Herbert Woisetschläger herbert.woisetschlaeger@tum.de Technical University of Munich Munich, Germany

Alexander Erben alex.erben@tum.de Technical University of Munich Munich, Germany

Ruben Mayer ruben.mayer@uni-bayreuth.de University of Bayreuth Bayreuth, Germany

ABSTRACT

With the emergence of AI regulations, such as the EU AI Act, requirements for simple data lineage, enforcement of low data bias, and energy efficiency have become a priority for everyone offering AI services. Being pre-trained on versatile and a vast amount of data, large language models and foundation models (FMs) offer a good basis for building high-quality deep learning pipelines. Fine-tuning can further improve model performance on a specific downstream task, which requires orders of magnitude less data than pre-training. Often, access to high-quality and low-bias data for model fine-tuning is limited due to technical or regulatory requirements. Federated learning (FL), as a distributed and privacypreserving technique, offers a well-suited approach to significantly expanding data access for model fine-tuning. Yet, this data is often located on the network edge, where energy, computational, and communication resources are significantly more limited than in data centers.

In our paper, we conduct an end-to-end evaluation for fine-tuning the FLAN-T5 FM family on the network edge. We study energy efficiency potentials throughout FL systems - on clients, in communication, and on the server. Our analysis introduces energy efficiency as a real-time metric to assess the computational efficiency of an FL system. We show the stark need for further improvements in communication efficiency when working with FMs and demonstrate the importance of adaptive FL optimizers for FM training.

ACM Reference Format:

Herbert Woisetschläger, Alexander Erben, Shiqiang Wang, Ruben Mayer, and Hans-Arno Jacobsen. 2024. Federated Fine-Tuning of LLMs on the Very Edge: The Good, the Bad, the Ugly. In Workshop on Data Management for End-to-End Machine Learning (DEEM 24), June 9, 2024, Santiago, AA, Chile. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3650203.3663331

DEEM 24, June 9, 2024, Santiago, AA, Chile

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0611-0/24/06

https://doi.org/10.1145/3650203.3663331

Hans-Arno Jacobsen jacobsen@eecg.toronto.edu University of Toronto Toronto, Canada



Shiqiang Wang

wangshiq@us.ibm.com

IBM T.J. Watson Research Center

Yorktown Heights, United States

Figure 1: Development of computational power and resource availability of DL accelerators 2017 - 2023 for data centers and embedded systems. Key: RPi4 = Raspberry Pi 4, Nano = NVIDIA Jetson Nano, Orin Nano = NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano, AGX Orin = NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin 64 GB.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) and Foundation Models (FMs) are omnipresent in academia and practice and fuel new innovations [6]. These models have grown significantly with regard to parameter size, as more parameters improve the performance to a certain degree [18]. In line with the growing computational need for these models, deep learning (DL) hardware accelerators have become increasingly more capable. Recent developments indicate a generational leap in computational power for data center applications, with the NVIDIA H100 NVL delivering 7.8 TB/s memory bandwidth compared to the previous state-of-the-art A100 80GB GPU that only has 2 TB/s (Figure 1). Due to memory-bandwidth bottlenecked operations taking up to 40% of the training time [22], this improvement may lead to much faster training times for both small and large models. At the same time, computational capabilities on embedded devices for mobile edge computing are significantly growing, with the NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin 64GB being the first-of-a-kind DLaccelerated embedded device that provides capabilities for training FMs [9]. This has never been possible before and enables us to build FL workloads with large transformer models, benefit from scattered data, and bring generative AI closer to users, all the while improving data privacy.

As this type of device is oftentimes scattered across geographies and entities, federated DL (FL) imposes itself as a well-suited technique for fine-tuning FMs in a distributed and private fashion. To

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

our knowledge, the largest models discussed in FL to this point entail FedBert and GPT2 [39, 48]. Both models were trained with FL methods on multi-GPU data center nodes. Only a few studies exist on field deployments [4]. As can be seen in Figure 1, the computing resources of state-of-the-art embedded hardware like the NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin are orders of magnitude less than on a modern data center GPU like the H100. However, if we want to gain access to a broader data basis, we need to foster FL on the edge and bring FMs to embedded devices.

At the same time, new regulations like the European Union AI Act impose new limitations and requirements for FL [43] that need to be met such that applications become practical. This entails the need to prioritize energy efficiency. For FL, this is an underexplored area as most existing works either perform microbenchmarks for FL clients [27, 5] or focus on communication cost reduction [13]. The combination of resource limitations and increasing regulatory requirements presents us with a set of challenges:

- (1) Comparably low memory bandwidth on embedded devices limits the compute potential of FL applications on the edge. We currently see a generation leap in data center DL accelerators regarding memory bandwidth, which has increased significantly (up to 7.8 TB/s). Even though the memory size on embedded devices has increased, the memory bandwidth remains comparatively low (up to 0.2 TB/s). This affects key memory-bandwidth bottlenecked operations for the training process, which could lead to severe training time penalties.
- (2) Energy efficiency has become a priority with the introduction of the EU AI Act. The new regulation requires service providers that offer FL applications to focus on energyefficient operations. To this point, energy efficiency can be measured by means of the Model-FLOP utilization [8], but it requires knowledge of what hardware is being used and how to optimally configure it. In FL systems, this can be impractical as we often do not know client details, and in many cases, clients are likely to participate only once in the training process [32].
- (3) **FMs are large in size and are harder to train or fine-tune than small models**. The prevailing benefit of FMs is their ability to cater to many different tasks [6]. However, their performance on specific downstream tasks can be improved with fine-tuning [20]. Yet, the gradients during foundation model training or fine-tuning are at much higher risk of exploding or vanishing than in smaller tasks, as they are frequently discussed in FL [27, 17, 7].
- (4) Communication on the edge is significantly more expensive than in data centers. While network bandwidth in data centers is available at 100 Gbit [2], mobile or remote communication over wide area networks is still a difficult challenge to achieve, especially when handling 100M+ parameter DL models. For distributed learning applications where high-bandwidth communication is available, we can use techniques such as ZeRo-offloading [37] and FSDP [50] that utilize a high-bandwidth interconnect for all-reduce communication between nodes to not materialize the full

model, optimizer, and gradient state due to limited memory sizes. In FL, this is typically infeasible due to a limited network interconnect.

Based on the open challenges to creating efficient edge computing systems capable of training FMs, we formulate our research question: How can we efficiently realize FM training and fine-tuning at the network edge? Which levers can have the largest impact on improving FL system efficiency?

