,” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning* (M. Meila and T. Zhang, eds.), vol. 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 12073–12086, PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [17] A. Kate, G. M. Zaverucha, and I. Goldberg, “Constant-size commitments to polynomials and their applications,” in *Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2010* (M. Abe, ed.), (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 177–194, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.
- [18] T. P. Pedersen, “Non-interactive and information-theoretic secure verifiable secret sharing,” in *Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO ’91*, vol. 576 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 129–140, Springer, 1992.
- [19] M. Blum, P. Feldman, and S. Micali, “Non-interactive zero-knowledge and its applications,” in *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 103–112, ACM, 1988.
- [20] D. J. Beutel, T. Topal, A. Mathur, X. Qiu, J. Fernandez-Marques, Y. Gao, L. Sani, K. H. Li, T. Parcollet, P. P. B. de Gusmão, and N. D. Lane, “Flower: A friendly federated learning research framework,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14390*, 2020.
- [21] Zkonduit, “EZKL: Easy Zero-Knowledge Inference.” <https://github.com/zkonduit/ezkl>, 2026. (Accessed: 2026-Sep-01).
- [22] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, “Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [23] H. Lycklama, L. Burkhalter, A. Viand, N. Küchler, and A. Hithnawi, “RoFL: Robustness of secure federated learning,” in *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pp. 453–476, IEEE, 2023.
- [24] J. Bell, A. Gascón, T. Lepoint, B. Li, S. Meiklejohn, M. Raykova, and C. Yun, “ACORN: Input validation for secure aggregation,” in *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, (Anaheim, CA), pp. 4805–4822, USENIX Association, 2023.
- [25] C. Nie, Q. Li, Y. Yang, Y. Ji, and B. Wang, “Efficient byzantine-robust and provably privacy-preserving federated learning,” 2024.
- [26] Z. Xing, Z. Zhang, Z. Zhang, J. Liu, L. Zhu, and G. Russello, “No vandalism: Privacy-preserving and byzantine-robust federated learning,” 2024.
- [27] Z. Xing, Z. Zhang, M. Li, J. Liu, L. Zhu, G. Russello, and M. R. Asghar, “Zero-knowledge proof-based practical federated learning on blockchain,” 2023.
- [28] G. Keshavarzkhori, C. Pérez-Solà, G. Navarro-Arribas, J. Herrera-Joancomartí, and H. Yajam, “Federify: A verifiable federated learning scheme based on zkSNARKs and blockchain,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 3240–3255, 2024.
- [29] B. Abdolmaleki, A. R. Asadi, V. R. Asadi, S. Köpsell, B. Mohee, N. Roustaeifar, and M. Zarezadeh, “VeriDP: Verifiable differentially private training,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2026, no. 3, pp. 48–64, 2026.
- [30] J. Guo, K. Vaswani, A. Paverd, and P. R. Pietzuch, “VerifiableFL: Verifiable claims for federated learning using exclave,” 2024.
- [31] G. Xu, H. Li, S. Liu, K. Yang, and X. Lin, “Verifynet: Secure and verifiable federated learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 911–926, 2020.
- [32] S. Takagi and S. Hasegawa, “Securing private federated learning in a malicious setting: A scalable TEE-based approach with client auditing,” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2026, no. 1, pp. 486–508, 2026.

- [33] Y. Zhu, Y. Wu, Z. Luo, B. C. Ooi, and X. Xiao, “Secure and verifiable data collaboration with low-cost zero-knowledge proofs,” *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 2321–2334, 2024.
- [34] J. Ma, H. Liu, M. Zhang, and Z. Liu, “VPFL: Enabling verifiability and privacy in federated learning with zero-knowledge proofs,” *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 299, p. 112115, 2024.
- [35] C. Zhang, H. Jin, S. Shi, H. Yu, S. Johns, Y. T. Hou, and W. Lou, “Enabling trustworthy federated learning via remote attestation for mitigating byzantine threats,” in *IEEE Military Communications Conference*, pp. 954–961, IEEE, 2025.
- [36] T. ElGamal, “A public key cryptosystem and a signature scheme based on discrete logarithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 469–472, 1985.
- [37] A. Ostrovski, J. Gavenda, A. Dufka, and T. Cerqueira, “elastic-elgamal: ElGamal Encryption and Related Zero-Knowledge Proofs.” <https://docs.rs/crate/elastic-elgamal/0.3.1>, 2024. Version 0.3.1, (Accessed: 2026-Sep-01).
- [38] H. de Valence, J. Grigg, M. Hamburg, I. Lovecruft, G. Tankersley, and F. Valsorda, “The ristretto255 and decaf448 Groups.” RFC 9496, Dec. 2023.
- [39] B. Bünz, J. Bootle, D. Boneh, A. Poelstra, P. Wuille, and G. Maxwell, “Bulletproofs: Short proofs for confidential transactions and more,” in *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 315–334, 2018.
- [40] D. Chaum and T. P. Pedersen, “Wallet databases with observers,” in *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO ’92* (E. F. Brickell, ed.), (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 89–105, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1993.
- [41] R. Gennaro, S. Jarecki, H. Krawczyk, and T. Rabin, “Secure distributed key generation for discrete-log based cryptosystems,” in *Advances in Cryptology — EUROCRYPT ’99* (J. Stern, ed.), (Berlin, Heidelberg), pp. 295–310, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.

APPENDIX A ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

This appendix expands on Section VII, elaborating on the practical considerations, limitations, and future directions of *PoCoFL*.

Policy Evaluation. Table I shows that Vanilla FL produces the smallest EZKL circuits. Continual and Personalised FL require larger circuits because their policies include additional EWC/Fisher and other checks, as defined in Sec. V and Appendix B-B. Their aggregation circuits are also larger because they verify both the client update and the shared global model. Personalised FL additionally verifies the sampled client set and the server-side mixing parameters. As a result, its additional policy inputs lead to aggregation circuits with approximately $2\times$ more rows than Vanilla FL.

The number of circuit rows therefore depends on how a policy is implemented and does not directly represent the number of policy checks. This also leaves room for optimisation. For example, repeated inputs may be removed, commitments may be reused, or less data may be included in the circuit. These optimisations can reduce the circuit size and the proving time, especially when they allow the use of a smaller k .