By exploring this research question, we make four major contributions to bridge the gap between federated foundation model training and energy-aware FL:

- (1) We systematically study the computational limitations of state-of-the-art embedded hardware for DL. Nowadays, most papers in the FL space use data center hardware for their experiments [17, 7], while large amounts of data are scattered on the edge and must not be neglected as a field of application. We, therefore, conduct an in-depth microbenchmark of various transformer models on the latest embedded and datacenter DL accelerators to identify computational bottlenecks.
- (2) We outline the limitations of theoretical metrics such as the Model-FLOP Utilization for FL applications. As micro-benchmarks require extensive experimentation, practitioners often use metrics, such as the Model-FLOP Utilization (MFU), based on theoretical hardware performance limits to assess the computational efficiency of algorithms [11]. Calculating the MFU requires knowledge of hardware specifications on FL clients, which could be infeasible due to privacy considerations. As such, we identify energy efficiency as a readily available alternative to the MFU and outline that the computational limits of embedded AI accelerators appear significantly earlier than the MFU suggests.
- (3) We benchmark four state-of-the-art FL optimizers for FM fine-tuning. A key to energy-efficient use of FL is the right optimizer choice. We systematically benchmark four state-of-the-art FL optimizers to quantify the energy savings with the right optimizer choice. We find adaptive optimization techniques to converge up to 8× faster than FedAvg with momentum, one of the most widely used FL optimizers [29].
- (4) We quantify the *total* cost of communication in FL applications with state-of-the-art FMs. Our study identifies wide-area communication as the primary driver for energy consumption in FL systems, up to 4 orders of magnitude higher than the energy consumed by computing on clients.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 will outline relevant background. In Section 3, we present our methodology, and in Section 4, we present our benchmark design, including datasets, DL models, and FL strategies. Section 5 contains experimental evaluations of our benchmark. In Section 6, we present related work. In Section 7, we discuss our results. In Section 8, we conclude our work.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Performance Objectives in Data Center Environments

One of the most important issues when training in a data center is to maximize throughput by trying to use the hardware to its limit without being blocked by communication. Communication concerns both local communication, i.e., memory movement, and communication between GPUs and nodes, typically with a high bandwidth interconnect such as NVLink (7.8 TB/s) and Ethernet (100 Gbit) [2].

Measuring the effectiveness of each GPU in training is possible via Model FLOP Utilization (MFU) [8], which is the ratio of throughput achieved compared to the theoretical throughput of a model and a set of hardware. Common values for the MFU are between 5 - 20% (Figure 4a) because DL models are not defined as a single matrix multiplication that can be perfectly parallelized between tensor cores but as many operations with memory bandwidth bottlenecks such as softmax, residual additions, and activations [22]. These operations result in a FLOP usage significantly lower than the theoretical hardware capability, and each model architecture has its own set of operations that slow down throughput. However, the MFU can be used as a benchmark for how well a model is suited to work on a particular piece of hardware, as it fits the trade-offs between memory bandwidth, memory capacity, and FLOP. This way, we can compare the MFU for the same model on different hardware and contrast their results.

2.2 Performance Objectives on the Edge

In edge computing systems that involve embedded devices, performance considerations differ from those in data center environments as use cases typically vary [41]. Yet, to run FL workloads on embedded devices on the edge, we need to unite performance characteristics from data centers and edge computing.

Running FL workloads on the edge is all about minimizing the time we use a client's hardware and maximizing the throughput. Yet, the hardware is often located in remote areas with limited access to power or even on mobile devices with very restrictive battery management [34]. Also, in remote and mobile environments, network bandwidth utilization and total network traffic are critical. Both have a significant impact on communication latency, i.e., how fast we can move model weights between clients and a server. For foundation models, both can become a hurdle, as this kind of model tends to grow beyond several hundreds of millions of parameters in size or, in other words, beyond 1 GB in parameters to transfer over the network. Putting that into perspective with the average available wireless network bandwidth of 50 Mbit/s on mobile devices [40] yields communication times substantially longer than the actual computation time on clients [5].

2.3 Regulatory Requirements with Regard to Energy Efficiency

As we see regulatory frameworks on Artificial Intelligence emerge and be passed as laws, the first legislation to come into effect by 2024 is the EU AI Act [10]. Other countries have declared the EU AI Act as a lighthouse framework; they aim to align their individual frameworks with it [19]. A priority in the EU AI Act is energy efficiency [43]. The objective is to promote sustainable computing practices by holding service providers liable for monitoring energy consumption and subsequently fostering the energy efficiency of an FL system. As such, it is vital to understand where and how efficiency potentials can be lifted such that the practical applicability of FL is improved.

Algorithm 1: Federated Adam with decoupled weight de- cay (FedAdamW)
Given: set of clients $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$, server rounds $s \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999, \tau = 10^{-6}, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$
Initialize: server round $t \leftarrow 0$, initial parameters $x_{t=0} \in \mathbb{R}$, first momentum vector $m_{t=0} \leftarrow 0$, second momentum vector $v_{t=0} \leftarrow 0$, server learning rate $\eta_s \in \mathbb{R}$, client learning rate $\eta_c \in \mathbb{R}$
for t to s do
// server-side Sample subset $k \in K$ $x_i^t = x_t$ Distribute model weights to clients
// client-side (is identical with FedAvg)
$ \begin{array}{l} \textbf{for } i \in k \textit{ in parallel do} \\ & g_i^t \leftarrow \nabla F_i(x_i^t) \; / / \; \text{compute local gradient} \\ & x_i^{t+1} = x_i^t - \eta_c \cdot g_i^t \; / / \; \text{update client model} \\ & \text{ Send model update } x_i^{t+1} \; \text{to server} \\ & \textbf{end} \end{array} $
<pre>// server-side optimization</pre>
$x_{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{ k } \sum_{i}^{ k } x_i^{t+1}$ // FedAvg
$g_t \leftarrow x_t - x_{t+1} / /$ pseudo gradient
$m_{t+1} \leftarrow \beta_1 \cdot m_t + (1 - \beta_1) \cdot g_t //$ momentum
$v_{t+1} \leftarrow \beta_2 \cdot v_t + (1 - \beta_2) \cdot g_t^2 // \text{ velocity}$
// FedAdamW
$x_{t+1} \leftarrow x_t - \eta_s \cdot \lambda x_t //$ decoupled weight decay $\hat{m}_{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{m_{t+1}}{1 - \beta_1^t} //$ regularized momentum
$\hat{v}_{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{v_{t+1}}{1-\beta_2^t}$ // regularized velocity
$x_{t+1} \leftarrow x_{t+1} - \frac{\eta_s \cdot \hat{m}_{t+1}}{\sqrt{\hat{o}_{t+1} + \tau}}$
$ t \leftarrow t + 1 //$ update FL round
enu

Result: optimized parameters x_t

3 METHODOLOGY

Generally, when transferring LLM fine-tuning to the edge, we also transfer the challenges we currently have in data center environments into systems that suffer from more severe resource limitations. While energy efficiency is a specific challenge to edge computing systems, network bandwidth and computational efficiency are frequently discussed topics for DL applications in data centers. With our hardware-centric study, we aim to provide a comprehensive perspective on energy efficiency levers in FL systems on the edge to foster sustainable computing and, subsequently, legal compliance with the EU AI Act. To do so, we organize our methodology along the following four pillars to cover the end-to-end training pipeline.

3.1 Computational Efficiency

By studying the behavior of state-of-the-art FL clients when it comes to scaling on-device training with varying model sizes and minibatch sizes, we aim to understand how the training steps (forward, loss calculation, opt.step(), and backward) differ between data center resources and clients deployed on the network edge. Maximization of resource utilization is the superior objective for DL and FL applications in data center environments, as this is usually equivalent to a cost-optimal solution [14]. In the HPC domain, MFU is used to calculate the hardware resource utilization based on the number of theoretical hardware FLOP/s. By varying the minibatch size, the MFU can also be used to identify computational bottlenecks, i.e., whether we are computationally bound or memory bandwidth limited. In our experiments, the theoretical capacity of the NVIDIA A100 is 312 TFLOP (at FP32), while the Jetson AGX Orin 64 GB provides 42.5 TFLOP or 13% of the A100. As such, the MFU is well suited for in-depth analysis but requires full knowledge of client hardware specifications and the availability of performance metrics. However, in FL systems, clients are often heterogeneous regarding their hardware and considered ephemeral, i.e., they are likely to participate in training only once [32].

3.2 Energy Efficiency

With the imminent legal requirements to focus on energy efficiency, practical FL system design must include energy monitoring, regardless of whether FL clients are deployed in a data center or on the network edge. Yet, in edge computing, energy efficiency has been a priority for a long time [38, 47, 51]. A major benefit of clients on the network edge, such as NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin, is their hardware design since they are often created as a system-on-a-chip (SoC) and contain hardware-based power measurement units for each component (e.g., CPU, GPU). In contrast to MFU, which requires detailed hardware knowledge, energy metrics are likely to be readily available and easy to measure across all clients. We define energy efficiency as the tokens per second (TPS) throughput over the average power draw (W) for a workload,

$$\eta_e = \frac{\text{TPS}}{W}.$$
 (1)

3.3 Communication Efficiency

Communication is equally important for federated LLM fine-tuning as computational efficiency. Typically, full models or partial model weights are communicated between client and server [33]. Yet, communication on data center settings is built on top of highperformance networking infrastructure that enables bandwidths of 100 Gbit and more [2]. On the edge, we often find significantly slower network links with 1 Gbit and below. For instance, the global average for communication over 4G LTE wireless is 40 Mbit download and 15 Mbit upload [40]. We need a reliable metric to quantify communication efficiency that, at the same time, tells us whether it is useful to further scale a FL workload over more clients or not. Borrowing from the HPC domain, Granularity (*G*) measures the ratio between the time it takes to compute a DL task (T_{comp}) and to communicate the model gradients or weights (T_{comm}) [21]. It is defined as

$$G = \frac{T_{\rm comp}}{T_{\rm comm}}.$$
 (2)

In our FL scenario, the computation time is the maximum finetuning time on a client in each round, and the communication time is the time spent sending the model state, waiting, and receiving the aggregated model state from the server. In general, $G \gg 1$ indicates that adding one more client to a system has a positive effect on the total processing speed (higher throughput). $G \ll 1$ is an indicator for communication times significantly outweighing computation times and, therefore, no positive effect on system throughput. As such, we use *G* as the evaluation metric to evaluate the practical utility of federating an FL application.

In addition to scalability considerations, we evaluate communication costs when deploying FL applications to the network edge. To do so, we consider two scenarios. First, we look at a mobile edge computing scenario where clients are connected via an LTE wireless connection [1], which exhibits download and upload speeds of 40 and 10 Mbit, respectively [40]. Second, we consider a scenario where FL clients are operating at the network edge with a wired 1 Gbit connection that is often found in factory settings [26]. We use the *per-bit communication model* to estimate the total communication cost of our FL pipelines [43, 46, 23]. It is important to note that once wireless communication is involved, the energy consumption for communication and the exact parameterization of the per-bit communication model are available in Section A.

3.4 Model Performance

We use four widely used federated optimizers: (I) Federated Averaging (FedAvg) [33], (II) FedAvg with Momentum (FedAvgM) [29], (III) Federated Adam (FedAdam) [36], and (IV) we introduce FedAdam with decoupled weight decay (FedAdamW). The objective of each optimizer is to minimize the loss of a given neural network, typically done by stochastic gradient descent (SGD). All four optimizers share SGD as the optimization basis.

FedAvg is used to control the communication efficiency of an FL application as it allows training over multiple minibatches on a client before communicating a model update. With federated SGD, we would have to communicate after each minibatch [33]. However, as soon as we encounter high change rates in gradients, as is often the case when working with foundation models, we require adaptive control over the model learning rate [25]. FedAvgM introduces (first-order) momentum regularization to reduce the impact of early gradient and stabilize training. Yet, often, this is not enough, as reducing the momentum too much slows down model convergence towards the end of the training; subsequently increasing training costs [25]. For this, Reddi et al. [36] introduced FedAdam among other federated optimizers. Additionally to momentum, FedAdam uses velocity (second-order momentum) to further regularize gradients. Even though FedAdam may provide faster model convergence,



Figure 2: DL training step times across FLAN-T5 transformer models with varying minibatch sizes on the Samsum dataset running on the NVIDIA A100 and Jetson AGX Orin platform. Detailed metrics are available in Appendix Section C.

similar to its centralized counterpart Adam, it is challenged by a worse generalization over new data than SGD.

To tackle this challenge, we implement federated Adam with decoupled weight decay (FedAdamW) based on Loshchilov and Hutter [30] (Algorithm 1). A theoretical analysis for decoupling weight decay in adaptive optimization algorithms is provided by Jin et al. [24]. The objective is to use weight decay as an additional optimization technique to penalize large or vanishing gradients. To evaluate the effectiveness of each optimization technique, we study the validation loss and the Rouge-1 score. In natural language processing research, the Rouge-1 score evaluates unigram overlaps between a model-generated output and a reference text. Generally, a Rouge-1 score of 50 is considered a strong result. It is a derivative of the F1-Score known from classification tasks (as often encountered in computer vision research) [28].

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Our hardware-centric study for FL on the edge focuses on evaluating state-of-the-art DL workloads on embedded devices. As such, we focus on a state-of-the-art FM family.

Evaluation hardware. In our hardware-centered study, we focus on state-of-the-art deep learning accelerators for embedded and data center computing. We employ a cloud VM with a single NVIDIA A100 80 GB (SXM4) as a data center node (A100) to perform our local baseline experiments. Further, we use a dedicated cluster consisting of ten NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin 64 GB nodes (Orin) as the only state-of-the-art embedded computing platform that provides enough computational resources for training FMs. The Orins are connected with a 1 Gbit synchronous network link and are monitored with 2 Hz for their power metrics (Figure 3). For our FL experiments, we use a GPU-accelerated VM co-located with the Orins to handle the model aggregation and testing of the global model. For all of our experiments, we do not limit hardware capabilities.

DL models. For our experiments, we adopt the FLAN-T5 transformer model family [9] for conditional text generation. Even though the FLAN-T5 models' parameter sizes are small compared to other state-of-the-art FMs, they often provide the best-in-class



Figure 3: Our NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin 64GB Testbed. 10 devices with freely configurable network interconnect up to 10 Gbit. Active external cooling is a must at the given energy density of $10 \cdot 60W$ max. power draw.

performance [15]. We evaluate the computational training performance of the FLAN-T5-Small model with 80M parameters or 308 MB in size, the FLAN-T5-Base model with 250M parameters (990 MB), the FLAN-T5-Large model with 783M parameters (3.1 GB), and the FLAN-T5-XL model with 3B parameters (11.4 GB). For all models, we use their corresponding pre-trained tokenizers. For each model, we apply parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) in the form of Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), which is used to reduce the number of trainable parameters to < 1% of all model parameters [20]. We parameterize LoRA for the FLAN-T5 model family as follows: r = 16, $\alpha_l = 32$, dropout = 0.05. We do not fine-tune the LoRA bias.

Dataset. All the FLAN-T5 models are fine-tuned on the Samsum dataset with the objective of summarizing texts with a maximum token length of 512 elements [16]. The maximum model output length is 95 tokens, which can be translated into the summaries of the respective inputs. For our FL experiments, we choose to sample to the number of samples per client subset from a Dirichlet distribution as it is frequently used in related work [27, 17, 7].

FL setup. We use a Dirichlet $\alpha_d = 1$ to randomly split the Samsum dataset into 100 subsets that we distribute on the Orin compute cluster. We train all FLAN-T5 models until they overfit the Samsum

DEEM 24, June 9, 2024, Santiago, AA, Chile

Woisetschläger et al.