The policy-based design further reduces the amount of computation that needs to be verified. Instead of proving the correctness of the complete local training process, *PoCoFL* verifies only the training and aggregation properties defined by the policy. This reduces unnecessary proving cost while still checking the properties required for admission. Common policies can also be reused across different FL settings, while additional checks can be added when required by a specific setting. Hence, *PoCoFL* allows a trade-off between how much

of the computation is verified and the cost of generating the corresponding proofs.

Modularity. We showcase the modularity of our framework through the different instantiations. In particular, the Threshold HE FL instantiation demonstrates how Def. 5 can be leveraged to incorporate additional cryptographic primitives required by a specific FL setting. Together, the instantiations show that *PoCoFL* can accommodate different FL functionalities and cryptographic components without changing the core framework.

The instantiations further demonstrate the topological versatility of *PoCoFL*. While the Vanilla, Continual, and Personalised FL instantiations follow the classical client-server topology, Threshold HE FL requires multiple aggregators to realise the threshold functionality. This shows that the framework is not restricted to a single aggregator or to the conventional client-server setting. Instead, the roles defined by *PoCoFL* can be distributed across multiple nodes depending on the requirements of the instantiated protocol. Consequently, the framework can also accommodate more decentralised settings in which nodes may assume client, aggregation, or combined roles. This further strengthens the modular nature of *PoCoFL*, as both the cryptographic components and the underlying network topology can be adapted to the target FL setting.

Bridge between ML and Applied Cryptography. *PoCoFL* provides a common abstraction between Machine Learning (ML) and applied cryptography. From the ML perspective, researchers can develop and optimise training algorithms, personalisation mechanisms, continual-learning techniques, and aggregation rules to improve local and global model performance. These properties can then be expressed through the policy layer of *PoCoFL* to specify which aspects of the resulting computation should be verifiable.

From the applied-cryptography perspective, researchers can independently optimise the underlying primitives used to enforce these policies, including commitment schemes, proof systems, and secure-aggregation mechanisms. Improvements to either side can therefore be incorporated without redesigning the complete framework. In this way, *PoCoFL* provides an interface between the two communities, as ML determines the properties and computations that should be enforced, while applied cryptography provides the mechanisms for securely and verifiably enforcing them. We view this separation as a first step towards enabling both communities to jointly develop more efficient and expressive verifiable FL systems.

Crypto-Agility. We do not experimentally evaluate the crypto-agility of *PoCoFL*. However, our formal definition and specification of *PoCoFL* are independent of a particular commitment scheme or NIZK construction. Hence, different schemes can be deployed, provided that their scheme-specific requirements are handled within the corresponding instantiation. This abstraction is particularly relevant during the ongoing transition from classical to post-quantum cryptography, as it allows cryptographic components to be replaced or upgraded without redesigning the overall framework, thereby supporting quantum-readiness.

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF VERIFIABLE FEDERATED-LEARNING SYSTEMS WITH RESPECT TO THE POLICY-COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (R1)–(R5) DEFINED IN SEC. II-B. A FILLED CIRCLE INDICATES EXPLICIT SUPPORT UNDER THE DEFINITIONS BELOW.

Techniques		Policy-compliance guarantees		Privacy guarantee	Framework modularity	
		(R2) Verifiable client-policy compliance	(R3) Verifiable aggregation-policy compliance	(R4) Private policy verification	(R1) Type-aware policy configuration	(R5) Cryptographic modularity and agility
VerifyNet [31]	SecAgg, SS, homomorphic hashing	○	○*	●	○	○
ElFFeL [6]	SS, VSS, ZKPs	●	○	●	○	○
RoFL [23]	SecAgg, commitments, ZKPs	●	○	●	○	○
ACORN [24]	SecAgg, commitments, ZKPs	●	○	●	○	○
RiseFL [33]	SecAgg, commitments, VSS, ZKPs	●	○	●	○	○
zkFL [3]	ZKPs, commitments, signatures, optional blockchain	○	●	●	○	○
PZKP-FL [27]	zk-SNARKs, HE, SecAgg, blockchain	●	●	●	○	○
VPFL [34]	ZKPs, commitments, Merkle tree	●	●	●	○	○
Federify [28]	zk-SNARKs, threshold HE, blockchain	●	●	●	○	○
BPFL [25]	zk-SNARKs, HE-based masking	●	○	●	○	○
NoV [26]	NIZKs, VSS, SecAgg	●	●	●	○	○
VerifiableFL/ExclaveFL [30]	TEE/exclaves, RA	○	●	● [◇]	○	○
Sentinel [35]	TEE, RA, instrumentation	●	○	●	○	○
Takagi–Hasegawa [32]	DP, TEE, SecAgg, client auditing	○	●	●	○	○
VeriDP [29]	DP, ZKPs, commitments, IVC	●	○	●	○	○
Our framework	Commitments, NIZKs, optional Aux components	●	●	●	●	●

Legend. ● indicates that the cited work explicitly satisfies the corresponding requirement, whereas ○ indicates that the requirement is not explicitly supported under the definitions used here.

* VerifyNet checks algebraic consistency of the returned aggregate but does not bind it to an explicitly identified admitted set and prescribed aggregation rule under the strict definition of Requirement (R3). ◇ VerifiableFL allows an auditor to verify attested data transformations without receiving the underlying plaintext data and exclaves provide execution integrity rather than confidentiality, and secure aggregation remains complementary.

Adaptability to Adversarial Settings. *PoCoFL* supports a range of adversarial settings through configurable client and aggregation policies alongside compatible cryptographic mechanisms. For scenarios involving malicious clients, policies specific to the chosen FL type enforce admission conditions designed to mitigate poisoned or manipulated updates. For malicious aggregators, policies mandate that each recorded and admitted contribution is processed exactly once according to the prescribed aggregation rule and weights. When aggregators must keep individual contributions confidential, auxiliary mechanisms can ensure privacy, as shown by the threshold-HE instantiation (Appendix B-C). Consequently, the framework accommodates diverse integrity and confidentiality requirements without changing its core interfaces. The selected policies and relevant adversarial assumptions determine the guarantees, as outlined in Sec. II-C. Table II in the appendices compares these capabilities with those of existing approaches.

APPENDIX B ADDITIONAL FRAMEWORK INSTANTIATIONS

Section V presents VanillaFL to illustrate stateless and retained-state client policies. We give three additional realisations here. ContinualFL targets forgetting, PersonalizedFL specialises the policy relations to personalised local training, while Threshold-HE illustrates the use of an auxiliary cryptographic mechanism for protected aggregation.