Figure 4: We study the model FLOP utilization (MFU) and the energy efficiency (η_e) of the FLAN-T5 transformer model family and find a strong correlation between the MFU and η_e , which is useful to evaluate root causes for poor training speeds in real-time.

dataset or have seen 60,000 samples. In each FL round, we let 10 physical clients participate, i.e., we have a participation rate of 10%. For each round, we perform 2 local training steps on each client before communicating with the server. The client-side optimizer is SGD with a learning rate of 1.0 and no momentum in all experiments. On the server side, we employ FedAvg, FedAvgM, FedAdam, and FedAdamW. The exact hyperparameters for the server-side optimizer can be drawn from Table 3 in Section B.

5 RESULTS

Our results are organized so that we first understand the computational limitations of what foundation model sizes can be deployed at the edge. We analyze to what point scaling primitives, as we know them from data center environments, hold true at the network edge. We then study computational bottlenecks and show the limitations of theoretical analysis. Next, we investigate the energy efficiency of training with varying minibatch sizes and point out how energy efficiency can be used to estimate the most energy-efficient on-device training configuration. We round off our systems analysis with a communication cost estimation. Lastly, we study the importance of decoupled weight decay when training state-of-the-art foundation models and quantify the cost savings.

5.1 Computational & Energy Efficiency

When designing FL systems, we have to anticipate what type of clients will be participating and how we can optimally use their training performance to receive a trained model in a timely manner. This is especially relevant for edge computing environments where client hardware is significantly distinct from data center hardware typically used to pre-train and prepare foundation models before using them in a federated setting [49, 3].

Increasing the minibatch size on embedded devices does not scale well. To understand local training performance in detail, we measure the timing using a microbenchmark (Figure 2). We find linearly growing opt.step() times for all models as we scale the minibatch size on the Orins, while the step times on the A100 platform scale logarithmically with increasing batch size (Figure 2). The same is true for the backward step.

The Orin platform is severely bottlenecked by memory bandwidth compared to the A100. To develop an understanding of what needs to be done to move from linear to logarithmically growing training times, we look at the MFU (Figure 4a). The MFU can explain whether training exhibits a computational or memory bottleneck on an FL client. Throughout all experiments, we find a stagnating MFU for the Orins as we scale the minibatch size, while on the A100 the MFU steadily grows. As such, on the embedded platform, we reach the maximum theoretical computational efficiency with a minibatch size of 64 for FLAN-T5 Small, 32 for FLAN-T5 Base, and 8 for FLAN-T5 Large. Overall, a stagnating MFU as minibatch sizes increase means that increased parallel computation potential does not result in additional used FLOPs. This can only happen if we encounter a memory bandwidth bottleneck. We see from Figure 2 that the Orin opt.step() function updating model weights and biases is taking up a significant amount of time in comparison to A100, which suggests that its performance is highly dependent on memory bandwidth.

With our proposed energy efficiency metric η_e , we enable realtime monitoring of computational efficiency on the clientlevel. We study η_e and MFU of the NVIDIA A100 and Jetson AGX Orin across the FLAN-T5 transformer family. For the FLAN-T5-Small model, as we scale the batch size, we notice an increasing η_e until a minibatch size of 8 (Figure 4b). Afterwards, η_e remains constant, i.e., scaling the minibatch size further does not yield any performance benefits. The A100, for the same set of experiments, consistently scales with increasing minibatch size. The evaluation of the MFU on the same set of experiments as for η_e unveils an identical trend (Figure 4a). The correlation between the MFU and η_e originates from both metrics being tied to power draw via FLOPs and Tokens per Second (TPS), respectively.

We reach the computational limits of state-of-the-art deep learning accelerators much earlier than theoretical analysis indicates. While the MFU suggests we should scale the minibatch size on the Orins up to 128 samples, we find that the actual memory bottlenecks appear at much smaller minibatch sizes already. When evaluating the energy efficiency during training, we found that we had already reached the highest efficiency on the Orins with a smaller minibatch size of 8 for all models compared to the A100. As such, we identified the practical computational limits of state-ofthe-art embedded devices for DL.

Federated Fine-Tuning of LLMs on the Very Edge: The Good, the Bad, the Ugly



Figure 5: We show the effectiveness of Federated AdamW by training the FLAN-T5 Model family in a federated setup with 100 clients (10 clients per round). We report the validation loss (left) and the Rouge-1 score (right) as performance indicators. Note: The loss spikes for FLAN-T5 Large originate from an increased sensitivity of LoRA adapters with a large parameter count to non-IID data [3].

5.2 Model Performance

Equally important to the hardware performance side is evaluating state-of-the-art FL optimizers on the algorithmic side, as this affects the energy efficiency of the entire FL system as well. We find adaptive optimization to be vital for FMs in FL applications.

Federating AdamW accelerates model convergence and saves cost and time compared to other widely-used FL optimizers. We compare four commonly used FL optimizers to find out about their training efficiency and convergence speed with stateof-the-art foundation models (Figure 5). While the FLAN-T5 model family exhibits a slow convergence speed with FedAvg that is approximately three orders of magnitude slower than FedAdam or FedAdamW, we find notable training progress with the adaptive optimizers after 135, 150, and 340 rounds for FLAN-T5 Small, Base, and Table 1: Communication cost analysis when training the FLAN-T5 model family in an FL system with FedAdamW until the minimal loss is achieved. $G \gg 1$ suggests that a model is well-suited for FL at scale. kWh denotes the power consumption incurred during communication per FL round based on the per-bit communication model.

			FLAN-T (845 FL 1	5 Small rounds)	FLAN-7 (856 FL :	5 Base rounds)	FLAN-T (2985 FL	5 Large rounds)
Training	Comm.	Device	G	kWh	G	kWh	G	kWh
Full Model	LTE	A100 Orin	0.01 0.03	0.81	0.00 0.01	2.60	0.0 0.0	8.22
i un wouer	1 Gbit	A100 Orin	14.90 32.90	0.13	4.64 10.23	0.40	1.47 3.24	1.27
DEPT	LTE	A100 Orin	1.70 3.70	0.01	0.65 1.44	0.02	0.25 0.54	0.05
r£f1	1 Gbit	A100 Orin	1690.90 3727.30	< 0.01	664.29 1464.29	< 0.01	244.74 539.47	0.01

Large, respectively. Also, for FLAN-T5 Base and Large, the achievable loss with FedAdamW is lower than with FedAdam before the model starts to overfit the Samsum dataset. As such, applying the state of the art for optimization in an FL application yields not only time and cost benefits but also improves model quality at the same time.

5.3 Communication Efficiency

As we have shown, the computational optimization potential on state-of-the-art embedded hardware is limited. As such, it is key to consider the cost of communication during FL training and study how well a model can scale under limited communication.

PEFT significantly improves the scalability of FL systems, regardless of whether bandwidth-limited wireless communication is involved. During our experiments, we find PEFT improves *G* by up to 110× as compared to full model training (Table 1). This originates from a compounding effect that is beneficial in FL setups. Not only does PEFT reduce the demand for computational resources (esp. GPU memory), but by reducing the number of trainable parameters to < 1% of the total parameter count, it also reduces communication by > 99%. Due to the relatively higher timeshare of computation compared to communication, this significantly increases *G*, indicating better scalability of an FL application regardless of the communication technology. At the same time and as expected, full model fine-tuning is only viable in environments that benefit from a high network bandwidth, often absent in FL.