A. Continual Federated Learning

We instantiate continual federated learning as Type = ContinualFL with clients $\{C^{(i)}\}_{i \in I}$ and one aggregator $A^{(1)}$, using Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) as the continual-learning rule [10], [14], [15]. This realisation uses the type-specific retained client state supported by ContinualFL.

For client $C^{(i)}$, let

$$s_{i,t-1} = (\theta_{i,t-1}^{\text{ref}}, F_{i,t-1})$$

denote its previously accepted continual state, where $\theta_{i,t-1}^{\text{ref}}$ is the client’s most recent accepted local model and $F_{i,t-1}$ is the diagonal Fisher information vector computed at that model.

If a client participates intermittently, the index $t-1$ refers to its previous accepted continual state and need not correspond to the immediately preceding global round. Initially, $s_{i,0} = (\theta_0, \mathbf{0})$. The commitment to $s_{i,t-1}$ is retained from the client’s previous admitted message. For the initial state, this commitment is created before the first training round. In round t , the aggregator distributes the current global model θ_t . Client $C^{(i)}$ holds the current private task dataset $D_{i,t}$ of size $n_{i,t} = |D_{i,t}|$ and computes

$$u_{i,t} \leftarrow \text{LocalTrain}(\text{ContinualFL}, \theta_t, D_{i,t}, \text{params}), \\ \theta_{i,t} = \theta_t + u_{i,t}.$$

For this realisation, LocalTrain uses the retained state $s_{i,t-1}$ and optimises the EWC objective

$$\mathcal{L}_{i,t}^{\text{EWC}}(\theta) = \text{Loss}(\theta, D_{i,t}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d F_{i,t-1,j} (\theta_j - \theta_{i,t-1,j}^{\text{ref}})^2.$$

For the resulting local model, define the EWC regularisation term

$$E_{i,t} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d F_{i,t-1,j} (\theta_{i,t,j} - \theta_{i,t-1,j}^{\text{ref}})^2.$$

The client then computes the diagonal empirical Fisher information for the current task at the same local model. The estimator is fixed in params. For each model parameter j ,

$$F_{i,t,j} = \frac{1}{n_{i,t}} \sum_{(x,y) \in D_{i,t}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \log p_\theta(y | x) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_{i,t}} \right)^2.$$

We denote this computation by

$$F_{i,t} = \text{DiagFisher}(\theta_{i,t}, D_{i,t}, \text{params}).$$

The client forms its next continual state as $s_{i,t} = (\theta_{i,t}, F_{i,t})$. Thus, the local model and Fisher vector retained for the client's next accepted participation are paired at the same model state.

Client policy. The policy $\phi_{\text{EWC}} \in \Phi$ links the current update to the previously committed continual state, enforces the EWC condition, and binds the state retained for the client's next participation. The committed collection is

$$M_{i,t} = (D_{i,t}, u_{i,t}, s_{i,t}), (C_{i,t}, R_{i,t}) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{\text{CS}}, M_{i,t}).$$

Let $c_{i,t-1}^s$ and $r_{i,t-1}^s$ denote the retained commitment to $s_{i,t-1}$ and its corresponding private opening. The values $u_{i,t}$, $n_{i,t}$, and $c_{i,t-1}^s$ are public. The values $D_{i,t}$, $s_{i,t-1}$, $s_{i,t}$, $r_{i,t-1}^s$, and $R_{i,t}$ remain private. No auxiliary mechanism is required for this policy.

The client predicate is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{EWC}}}(x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) = 1 &\iff c_{i,t-1}^s \text{ binds } (\theta_{i,t-1}^{\text{ref}}, F_{i,t-1}) \\ &\wedge C_{i,t} \text{ binds } (D_{i,t}, u_{i,t}, s_{i,t}) \\ &\wedge n_{i,t} = |D_{i,t}| \\ &\wedge \theta_{i,t} = \theta_t + u_{i,t} \\ &\wedge E_{i,t} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d F_{i,t-1,j} (\theta_{i,t,j} - \theta_{i,t-1,j}^{\text{ref}})^2 \\ &\wedge E_{i,t} \leq \tau_{\text{EWC}} \\ &\wedge F_{i,t} = \text{DiagFisher}(\theta_{i,t}, D_{i,t}, \text{params}) \\ &\wedge s_{i,t} = (\theta_{i,t}, F_{i,t}). \end{aligned}$$

The relation therefore certifies that the submitted local model satisfies the EWC bound with respect to the client's previously committed continual state and that the Fisher vector retained for the next participation is computed at the resulting local model. As in the VanillaFL realisation, the policy does not certify the internal execution of LocalTrain.

Following Algorithm 2, the client instantiates the generic client procedure with $\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{\text{EWC}}}$ and computes

$$\pi_{i,t} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{\text{EWC}}}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}).$$

The client sends

$$C^{(i)} \longrightarrow A^{(1)} : \mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}).$$

Aggregation policy. Following Algorithm 3, $A^{(1)}$ verifies the received client messages and records the accepted messages in Adm_t . For each admitted client, the extracted aggregation value is

$$v_{i,t} = (u_{i,t}, n_{i,t}), V_t[i] = (u_{i,t}, n_{i,t}).$$

The next-state commitment is not part of the numerical aggregation value. It remains in the admitted client message and

is retained as the client's reference-state commitment for its next participation.

ContinualFL reuses the aggregation policy $\psi_{\text{FedAvg}} \in \Phi$ from the VanillaFL realisation. Let

$$N_t = \sum_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}} n_{i,t}.$$

The prescribed aggregate and next global model are

$$\Delta_t = \sum_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}} \frac{n_{i,t}}{N_t} u_{i,t}, \quad \theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \Delta_t.$$

Accordingly, $\text{Pred}_{\psi_{\text{FedAvg}}}(x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}) = 1$ holds when V_t contains exactly the values extracted from Adm_t , Δ_t is computed according to the prescribed FedAvg rule, and θ_{t+1} is obtained from θ_t and Δ_t .

Following Algorithm 3, the aggregator instantiates the generic aggregation procedure with $\mathcal{R}_{\psi_{\text{FedAvg}}}$ and computes

$$\pi_t^{\text{agg}} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\psi_{\text{FedAvg}}}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}).$$

Finally, the aggregator returns

$$A^{(1)} \longrightarrow \{C^{(i)}\}_{i \in I} : \nu_t = (1, t, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}}).$$

B. Personalised Federated Learning

We instantiate $\text{Type} = \text{PersonalizedFL}$ with clients $\{C^{(i)}\}_{i \in I}$ and one aggregator $A^{(1)}$ using pFedMe [9]. This realisation specialises the client and aggregation policies to the pFedMe learning rule. The generic commitment, proof, admission, and message construction follow Algorithms 2 and 3.