6 RELATED WORK

We divide our related work section into two major streams of work. One is foundation model training with FL, and the other is energyaware or energy-efficient FL.

Foundation model training with FL. With FATE-LLM, Fan et al. [12] present an extension of the FATE FL framework to train foundation models, specifically large language models, in a federated setting. They introduce a broad range of foundation models and parameter-efficient training techniques with a brief evaluation of the communication benefits of parameter-efficient fine-tuning techniques by means of trainable parameters. Similarly, FedML [17] supports the training of foundation models in FL systems by providing

a wide range of models ready to use. At the same time, we see a wide variety of parameter-efficient FL methods emerge that tackle data heterogeneity and address resource limitations. SLoRA [3] presents a method to tackle the challenge of non-IID data by calibrating the LoRA parameterization in a warm-up phase over multiple rounds, achieving stronger model performance than LoRA without calibration. FwdLLM [44] enables backpropagation-free fine-tuning of foundation models with a special focus on reducing the memory footprint, enabling the training of models on resource-constrained clients.

Energy-aware and energy-efficient FL. Energy-aware FL system design has been discussed extensively, especially in the space of edge computing applications [38, 51, 47, 45, 42]. The objective is to reduce the communication cost to a minimum while not compromising model quality. Yet, most works neglect the full cost of communication as it was introduced by the per-bit communication model [23]. Yousefpour et al. [46] provide a holistic viewpoint on energy consumption of a wide range of Fl system configurations. Especially, asynchronous FL, which accelerates the training process based on increased training parallelism, incurs a significantly higher energy footprint than round-based FL.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no overlap between federated foundation model training and energy-aware FL yet. Our paper creates this link by evaluating state-of-the-art hardware for its capabilities to serve FL workloads involving foundation models and discusses what can be done to improve the overall energy efficiency of an FL system. Our evaluation underpins the importance of developing parameter-efficient training techniques for FL, not only to mitigate data heterogeneity effects but also to reduce energy consumption and improve computational efficiency.

7 DISCUSSION

With formal regulations for AI applications on the horizon, energy monitoring and building energy-efficient FL systems will soon become a necessity to comply with standards for modern AI systems and subsequently build trust with end users. Therefore, it is key to understand the benefits of FL when working with foundation models (the good), the open challenges (the bad), and what indirect effects FL has (the ugly).

The Good. By design, FL enables data parallel training of a shared model across geo-distributed clients. A major benefit is the access to a much broader range of data as compared to centralized learning where training data is challenging to acquire. At the same time, the privacy-preserving design of FL also supports building the trust of end users in FL applications since clients must not share their raw data. Overall, this helps improve the quality of foundation models on downstream tasks and lower the data bias as we continuously train over an evolving client basis.

The Bad. We do find state-of-the-art embedded devices for deep learning applications to be bottlenecked, which limits the applicability of optimization techniques that we know from deep learning in high-performance computing environments, especially as in data centers, the memory bandwidth of GPUs has increased significantly (e.g., with the NVIDIA H100). However, as we show in the introduction, the trend of increasing memory bandwidth has also started for embedded devices. Nonetheless, we can develop targeted optimizations for FL workloads on embedded devices such as the Orins by profiling what GPU kernels are responsible for the on-client memory bottleneck. Also, promising techniques such as 1.58-bit training of foundation models are capable of reducing the need for high memory bandwidth significantly [31]. Furthermore, recent research has shown that LoRA is more sensitive towards a non-IID data distribution, but adaptive methods for configuring LoRA are a promising direction to mitigate this challenge [3].

The Ugly. We show in our study that even though we apply PEFT for all FLAN-T5 models, the energy consumption incurred during training and attributable to communication is still significant. To put the energy consumption into perspective: Fine-tuning FLAN-T5 Large over the Samsum dataset is possible on a single GPU or even on a single Orin, neglecting the benefit of broader data access, which FL provides. With our configuration (Table 3), training on an A100 takes approximately 3.33 hours or 1.3 kWh of power, and on an Orin, it takes approximately 8.33 hours or 0.5 kWh. As such, fine-tuning FLAN-T5 Large consumes more energy for communicating model updates than for the computations. This points out the need for future research on even more communication-efficient FL methods than we currently have available. A promising step is gradient projection based on probability-differentiated seeds [35].

8 CONCLUSIONS

In our work, we conduct an end-to-end study for FL workloads focusing on energy consumption involving three foundation models. We point out the hardware limits of state-of-the-art embedded hardware for deep learning and put the performance into perspective with modern data center hardware to discover distinct performance characteristics. We further introduce η_e , the real-time metric to evaluate computational bottlenecks, as a drop-in replacement for MFU and show significant potential for on-client optimizations. Additionally, we show the effectiveness of η_e as a proxy for MFU.

To understand the impact FL optimizers have on overall energy consumption, we study three widely used FL optimizers and compare them with FedAdamW, which not only improves model convergence speed but also achieves higher model quality. Based on the FedAdamW experiments, we quantified the trade-off between communication and computation in FL systems with granularity.

This underpins the relevance of parameter-efficient training techniques to improve communication efficiency in FL systems and render foundation model training practical. In the course of our communication analysis, we also quantify the end-to-end energy consumption for communication in our FL experiments, showing that communication is orders of magnitude more energy-intensive than computation for an FL application. Putting the current state of FL research into context with emerging AI regulation, we find significant benefits of FL over centralized learning when it comes to data lineage and the potential for data bias mitigation but we have to pick up on research for energy-efficient FL system designs.

To conclude, we demonstrate the feasibility of fine-tuning foundation models in FL systems but we also hope to raise awareness of the substantial challenges that need to be overcome to enable foundation model training on a broad basis for systems suffering from limited computational and network resources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is partially funded by the Bavarian Ministry of Economic Affairs, Regional Development and Energy (Grant: DIK0446/01), the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (Grant: 16KN085729), and the German Research Foundation (DFG, Grant: 392214008).