In round t , the aggregator distributes the current global reference model θ_t . Client $C^{(i)}$ holds a private dataset D_i and constructs a sequence of local reference models

$$\omega_{i,t,0}, \dots, \omega_{i,t,R}, \quad \omega_{i,t,0} = \theta_t.$$

For each local round r , the client computes a private personalised model $\theta_{i,t,r}^{\text{pers}}$ with respect to the proximal objective

$$\tilde{h}_{i,t,r}(v) = \text{Loss}_{\text{circ}}(v, D_i) + \frac{\lambda_M}{2} \|v - \omega_{i,t,r}\|_2^2,$$

where $\text{Loss}_{\text{circ}}$ is the circuit-compatible empirical loss fixed by params. The policy requires the resulting personalised point to satisfy the approximate first-order condition

$$\left\| \nabla_v \tilde{h}_{i,t,r}(\theta_{i,t,r}^{\text{pers}}) \right\|_2^2 \leq \tau_{\text{prox}}.$$

The local reference model is then updated according to the pFedMe rule

$$\omega_{i,t,r+1} \simeq_{\varepsilon_{\text{rec}}} \omega_{i,t,r} - \eta \lambda_M (\omega_{i,t,r} - \theta_{i,t,r}^{\text{pers}}),$$

where $\simeq_{\varepsilon_{\text{rec}}}$ denotes coordinate-wise equality up to the fixed-point tolerance prescribed by params. After R local rounds, the public client contribution is

$$u_{i,t} = \omega_{i,t,R} - \theta_t.$$

The personalised models remain private and are not numerically aggregated.

Client policy. The policy $\phi_{\text{pFedMe}} \in \Phi$ binds the private personalised and reference-model trajectory to the submitted update. It requires each personalised point to satisfy the prescribed proximal-stationarity condition and each reference-model transition to follow the pFedMe recurrence.

The committed collection contains the client dataset, the private personalised and reference-model trajectory, and the submitted update. The dataset and local trajectory remain private, whereas $u_{i,t}$ is public. The client predicate is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{pFedMe}}}(x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) = 1 \iff & \\ C_{i,t} \text{ binds } & \left(D_i, \{\omega_{i,t,r}\}_{r=0}^R, \{\theta_{i,t,r}^{\text{pers}}\}_{r=0}^{R-1}, u_{i,t} \right) \\ \wedge \omega_{i,t,0} = & \theta_t \\ \wedge \bigwedge_{r=0}^{R-1} \left\| \nabla_v \tilde{h}_{i,t,r}(\theta_{i,t,r}^{\text{pers}}) \right\|_2^2 \leq & \tau_{\text{prox}} \\ \wedge \bigwedge_{r=0}^{R-1} \omega_{i,t,r+1} \simeq_{\text{rec}} & \omega_{i,t,r} - \eta \lambda_M \left(\omega_{i,t,r} - \theta_{i,t,r}^{\text{pers}} \right) \\ \wedge u_{i,t} = & \omega_{i,t,R} - \theta_t. \end{aligned}$$

The client relation therefore certifies that the submitted update is consistent with private personalised points satisfying the prescribed proximal-stationarity bound and with the corresponding pFedMe reference-model updates. It does not require a particular local optimiser or an exact minimiser.

Aggregation policy. For an admitted client, the type-and-policy extraction interface returns

$$v_{i,t} = \text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{PersonalizedFL}, \phi_{\text{pFedMe}}}(x_{i,t}) = u_{i,t},$$

and $V_t[i] = u_{i,t}$. Let S_t denote the cohort prescribed for round t . The aggregation policy $\psi_{\text{pFedMe}} \in \Phi$ requires the admitted set to equal S_t and applies the pFedMe server mixing rule

$$\Delta_t = \frac{\beta}{|S_t|} \sum_{i \in S_t} u_{i,t}, \quad \theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \Delta_t.$$

Equivalently,

$$\theta_{t+1} = (1 - \beta)\theta_t + \frac{\beta}{|S_t|} \sum_{i \in S_t} \omega_{i,t,R}.$$

These operations use the deterministic fixed-point arithmetic prescribed by params.

Accordingly, the aggregation predicate is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pred}_{\psi_{\text{pFedMe}}}(x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}) = 1 \iff & I_t^{\text{adm}} = S_t \\ & \wedge V_t[i] = u_{i,t} \quad \forall i \in S_t \\ & \wedge \Delta_t = \frac{\beta}{|S_t|} \sum_{i \in S_t} V_t[i] \\ & \wedge \theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \Delta_t. \end{aligned}$$

For evaluation, we instantiate one local reference-model round, a full local batch, and full-cohort participation. These are choices of the evaluated realisation rather than requirements of PersonalizedFL. The policy certifies the round-local pFedMe relation, but not personalised model accuracy or cross-round continuity of a retained personalised model.

C. Threshold Homomorphic Federated Learning

We instantiate $\text{Type} = \text{Threshold-HE}$, motivated by threshold-encrypted FL constructions such as Zhu et al. [12], with clients $\{C^{(i)}\}_{i \in I}$ and a set of aggregators $\{A^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell \in J}$. This type uses threshold-encrypted aggregation, with the required cryptographic functionality provided through the auxiliary component $\text{HE} \in \text{Aux}$. We instantiate HE with an additively homomorphic threshold-encryption scheme. Its setup, executed by Algorithm 1, produces a public encryption key pk_{HE} and the private decryption shares required by the aggregators.

For Threshold-HE, we instantiate HE with 3-of-3 threshold ElGamal [36] using `elastic-elgamal 0.3.1` [37] over Ristretto255 [38]. Client validity uses ElGamal-Pedersen consistency proofs and Bulletproofs [39] range and norm proofs, while each decryption share carries a Chaum-Pedersen [40] equality proof. The research prototype uses trusted-dealer key generation rather than distributed key generation (DKG) [41]. In round t , client $C^{(i)}$ computes

$$u_{i,t} \leftarrow \text{LocalTrain}(\text{Threshold-HE}, \theta_t, D_{i,t}, \text{params})$$

and encodes the update as an integer vector

$$q_{i,t} = \text{Encode}(u_{i,t}, \text{params}).$$

The public parameters fix a coordinate bound Q and a squared-norm bound B_q^2 .

Client policy. The client policy $\phi_{\text{HE-L2}} \in \Phi$ requires the encrypted aggregation value to correspond to the same encoded update bound by the commitment and to satisfy the prescribed coordinate and squared-norm bounds. The committed collection is

$$M_{i,t} = (q_{i,t}), (C_{i,t}, R_{i,t}) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{\text{CS}}, q_{i,t}).$$

The selected auxiliary HE mechanism encrypts the same encoded update:

$$E_{i,t} = \text{Enc}(\text{pk}_{\text{HE}}, q_{i,t}; \eta_{i,t}),$$

where $E_{i,t}$ is public auxiliary output and the encryption randomness $\eta_{i,t}$ remains private.

The client predicate is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pred}_{\phi_{\text{HE-L2}}}(x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) = 1 \iff & C_{i,t} \text{ binds } q_{i,t} \\ & \wedge E_{i,t} = \text{Enc}(\text{pk}_{\text{HE}}, q_{i,t}; \eta_{i,t}) \\ & \wedge |q_{i,t,j}| \leq Q \quad \text{for every } j \\ & \wedge \|q_{i,t}\|_2^2 \leq B_q^2. \end{aligned}$$

The relation therefore binds the encrypted aggregation value to the committed encoded update and certifies the prescribed bounds without revealing $q_{i,t}$. Following Algorithm 2, the client instantiates the generic client procedure with $\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{\text{HE-L2}}}$ and computes

$$\pi_{i,t} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\phi_{\text{HE-L2}}}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}).$$

The client sends, to the executing aggregator $A^{(\ell)}$,

$$C^{(i)} \longrightarrow A^{(\ell)} : \mu_{i,t} = (i, t, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}).$$

Aggregation policy. For every admitted client, the type-and-policy extraction interface returns

$$v_{i,t} = \text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{Threshold-HE}\phi_{\text{HE-L2}}}(x_{i,t}) = (E_{i,t}, n_i),$$

and $V_t[i] = (E_{i,t}, n_i)$, where n_i is the public aggregation weight fixed in params. Let

$$N_t = \sum_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}} n_i.$$

The aggregation policy $\psi_{\text{HE-FedAvg}} \in \Phi$ applies the prescribed weighted aggregation to the encrypted client values. The homomorphic aggregation procedure prescribed by Threshold-HE computes the encrypted weighted numerator

$$E_t^{\text{sum}} = \text{Eval}(\text{pk}_{\text{HE}}, \{(n_i, E_{i,t})\}_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}}).$$

The required aggregators produce threshold-decryption shares, and their combination yields

$$s_t = \sum_{i \in I_t^{\text{adm}}} n_i q_{i,t}.$$

Using the public encoding rule, the plaintext aggregate and next global model are

$$\Delta_t = \text{DecodeAvg}(s_t, N_t, \text{params}), \theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \Delta_t.$$

The aggregation policy $\psi_{\text{HE-FedAvg}} \in \Phi$ requires that V_t contain exactly the ciphertexts and weights extracted from Adm_t , that E_t^{sum} is the prescribed homomorphic evaluation, that the threshold-decryption shares are valid, and that decoding the resulting plaintext aggregate yields the published θ_{t+1} . The public decryption objects and their verification material are supplied through the selected auxiliary component as prescribed by Algorithm 3.

Following Algorithm 3, the executing aggregator instantiates the generic aggregation procedure with $\mathcal{R}_{\psi_{\text{HE-FedAvg}}}$ and computes

$$\pi_t^{\text{agg}} \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_{\psi_{\text{HE-FedAvg}}}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x_t^{\text{agg}}, w_t^{\text{agg}}).$$

The aggregator returns

$$A^{(\ell)} \longrightarrow \{C^{(i)}\}_{i \in I} : \nu_t = (\ell, t, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}}).$$

APPENDIX C SECURITY DEFINITIONS AND PROOFS

This appendix provides the formal definitions, security games, and proofs supporting the results stated in Sec. IV. We first state the cryptographic notions used by the reductions, then introduce the common notation used in the framework-level games, and finally give the experiments and proofs for update admissibility, aggregation correctness, and policy-relative privacy.

A. Cryptographic Notions

We recall the cryptographic notions used in the generic security proofs. They are defined independently of any particular FL policy or instantiation. Auxiliary primitives are realisation-specific and are considered separately. Any additional guarantee obtained from such a primitive relies on the corresponding security assumptions stated by that instantiation.

(i) *Soundness.* Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a relation supported by Π , and let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}}$ denote its corresponding language. For a PPT adversary $\mathcal{B}$, define

$$\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}}^{\text{snd}}(\lambda) = \Pr \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{pp}_{\Pi} \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\Pi}(1^{\lambda}); \\ (x, \pi) \leftarrow \mathcal{B}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}) : \\ x \notin \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} \wedge \Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x, \pi) = 1 \end{array} \right]$$

(ii) *Zero knowledge.* Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a relation supported by Π , and let $(\text{SimSetup}, \text{SimProve})$ denote the simulator of Π . Let $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ be a two-stage PPT adversary. After receiving the public parameters, $\mathcal{B}_1$ selects a statement-witness pair (x, w) together with state st . The experiment proceeds only when $(x, w) \in \mathcal{R}$.

In the real experiment, the public parameters and proof are generated honestly. In the simulated experiment, they are generated using the simulator, as shown in Fig. 4. The zero-knowledge advantage of $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}}^{\text{zk}}(\lambda) = \left| \Pr[\text{ZKReal}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}}(1^{\lambda}) = 1] - \Pr[\text{ZKSim}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}}(1^{\lambda}) = 1] \right|.$$

(iii) *Commitment hiding.* Let $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ be