REFERENCES

- GPP. 4g (lte advanced). https://portal.3gpp.org/desktopmodules/ Specifications/SpecificationDetails.aspx?specificationId=2585, 2008.
- [2] Amazon Web Services (AWS). Amazon AWS p3 instance types. https: //aws.amazon.com/ec2/instance-types/p3/, 2023. Accessed: 2023-09-27.
- [3] Sara Babakniya, Ahmed Elkordy, et al. SLoRA: Federated parameter efficient fine-tuning of language models. In *International Workshop* on Federated Learning in the Age of Foundation Models in Conjunction with NeurIPS 2023, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id= 06quMTmtRV.
- [4] Sebastian Baunsgaard, Matthias Boehm, and et al. Exdra: Exploratory data science on federated raw data. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*, SIGMOD/PODS '21. ACM, June 2021. doi: 10.1145/3448016.3457549. URL http://dx.doi.org/10. 1145/3448016.3457549.
- [5] Daniel J. Beutel, Taner Topal, Akhil Mathur, Xinchi Qiu, Javier Fernandez-Marques, Yan Gao, Lorenzo Sani, Kwing Hei Li, Titouan Parcollet, Pedro Porto Buarque de Gusmão, and Nicholas D. Lane. Flower: A friendly federated learning research framework, 2020. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.14390.
- [6] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. ArXiv, 2021. URL https://crfm.stanford. edu/assets/report.pdf.
- [7] Sebastian Caldas, Peter Wu, Tian Li, Jakub Konecný, H. Brendan McMahan, Virginia Smith, and Ameet Talwalkar. Leaf: A benchmark for federated settings. *CoRR*, abs/1812.01097, 2018. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.01097.
- [8] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, et al. Palm: scaling language modeling with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24(1), mar 2024. ISSN 1532-4435.
- [9] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2210.11416. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11416.
- [10] Council of the European Union. Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL - LAYING DOWN HARMONISED RULES ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AR-TIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACT) AND AMENDING CERTAIN UNION LEGISLATIVE ACTS, apr 2021. URL https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206. Document 52021PC0206.
- [11] Radosvet Desislavov, Fernando Martínez-Plumed, and José Hernández-Orallo. Trends in ai inference energy consumption: Beyond the performance-vs-parameter laws of deep learning. *Sustainable Computing: Informatics and Systems*, 38:100857, 2023. ISSN 2210-5379. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.suscom.2023.100857. URL https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210537923000124.
- [12] Tao Fan, Yan Kang, Guoqiang Ma, Weijing Chen, Wenbin Wei, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. Fate-llm: A industrial grade federated learning framework for large language models, 2023. URL https://arxiv.org/ abs/2310.10049.
- [13] Jie Feng, Lei Liu, Qingqi Pei, and Keqin Li. Min-max cost optimization for efficient hierarchical federated learning in wireless edge networks. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 33(11):2687–2700, 2021.

- [14] Nathan C. Frey, Baolin Li, Joseph McDonald, Dan Zhao, Michael Jones, David Bestor, Devesh Tiwari, Vijay Gadepally, and Siddharth Samsi. Benchmarking resource usage for efficient distributed deep learning. In 2022 IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (HPEC), pages 1–8, 2022. doi: 10.1109/HPEC55821.2022.9926375.
- [15] Xue-Yong Fu, Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, et al. Tiny titans: Can smaller large language models punch above their weight in the real world for meeting summarization?, 2024. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/ 2402.00841.
- [16] Bogdan Gliwa, Iwona Mochol, Maciej Biesek, and Aleksander Wawer. SAMSum corpus: A human-annotated dialogue dataset for abstractive summarization. In Lu Wang, Jackie Chi Kit Cheung, Giuseppe Carenini, and Fei Liu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on New Frontiers in Summarization*, pages 70–79, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-5409. URL https://aclanthology.org/D19-5409.
- [17] Chaoyang He, Songze Li, et al. Fedml: A research library and benchmark for federated machine learning, 2020. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/ 2007.13518.
- [18] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, et al. An empirical analysis of compute-optimal large language model training. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL https://openreview. net/forum?id=iBBcRUIOAPR.
- [19] House Of Commons of Canada. An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act, the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, 6 2022. URL https: //www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/44-1/bill/C-27/first-reading.
- [20] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, et al. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZeVKeeFYf9.
- [21] Kai Hwang. Advanced Computer Architecture: Parallelism,Scalability,Programmability. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 1st edition, 1992. ISBN 0070316228.
- [22] Andrei Ivanov, Nikoli Dryden, Tal Ben-Nun, Shigang Li, and Torsten Hoefler. Data movement is all you need: A case study on optimizing transformers. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 3:711–732, 2021.
- [23] Fatemeh Jalali, Rob Ayre, Arun Vishwanath, Kerry Hinton, Tansu Alpcan, and Rod Tucker. Energy consumption of content distribution from nano data centers versus centralized data centers. ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review, 42(3):49–54, December 2014. ISSN 0163-5999. doi: 10.1145/2695533.2695555. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2695533.2695555.
- [24] Jiayin Jin, Jiaxiang Ren, Yang Zhou, Lingjuan Lyu, Ji Liu, and Dejing Dou. Accelerated federated learning with decoupled adaptive optimization. 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2207.07223. URL https: //arxiv.org/abs/2207.07223.
- [25] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings, 2015. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980.
- [26] Kacper Kubiak, Grzegorz Dec, and Dorota Stadnicka. Possible applications of edge computing in the manufacturing industry—systematic literature review. *Sensors*, 22(7):2445, March 2022. ISSN 1424-8220. doi: 10.3390/s22072445. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/s22072445.
- [27] Fan Lai, Yinwei Dai, Sanjay S. Singapuram, Jiachen Liu, Xiangfeng Zhu, Harsha V. Madhyastha, and Mosharaf Chowdhury. FedScale: Benchmarking model and system performance of federated learning at scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2022.

- [28] Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain, July 2004. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013.
- [29] Wei Liu, Li Chen, et al. Accelerating federated learning via momentum gradient descent. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 31(8):1754–1766, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TPDS.2020.2975189.
- [30] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7.
- [31] Shuming Ma, Hongyu Wang, Lingxiao Ma, Lei Wang, Wenhui Wang, Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Ruiping Wang, Jilong Xue, and Furu Wei. The era of 1-bit llms: All large language models are in 1.58 bits, 2024. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17764.
- [32] Grigory Malinovsky, Samuel Horváth, Konstantin Pavlovich Burlachenko, and Peter Richtárik. Federated learning with regularized client participation. In Federated Learning and Analytics in Practice: Algorithms, Systems, Applications, and Opportunities, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=6CDBpf7kNG.
- [33] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, et al. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data. In Aarti Singh and Jerry Zhu, editors, Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, volume 54 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 20–22 Apr 2017. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/mcmahan17a.html.
- [34] Samuel S. Ogden and Tian Guo. MODI: Mobile deep inference made efficient by edge computing. In USENIX Workshop on Hot Topics in Edge Computing (HotEdge 18), Boston, MA, July 2018. USENIX Association. URL https://www.usenix.org/conference/hotedge18/ presentation/ogden.
- [35] Zhen Qin, Daoyuan Chen, et al. Federated full-parameter tuning of billion-sized language models with communication cost under 18 kilobytes, 2023. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06353.
- [36] Sashank J. Reddi, Zachary Charles, et al. Adaptive federated optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=LkFG3lB13U5.
- [37] Jie Ren, Samyam Rajbhandari, et al. Zero-offload: Democratizing billion-scale model training. In 2021 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 21), pages 551–564, 2021.
- [38] Swapnil Sadashiv Shinde, Arash Bozorgchenani, Daniele Tarchi, and Qiang Ni. On the design of federated learning in latency and energy constrained computation offloading operations in vehicular edge computing systems. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 71(2): 2041–2057, 2021.
- [39] Yuanyishu Tian, Yao Wan, Lingjuan Lyu, Dezhong Yao, Hai Jin, and Lichao Sun. FedBERT: When federated learning meets pre-training. ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, 13(4):1–26, August 2022. doi: 10.1145/3510033. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/3510033.