$\text{ZKReal}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}}(1^{\lambda})$	$\text{ZKSim}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}}(1^{\lambda})$
Setup. Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $\text{pp}_{\Pi} \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\Pi}(1^{\lambda}).$	Setup. Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $(\tilde{\text{pp}}_{\Pi}, \tau) \leftarrow \text{SimSetup}(1^{\lambda}).$
Statement selection. The first-stage adversary outputs $(x, w, \text{st}) \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_1(\text{pp}_{\Pi}).$	Statement selection. The first-stage adversary outputs $(x, w, \text{st}) \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\text{pp}}_{\Pi}).$
Admissibility check. If $(x, w) \notin \mathcal{R},$	Admissibility check. If $(x, w) \notin \mathcal{R},$
Return 0 and halt. Proof generation. Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $\pi \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{pp}_{\Pi}, x, w).$	Return 0 and halt. Proof generation. Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $\tilde{\pi} \leftarrow \text{SimProve}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tau, x).$
Distinguishing. The second-stage adversary outputs $b' \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_2(\text{st}, x, \pi).$	Distinguishing. The second-stage adversary outputs $b' \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_2(\text{st}, x, \tilde{\pi}).$
Return $b'.$	Return $b'.$

Fig. 4. Real and simulated zero-knowledge experiments.

a two-stage PPT adversary. The hiding experiment proceeds as follows: Challenger computes $\text{pp}_{\text{CS}} \leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\text{CS}}(1^{\lambda})$ and $(M_0, M_1, \text{st}) \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_1(\text{pp}_{\text{CS}})$, where M_0 and M_1 are valid messages in the commitment scheme's message space. The challenger then samples $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$,

Framework operations:

- ◊ $\mathfrak{F}.\text{Setup}$: denotes the generic framework setup procedure, with the fixed framework instance, participant sets, and realisation specification suppressed from the notation.
- ◊ $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}$: efficiently verifies a client message against the active round context.
- ◊ $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyAgg}$: efficiently verifies an aggregation message against the active round context, aggregation policy, and admitted-message record.

Semantic validity predicate:

- $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}$: states that a client message is semantically valid under the applicable client policy.
- $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidRec}$: states that the admitted-message record contains distinct client identifiers and only semantically valid client messages.
- $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidAgg}$: states that the admitted record is valid and that the aggregation statement satisfies the applicable aggregation policy.

Security-game helper notation.

- ◊ $\mathfrak{F}.\text{AggOut}$: denotes the aggregation output prescribed by the framework for a given admitted-message record.
- ◊ $\mathfrak{F}.\text{BuildClient}$: denotes the client-side construction of a statement-witness pair (x, w) before NIZK proof generation.
- ◊ $\mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}$: extracts the public fields of a client statement that are required to remain identical in the two privacy-challenge worlds.

Fig. 5. Framework notation used in the security games.

computes $(C_b, R_b) \leftarrow \text{Commit}(\text{pp}_{\text{CS}}, M_b)$. The adversary outputs

$$b' \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_2(\text{st}, C_b).$$

The hiding advantage for CS is

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{CS}, \mathcal{B}}^{\text{hid}}(\lambda) = |2 \Pr[b' = b] - 1|.$$

The generic reductions for Properties **(P1)**–**(P3)** use soundness and zero knowledge of Π and hiding of CS as specified below. Any additional guarantees supplied by optional auxiliary mechanisms rely on the primitive-specific assumptions of the corresponding realisation.

B. Security Game Notions and Notation

Before defining the framework-level security experiments, we introduce the verification procedures, semantic validity predicates, and helper notation shared by the three games. These notions allow the games to distinguish efficient protocol acceptance from the underlying policy-compliance condition that acceptance is intended to certify. The security games distinguish between *verification* and *semantic validity*. Verification procedures are the efficient checks performed by honest parties during protocol execution. Validity predicates capture the semantic conditions that an accepted client message, recorded set, or aggregation result is intended to satisfy. We use the namespace $\mathfrak{F}.$ for the framework-level operations, predicates, and helper notation used in the games. To make the security definitions easier to follow, Fig. 5 summarises the framework-level operations, semantic validity predicates, and other notation used in the games. The verification procedures $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}$ and $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyAgg}$ are efficiently computable and correspond to checks performed during protocol execution. In contrast, $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}$, $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidRec}$, and $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidAgg}$ are

semantic predicates used only in the security definitions and need not be efficiently decidable. The remaining notation is introduced only to keep the security games concise. The use of these notions and other notation is most easily understood in the context of a single protocol round, which we describe below.

One-round interpretation. In order to make these notions clear, consider a fixed protocol round t . For a client policy ϕ , let $\kappa_t^\phi = (t, \phi, \theta_t, \text{params})$ denote the active public context for that round. Suppose a client message $\mu_{i,t} = (\hat{i}, \hat{t}, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t})$ is received over an authenticated channel from client i . The identity i is therefore determined by the authenticated channel rather than by the contents of the message. The client verification and validity predicates share the same sender, round, context, and aggregation-value availability checks. Their only substantive difference is the final condition: verification checks whether the submitted NIZK proof is accepted, whereas semantic validity requires the underlying statement to belong to the client-policy language. Figure 6 shows the two predicates side by side. By definition of the policy language,

$\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}$	$\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}$
$\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1$	$\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1$
$\iff$	$\iff$
$\hat{i} = i \wedge$	$\hat{i} = i \wedge$
$\hat{t} = t \wedge$	$\hat{t} = t \wedge$
$\text{Ctx}(x_{i,t}) = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, \text{params}) \wedge$	$\text{Ctx}(x_{i,t}) = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, \text{params}) \wedge$
$\text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{Type}, \phi}(x_{i,t}) \neq \perp \wedge$	$\text{ExtractAgg}_{\text{Type}, \phi}(x_{i,t}) \neq \perp \wedge$
$\Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}) = 1$	$x_{i,t} \in \mathcal{L}_\phi$

Fig. 6. Client verification and semantic validity for a fixed protocol round.

$$x_{i,t} \in \mathcal{L}_\phi \iff \exists w_{i,t} : (x_{i,t}, w_{i,t}) \in \mathcal{R}_\phi.$$

After client verification, let $\text{Rec}_t = ((i_1, \mu_{i_1,t}), \dots, (i_m, \mu_{i_m,t}))$ denote the public admitted-message record for the same round, where each i_j is the authenticated sender identity associated with the corresponding message. The record is semantically valid when all recorded client identifiers are pairwise distinct and every recorded client message is semantically valid.

Thus, $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidRec}(\kappa_t^\phi, \text{Rec}_t) = 1$ if and only if the identifiers in Rec_t are pairwise distinct and

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1 \quad \forall (i, \mu_{i,t}) \in \text{Rec}_t.$$

For this record, define $\mathfrak{F}.\text{AggOut}_{\text{Type}, \psi}(\theta_t, \text{Rec}_t, \text{params})$ as the deterministic output obtained by extracting exactly one aggregation value from every recorded message, applying the aggregation rule and weights prescribed by Type and ψ , and then applying the prescribed model-update rule.