- [40] Martino Trevisan, Ali Safari Khatouni, and Danilo Giordano. Errant: Realistic emulation of radio access networks. *Computer Networks*, 176: 107289, July 2020. ISSN 1389-1286. doi: 10.1016/j.comnet.2020.107289. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2020.107289.
- [41] Blesson Varghese, Nan Wang, David Bermbach, Cheol-Ho Hong, Eyal De Lara, Weisong Shi, and Christopher Stewart. A survey on edge performance benchmarking. ACM Comput. Surv., 54(3), apr 2021. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3444692. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/3444692.
- [42] Xiaofei Wang, Yiwen Han, Chenyang Wang, Qiyang Zhao, Xu Chen, and Min Chen. In-edge ai: Intelligentizing mobile edge computing, caching and communication by federated learning. *Ieee Network*, 33 (5):156–165, 2019.
- [43] Herbert Woisetschläger, Alexander Erben, Bill Marino, Shiqiang Wang, Nicholas D. Lane, Ruben Mayer, and Hans-Arno Jacobsen. Federated learning priorities under the european union artificial intelligence act, 2024. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05968.
- [44] Mengwei Xu, Dongqi Cai, Yaozong Wu, Xiang Li, and Shangguang Wang. Fwdllm: Efficient fedllm using forward gradient, 2023. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.13894.
- [45] Yunfan Ye, Shen Li, Fang Liu, Yonghao Tang, and Wanting Hu. Edgefed: Optimized federated learning based on edge computing. *IEEE Access*, 8:209191–209198, 2020. ISSN 2169-3536. doi: 10.1109/access.2020. 3038287. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3038287.
- [46] Ashkan Yousefpour, Shen Guo, Ashish Shenoy, Sayan Ghosh, Pierre Stock, Kiwan Maeng, Schalk-Willem Krüger, Michael Rabbat, Carole-Jean Wu, and Ilya Mironov. Green federated learning, 2023. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.14604.
- [47] Rong Yu and Peichun Li. Toward resource-efficient federated learning in mobile edge computing. *IEEE Network*, 35(1):148–155, 2021.
- [48] Jianyi Zhang, Saeed Vahidian, Martin Kuo, Chunyuan Li, Ruiyi Zhang, Tong Yu, Guoyin Wang, and Yiran Chen. Towards building the federatedGPT: Federated instruction tuning. In International Workshop on Federated Learning in the Age of Foundation Models in Conjunction with NeurIPS 2023, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=TaDiklyVps.
- [49] Zhuo Zhang, Yuanhang Yang, Yong Dai, Qifan Wang, Yue Yu, Lizhen Qu, and Zenglin Xu. FedPETuning: When federated learning meets the parameter-efficient tuning methods of pre-trained language models. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 9963–9977, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.632. URL https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.632.
- [50] Yanli Zhao, Andrew Gu, et al. Pytorch fsdp: Experiences on scaling fully sharded data parallel. Proc. VLDB Endow., 16(12):3848–3860, aug 2023. ISSN 2150-8097. doi: 10.14778/3611540.3611569. URL https: //doi.org/10.14778/3611540.3611569.
- [51] Jingjing Zheng, Kai Li, Eduardo Tovar, and Mohsen Guizani. Federated learning for energy-balanced client selection in mobile edge computing. In 2021 International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing (IWCMC), pages 1942–1947. IEEE, 2021.

APPENDIX

Our appendix is organized along the main paper structure. We provide additional details for our methodology, experimental setup, and experiment results.

Appendix A METHODOLOGY

Communication efficiency. We use to per-bit communication model proposed by Jalali et al. [23] to estimate the total communication cost of our FL experiments. In the following, we provide a detailed explanation of calculating the cost for an FL experiment with the per-bit communication cost model.

$$P_{t} = E_{t} \cdot \mathcal{B} = (n_{as} \cdot E_{as} + n_{LTEE} \cdot E_{LTEE} + n_{LTEB} \cdot E_{LTEB} + E_{bng} + n_{e} \cdot E_{e} + n_{c} \cdot E_{c} + n_{d} \cdot E_{d}) \cdot \mathcal{B}.$$
(2)

 $P_{\rm t}$ is the total power draw for a single transmission. $E_{\rm as}$, $E_{\rm LTEE}$, $E_{\rm LTEB}$, $E_{\rm bng}$, E_e , E_c , E_d denote the per-bit energy consumption of edge one or more ethernet switches $n_{\rm as}$, one or 0 client-side LTE endpoint $n_{\rm LTEE}$, one or 0 LTE base stations $n_{\rm LTEB}$, the broadband network gateway (BNG), one or more edge routers n_e , one or more core routers n_c , and one or more data center Ethernet switches n_d , respectively. We adopt the energy consumption of networking devices as specified in Jalali et al. [23] and assume $n_{\rm as} = 1$, $n_{\rm bng} = 1$, $n_e = 3$. $n_c = 4$, and $n_d = 2$. For calculation involving wireless communication, we assume $n_{\rm LTEE} = 1$ and $n_{\rm LTEB} = 1$, 0 otherwise. \mathbb{B} is the number of trainable model parameters multiplied by the parameter precision (32 bits in our case).

 Table 2: Energy efficiency is measured in $\frac{TPS}{W}$.

 FLAN-T5 Model
 Minib. Size
 Device
 Avg. Power Draw (W)
 η_e TPS

 Small
 1
 A100
 75.8
 21.16
 1603.62

 AGX Orin
 16.7
 55.26
 923.04

Sman	1	A100	/3.0	21.10	1005.02
		AGX Orin	16.7	55.26	923.04
	8	A100	103.17	121.63	12548.15
		AGX Orin	28.1	200.75	5641.15
	16	A100	120.96	215.03	26010.34
		AGX Orin	35.8	198.32	7099.35
	32	A100	171.15	258.52	44246.31
		AGX Orin	38.84	196.53	7633.56
	64	A100	212.53	304.82	64782.11
		AGX Orin	38.82	203.57	7903.25
	128	A100	247.72	327.2	81055.16
		AGX Orin	41.08	195.73	8040.93
Base	1	A100	85.63	13.0	1113.37
		AGX Orin	24.86	25.23	627.45
	8	A100	135.57	63.77	8645.35
		AGX Orin	31.3	74.21	2322.81
	16	A100	159.09	94.55	15041.23
		AGX Orin	38.59	66.51	2566.63
	32	A100	223.55	99.28	22194.39
		AGX Orin	38.54	69.84	2691.45
	64	A100	260.68	100.08	26088.77
		AGX Orin	Out of memory		
Large	1	A100	91.61	6.06	554.97
		AGX Orin	26.1	11.24	293.38
	8	A100	173.43	24.24	4204.11
		AGX Orin	41.46	20.36	844.18
	16	A100	196.9	33.76	6647.37
		AGX Orin	Out of memory		
XL	1	A100	128.21	4.31	552.0
		AGX Orin	Out of memory		

Appendix B EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Evaluation hardware. We feel it is important to provide an estimate for establishing a research cluster with NVIDIA Jetson Orin 64 GB devices. We purchased the devices in mid-2023 at a unit price tag of roughly EUR 2,400, totaling EUR 24,000 just in compute. Additionally, we equipped each Orin with a Samsung 980 Pro 1 TB NVMe SSD, which cost us a total of EUR 700. The necessary networking infrastructure (FS S5860-48XMG-U + cables) with a 10 Gbit/s uplink for each device had a price tag of EUR 4,900. The enclosure is custom-made from sheet metal and aluminum to fit a standard 19-inch rack. The material for the case was around EUR 150 + 5 hours for assembly. In total, our embedded computing cluster cost us just shy of EUR 30,000. We are happy to share CAD designs and a full part list with anyone interested.

DL models. We use the pre-trained FLAN-T5 models provided by Google via the HuggingFace hub. For each model, we ran a hyperparameter search in a centralized experiment on a single node. In our experiments, we chose the optimal hyperparameter configuration as depicted in table 3. Our search space is as follows. The learning rate was selected from a set of values [0.1, 0.001, 0.0006, 0.0005, 0.0003, 0.0001, 0.00001]. Similarly, we selected the weight decay from the following set [0.1, 0.003, 0.001, 0.0009, 0.0001]. The momentum and β_1 were selected from the set [0.85, 0.9, 0.95]. β_2 was selected from the set [0.99, 0.995, 0.999, 0.9999].

Dataset. We randomly sample the Samsum dataset by using a Dirichlet distribution ($\alpha = 1.0$) for 100 clients in our experiments. The number of samples per client is depicted in Figure 6.

FL setup In Table 3, we provide the full set of hyperparameters used in our experiments. For our main paper, we limit the number of samples each model sees to 60,000. In addition, we performed additional experiments to identify the point of overfitting for each FL optimizer that would allow a model to converge. We chose to validate the global model every 200 FL rounds.

Appendix C RESULTS

This appendix section contains additional results on the energy efficiency measurements and micro-benchmark timings.

C.1 Energy efficiency

Energy efficiency is derived from the average power draw of each device during our experiments. The experiments are fixed to 100 steps per epoch for each experiment. Table 2 contains details on our energy efficiency calculations.

C.2 Model FLOP Utilization

MFU helps to identify computational or memory bottlenecks. Table 5 depicts all details required to calculate the MFU.

C.3 Micro-benchmark

Table 4 describes the step timings in detail and provides a perspective on the speed differences between the data center and embedded hardware.

Model		:	Small				Base			1	Large	
Optimizer	FedAvg	FedAvgM	FedAdam	FedAdamW	FedAvg	FedAvgM	FedAdam	FedAdamW	FedAvg	FedAvgM	FedAdam	FedAdamW
Mini-Batch Size			30				20				10	
Learning Rate	0.01	0.1	0.0005	0.0005	0.001	0.1	0.0005	0.0005	0.01	0.1	0.0005	0.0005
Weight Decay	0.001	0.001	-	0.001	0.001	0.001	-	0.001	0.001	0.001	-	0.001
Momentum	0.0	0.9	-	-	0.0	0.9	-	-	0.0	0.9	-	-
β_1	-	-	0.9	0.9	-	-	0.9	0.9	-	-	0.9	0.9
β_2	-	-	0.999	0.999	-	-	0.999	0.999	-	-	0.999	0.999
Training rounds			1000				1500				1500	
Clients p. Round							10					





Figure 6: Dataset samples per client

Table 5: Details on MFU calculation for the NVIDIA A100and Jetson AGX Orin platforms.

Table 4: Results of the micro-benchmark of the FLAN-T5
ransformer model family on the NVIDIA A100 and Jetson
AGX Orin platforms. The sequence length per batch item is
512.

FLAN-T5 Model	Minib. Size	Device	TPS	Params	# Layers	d_{model}	$d_{\rm ff}$	$n_{\rm attheads}$	Seq. Len.	MFU
Small	1	A100	1657.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	0.3
		Orin AGX	927.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	1.1
	~	A100	13051.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	2.0
		Orin AGX	5665.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	6.5
	16	A100	26741.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	4.2
		Orin AGX	7112.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	8.1
	32	A100	45428.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	7.1
		Orin AGX	7713.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	8.8
	64	A100	65944.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	10.24.0	8.0	512.0	10.3
		Orin AGX	8040.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	9.2
	128	A100	82045.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	12.8
		Orin AGX	8094.0	0.0	8.0	512.0	1024.0	8.0	512.0	9.3
Base	-	A100	1134.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	2048.0	12.0	512.0	0.6
		Orin AGX	631.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	20.48.0	12.0	512.0	2.3
	80	A100	8805.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	2048.0	12.0	512.0	4.4
		Orin AGX	2339.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	20.48.0	12.0	512.0	8.5
	16	A100	15380.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	2048.0	12.0	512.0	7.6
		Orin AGX	2591.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	2048.0	12.0	512.0	9.4
	32	A100	22427.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	2048.0	12.0	512.0	11.1
		Orin AGX	2692.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	20.48.0	12.0	512.0	9.8
	64	A100	26250.0	0.0	12.0	768.0	2048.0	12.0	512.0	13.0
		AGX Orin	Out of memory							
Large	-	A100	562.0	0.0	24.0	1024.0	2816.0	16.0	512.0	0.9
		Orin AGX	298.0	0.0	24.0	1024.0	2816.0	16.0	512.0	3.4
	*	A100	4260.0	0.0	24.0	1024.0	2816.0	16.0	512.0	9.6
		Orin AGX	853.0	0.0	24.0	1024.0	2816.0	16.0	512.0	6.7
	16	A100	6728.0	0.0	24.0	1024.0	2816.0	16.0	512.0	10.5
		AGX Orin	Out of memory							
XL	1	A100	560.0	0.0	24.0	2048.0	5120.0	32.0	512.0	3.1
		AGX Orin	Out of memory							

FLAN-T5 Model	Batch Size	Device	Backward	Opt. Step	Loss Calc.	Forward	Batch Loading	IPS	Total Time
Small	1	A100	0.09	0.16	0.0	0.06	0.01	1657.87	0.32
		AGX Orin	0.15	0.3	0.0	0.09	0.01	927.51	0.55
	8	A100	0.09	0.16	0.0	0.06	0.01	13051.3	0.33
		AGX Orin	0.22	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.01	5665.54	0.73
	16	A100	0.09	0.16	0.0	0.06	0.01	26741.79	0.31
		AGX Orin	0.36	0.63	0.0	0.15	0.01	7112.45	1.15
	32	A100	0.12	0.18	0.0	0.06	0.01	45428.27	0.37
		AGX Orin	0.66	1.16	0.0	0.32	0.01	7713.02	2.15
	64	A100	0.17	0.26	0.0	0.06	0.01	65944.32	0.51
		AGX Orin	1.28	2.22	0.0	0.64	0.01	7992.08	4.15
	128	A100	0.28	0.46	0.0	0.06	0.02	82045.0	0.81
		AGX Orin	2.6	4.34	0.0	1.21	0.01	8046.96	8.15
Base		A100	0.14	0.23	0.0	0.08	0.01	1134.51	0.46
		AGX Orin	0.22	0.45	0.0	0.14	0.01	631.08	0.82
	80	A100	0.14	0.23	0.0	0.09	0.01	8805.38	0.47
		AGX Orin	0.51	0.95	0.0	0.3	0.01	2339.49	1.76
	16	A100	0.17	0.27	0.0	0.09	0.02	15380.06	0.54
		AGX Orin	0.93	1.69	0.0	0.57	0.01	2590.44	3.19
	32	A100	0.24	0.38	0.0	0.1	0.01	22427.21	0.74
		AGX Orin	1.81	3.19	0.0	1.09	0.01	2692.26	6.09
	64	A100	0.4	0.65	0.0	0.19	0.01	26250.25	1.26
		AGX Orin	Out of memory						
Large	1	A100	0.27	0.46	0.0	0.18	0.02	562.2	0.92
		AGX Orin	0.43	1.03	0.0	0.27	0.01	298.91	1.75
	∞	A100	0.29	0.49	0.0	0.18	0.02	4260.38	0.97
		AGX Orin	1.31	2.62	0.0	0.92	0.01	850.43	4.85
	16	A100	0.4	0.62	0.0	0.2	0.02	67.28.79	1.23
		AGX Orin	Out of memory						
XL	1	A100	0.27	0.48	0.0	0.17	0.02	560.07	0.93
		AGX Orin	Out of memory						