Now consider the aggregation message for the same round,

$$\nu_t = (\ell, \hat{t}, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}}),$$

where $x_t^{\text{agg}} = (\hat{\ell}, \hat{t}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\theta}, \widehat{\text{Rec}_t}, \theta_{t+1}, Z_t^{\text{pub}}, \widehat{\text{params}})$.

The framework accepts this aggregation message when all of the following conditions hold:

- (1) the aggregation message and statement agree with the active round context:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{t} = \tilde{t} = t, \quad \hat{\ell} = \ell, \quad \hat{\phi} = \phi, \quad \hat{\psi} = \psi, \\ \hat{\theta} = \theta_t, \quad \widehat{\text{params}} = \text{params}, \quad \widehat{\text{Rec}_t} = \text{Rec}_t \end{aligned}$$

- (2) the client identifiers in Rec_t are pairwise distinct
- (3) every recorded client message satisfies

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1$$

- (4) the aggregation proof verifies:

$$\Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\psi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}}) = 1.$$

We denote these efficient checks by

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyAgg}(\kappa_t^\phi, \psi, \text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) = 1$$

and the corresponding semantic aggregation-validity condition is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidAgg}(\kappa_t^\phi, \psi, \text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) = 1 &\iff \\ \mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidRec}(\kappa_t^\phi, \text{Rec}_t) = 1 \wedge x_t^{\text{agg}} \in \mathcal{L}_\psi. \end{aligned}$$

Since the aggregation relation $\mathcal{R}_\psi$ enforces the prescribed participation, extraction, aggregation, weighting, and model-update computation, $x_t^{\text{agg}} \in \mathcal{L}_\psi$ implies

$$\theta_{t+1} = \mathfrak{F}.\text{AggOut}_{\text{Type}, \psi}(\theta_t, \text{Rec}_t, \text{params}).$$

Privacy game helper notation. The privacy game additionally uses two pieces of helper notation derived from the ordinary client construction. Let s denote the private client-side input and local private state required by the selected FL type, client policy, and realisation. We write

$$(x, w) \leftarrow \mathfrak{F}.\text{BuildClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, s)$$

for execution of the client-side construction up to formation of the public statement x and witness w . In particular, this construction performs the policy-prescribed local computation, forms the committed collection, generates the commitment and auxiliary objects, and constructs (x, w) as in Algorithm 2, but stops before the relation check and NIZK proof generation. This notation is only shorthand for the existing client algorithm. For a client statement $x_{i,t} = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, C_{i,t}, Z_{i,t}^{\text{pub}}, \text{params})$, define

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}(x_{i,t}) = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, Z_{i,t}^{\text{pub}}, \text{params}).$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}$ contains exactly the public fields that must remain identical in the two privacy-challenge worlds. The challenge-dependent commitment $C_{i,t}$ is excluded from this, although the commitment itself remains part of the public statement.

Thus, for a fixed round, the verification predicates describe what honest parties can efficiently check, while the corresponding validity predicates describe the semantic conditions whose violation defines success in the security games below. The helper notation above is used only to express these games compactly and does not add new protocol functionality.

C. Update Admissibility

We now formalise Property **(P1)**. The experiment captures the event that a corrupted client produces a message that is accepted by the efficient client-verification procedure although the message is not semantically valid under the active client policy. Fix a protocol round t arising from an honest framework execution under the framework setup, and let κ_t^ϕ denote its active public context as defined in Appendix C-B.

Game $\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_1}^{\text{adm}}(1^\lambda)$
▷ Setup Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \{\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}) \leftarrow \mathfrak{F}.\text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$. $\mathcal{C}$ gives $(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \kappa_t^\phi)$ and the prescribed setup state of the corrupted client to $\mathcal{A}_1$. ▷ Adversary output The adversary, acting as corrupted client i, outputs $\mu_{i,t} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_1(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \kappa_t^\phi)$. Return 1 if and only if $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1 \wedge \mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 0$.

Fig. 7. Update-admissibility game.

Definition 8 (Update admissibility). *The update-admissibility advantage of $\mathcal{A}_1$ is*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_1}^{\text{adm}}(\lambda) = \Pr[\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_1}^{\text{adm}}(1^\lambda) = 1].$$

The framework provides update admissibility if this advantage is negligible for every PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$.

Proof (Theorem 1). Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_1$ wins the game. Since

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1,$$

the authenticated identity, round, context, and extraction checks succeed, and $\Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}) = 1$.

Since $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 0$ uses the same deterministic identity, context, and extraction conditions, it follows that $x_{i,t} \notin \mathcal{L}_\phi$.

Hence

$$x_{i,t} \notin \mathcal{L}_\phi \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}) = 1.$$

An adversary $\mathcal{B}_{\text{adm}}$ that outputs $(x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t})$ therefore breaks soundness of Π whenever $\mathcal{A}_1$ wins. This proves the stated bound. $\square$

D. Aggregation Correctness

We next formalise Property **(P2)**. The experiment captures the event that a corrupted aggregator produces an aggregation message that passes the framework's efficient verification procedure but is not semantically valid with respect to the active aggregation policy and the recorded admitted set. Fix the active client context κ_t^ϕ and aggregation policy $\psi \in \Phi$ for the round.

Definition 9 (Aggregation correctness). *The aggregation-correctness advantage of $\mathcal{A}_2$ is*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{agg}}(\lambda) = \Pr[\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{agg}}(1^\lambda) = 1].$$

Game $\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{agg}}(1^\lambda)$ ▷ Setup Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \{\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}) \leftarrow \mathfrak{F}.\text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$. $\mathcal{C}$ gives $(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \kappa_t^\phi, \psi)$ and the prescribed setup state of the corrupted aggregator to $\mathcal{A}_2$. ▷ Adversary output The adversarial aggregator outputs $(\text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_2(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \kappa_t^\phi, \psi).$ Return 1 if and only if $\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyAgg}(\kappa_t^\phi, \psi, \text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) = 1 \\ &\wedge \mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidAgg}(\kappa_t^\phi, \psi, \text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) = 0. \end{aligned}$

Fig. 8. Aggregation-correctness game.

The framework provides aggregation correctness if this advantage is negligible for every PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}_2$.

Proof (Theorem 2). Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_2$ wins the aggregation-correctness game.

Since $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyAgg}(\kappa_t^\phi, \psi, \text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) = 1$, all deterministic verification checks succeed. In particular, the active round, policies, current model, public parameters, and recorded list are consistent and the record contains distinct client identifiers. Every recorded message passes $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}$ and the aggregation proof is accepted.

We consider two cases:

(i) First suppose that some entry $(i, \mu_{i,t}) \in \text{Rec}_t$ satisfies

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 0.$$

Since $\mathfrak{F}.\text{VfyClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, \mu_{i,t}) = 1$, the deterministic identity, context, and extraction checks already succeed. Therefore $x_{i,t} \notin \mathcal{L}_\phi$ while $\Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_{i,t}, \pi_{i,t}) = 1$. This yields a soundness violation of Π . A union bound over at most $q(\lambda)$ recorded client messages gives the first term.

(ii) Secondly it now remains to consider the case

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidRec}(\kappa_t^\phi, \text{Rec}_t) = 1.$$

Since $\mathcal{A}_2$ still wins, $\mathfrak{F}.\text{ValidAgg}(\kappa_t^\phi, \psi, \text{Rec}_t, \nu_t) = 0$, and therefore $x_t^{\text{agg}} \notin \mathcal{L}_\psi$. The relation $\mathcal{R}_\psi$ captures compliance with the prescribed aggregation policy. Hence, any aggregation statement that does not satisfy the requirements encoded by ψ falls outside $\mathcal{L}_\psi$.

However, at the same time we have, $\Pi.\text{Verify}_{\mathcal{R}_\psi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}}) = 1$. Hence an adversary that outputs $(x_t^{\text{agg}}, \pi_t^{\text{agg}})$ breaks soundness of Π , giving the final term.

It is important to note that the guarantee is relative to the public record Rec_t . We state here for completeness that showing that every message submitted to the aggregator was included in this record is outside this game and requires an auditable submission mechanism. $\square$

E. Policy-Relative Privacy

Finally, we formalise Property (P3). The privacy experiment compares two valid private client inputs that induce the same

permitted public context. The verifier receives the proof-carrying message produced from one of these inputs and attempts to distinguish which private input was used. We use the client-construction and common-context notation from Appendix C-B.

Game $\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{priv}}(1^\lambda, b)$ ▷ Setup Challenger $\mathcal{C}$ computes $(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \{\text{st}_P^{\text{setup}}\}_{P \in \mathcal{P}}) \leftarrow \mathfrak{F}.\text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$. $\mathcal{C}$ gives $(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \kappa_t^\phi)$ and the prescribed setup state of the corrupted participant to $\mathcal{A}_{2,1}$. ▷ Challenge selection The first-stage adversary outputs $(i, s_0, s_1, \text{st}) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_{2,1}(\text{pp}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \kappa_t^\phi)$. ▷ Challenge construction For each $j \in \{0, 1\}$: $\mathcal{C}$ computes $(x_j, w_j) \leftarrow \mathfrak{F}.\text{BuildClient}(\kappa_t^\phi, i, s_j)$. ▷ Admissibility If $\mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}(x_0) \neq \mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}(x_1)$ or $(x_j, w_j) \notin \mathcal{R}_\phi \text{ for some } j \in \{0, 1\},$ Return 0. ▷ Challenge $\mathcal{C}$ computes $\pi_b \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_b, w_b)$ and gives (x_b, π_b) to $\mathcal{A}_{2,2}$. ▷ Adversary output The second-stage adversary outputs $b' \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_{2,2}(\text{st}, x_b, \pi_b).$ Return b' .
--

Fig. 9. Policy-relative-privacy game.

Definition 10 (Policy-relative privacy). Let

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = (\mathcal{A}_{2,1}, \mathcal{A}_{2,2}).$$

The policy-relative-privacy advantage is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{priv}}(\lambda) = & \left| \Pr[\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{priv}}(1^\lambda, 0) = 1] \right. \\ & \left. - \Pr[\text{Game}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{priv}}(1^\lambda, 1) = 1] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The framework provides policy-relative privacy if this advantage is negligible for every PPT verifier $\mathcal{A}_2$.

Proof (Theorem 3). Let (x_0, x_1) be an admissible challenge pair such that

$$x_0 = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, C_0, Z^{\text{pub}}, \text{params}),$$

$$x_1 = (i, t, \phi, \theta_t, C_1, Z^{\text{pub}}, \text{params}).$$

By definition we have,

$$\mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}(x_0) = \mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}(x_1).$$

Consider four hybrids. For each hybrid H_i , we write $\Pr[H_i = 1]$ for the probability that the experiment outputs 1.

(H_0). The challenger uses x_0 and the real proof

$$\pi_0 \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_0, w_0).$$

(H_1). The statement remains x_0 , but its proof is replaced by a simulated proof. By zero knowledge of Π ,

$$|\Pr[H_0 = 1] - \Pr[H_1 = 1]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_{zk,0}}^{\text{zk}}(\lambda).$$

(H_2). Replace the commitment C_0 by C_1 while keeping every field in $\mathfrak{F}.\text{CommonCtx}$ unchanged. The proof remains simulated. Since both challenge executions use the same policy ϕ , their committed collections have the same policy-defined structure. By hiding of CS we have,

$$|\Pr[H_1 = 1] - \Pr[H_2 = 1]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{CS}, \mathcal{B}_{\text{hid}}}^{\text{hid}}(\lambda).$$

(H_3). Replace the simulated proof for x_1 by the real proof

$$\pi_1 \leftarrow \Pi.\text{Prove}_{\mathcal{R}_\phi}(\text{pp}_\Pi, x_1, w_1).$$

Again, by zero knowledge of Π ,

$$|\Pr[H_2 = 1] - \Pr[H_3 = 1]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{B}_{zk,1}}^{\text{zk}}(\lambda).$$

Hybrid H_0 is the privacy experiment with $b = 0$, while hybrid H_3 is the privacy experiment with $b = 1$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{A}_2}^{\text{priv}}(\lambda) &= |\Pr[H_0 = 1] - \Pr[H_3 = 1]| \\ &\leq |\Pr[H_0 = 1] - \Pr[H_1 = 1]| \\ &\quad + |\Pr[H_1 = 1] - \Pr[H_2 = 1]| \\ &\quad + |\Pr[H_2 = 1] - \Pr[H_3 = 1]|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the bounds established above for the three hybrid transitions gives the claimed bound.

□