

# Training Heterogeneous Client Models using Knowledge Distillation in Serverless Federated Learning

Mohak Chadha<sup>1</sup>, Pulkit Khera<sup>1</sup>, Jianfeng Gu<sup>1</sup>, Osama Abboud<sup>2</sup>, Michael Gerndt<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>{firstname.lastname}@tum.de, Technische Universität München, Germany  
<sup>2</sup>{firstname.lastname}@huawei.com, Huawei Technologies, Germany

## ABSTRACT

Federated Learning (FL) is an emerging machine learning paradigm that enables the collaborative training of a shared global model across distributed clients while keeping the data decentralized. Recent works on designing systems for efficient FL have shown that utilizing serverless computing technologies, particularly Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) for FL, can enhance resource efficiency, reduce training costs, and alleviate the complex infrastructure management burden on data holders. However, existing serverless FL systems implicitly assume a uniform global model architecture across all participating clients during training. This assumption fails to address fundamental challenges in practical FL due to the resource and statistical data heterogeneity among FL clients. To address these challenges and enable heterogeneous client models in serverless FL, we utilize Knowledge Distillation (KD) in this paper. Towards this, we propose novel optimized serverless workflows for two popular conventional federated KD techniques, i.e., FedMD and FedDF. We implement these workflows by introducing several extensions to an open-source serverless FL system called *FedLess*. Moreover, we comprehensively evaluate the two strategies on multiple datasets across varying levels of client data heterogeneity using heterogeneous client models with respect to accuracy, fine-grained training times, and costs. Results from our experiments demonstrate that serverless FedDF is more robust to extreme non-IID data distributions, is faster, and leads to lower costs than serverless FedMD. In addition, compared to the original implementation, our optimizations for particular steps in FedMD and FedDF lead to an average speedup of 3.5x and 1.76x across all datasets.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computer systems organization** → **Cloud computing**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Distributed artificial intelligence**.

## KEYWORDS

Federated Learning, Serverless Computing, FaaS, Deep Learning, Scalability of learning algorithms, Knowledge Distillation

## ACM Reference Format:

Mohak Chadha<sup>1</sup>, Pulkit Khera<sup>1</sup>, Jianfeng Gu<sup>1</sup>, Osama Abboud<sup>2</sup>, Michael Gerndt<sup>1</sup>. 2024. Training Heterogeneous Client Models using Knowledge

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](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

SAC '24, April 8–12, 2024, Avila, Spain

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0243-3/24/04...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636015>

Distillation in Serverless Federated Learning. In *The 39th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC '24)*, April 8–12, 2024, Avila, Spain. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636015>


## 1 INTRODUCTION

Increasing concerns about data privacy and recent legislations such as the Consumer Privacy Bill of Rights in the U.S. [15] prevent the training of ML models using the traditional centralized learning approach [34]. With the goal of not exposing raw data as in centralized learning, an emerging distributed training paradigm called Federated Learning (FL) [39] has gained significant popularity in various application domains, such as banking [38] and mobile services [23].

FL enables the collaborative training of a shared global ML model across remote devices or clients while keeping the training data decentralized. The traditional FL training process [39] is *synchronous* and occurs in multiple rounds. A main component called the central server organizes the training process and decides which clients contribute in a new round. During each round, clients improve the shared global model by optimizing it on their local datasets and sending back only the updated model parameters to the central server. Following this, the local model updates from all participating clients are collected and aggregated to form the updated consensus model. Recent works on designing systems for efficient FL have shown that both components in an FL system, i.e., the clients and the central server, can immensely benefit from an emerging cloud computing paradigm called *serverless computing* [8, 13, 17, 24–26, 32].

Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) is the computational concept of serverless computing and has gained significant popularity and widespread adoption in various application domains such as machine learning [8, 13, 17, 18], edge computing [44], heterogeneous computing [27–30], and scientific computing [9, 31]. In FaaS, developers implement fine-grained pieces of code called *functions* that are packaged independently in containers and uploaded to a FaaS platform. These functions are *ephemeral*, i.e., short-lived, and *event-driven*, i.e., these functions only get executed in response to external triggers such as HTTP requests. Moreover, these functions are *stateless*, i.e., any application state needs to be persisted in external storage. Several open-source and commercial FaaS platforms, such as OpenFaaS [43] and Google Cloud Functions (GCF) [16], are currently available. In serverless FL, clients are independent functions deployed onto a FaaS platform and capable of performing their model updates.

Most standard stateful FL systems [4, 33] and all current serverless FL systems implicitly assume that all FL clients must have a uniform ML model architecture to train a global consensus model. However, a practical FL system is affected by different fundamental




**Figure 1: Global model accuracy across different model architectures on the CIFAR-10 dataset with FedAvg [39] for both IID and non-IID data distributions. The models are trained with FedLess [17] for 100 clients.**

client-level challenges that are difficult to address with this assumption. These include computational heterogeneity and statistical data heterogeneity. FL clients in the wild [23] can vary from small edge devices to high-performant GPU-enabled systems with varying memory, compute, and storage capacities. Therefore, it is not always feasible for each participating client to agree on a single global model architecture. Opting for a simple architecture may restrict the capacity of the collaboratively trained global model, whereas selecting a large and complex model architecture can substantially increase the duration required for FL training [13]. In addition, clients in practical FL systems have *unbalanced non-IID* data distributions, i.e., the private data samples held by individual clients exhibit variations in their statistical properties, such as feature distributions, class imbalances, or data biases [20]. As a result, in extreme non-IID scenarios, the uniform global model may lead to poor generalization performance following the model aggregation process due to high variance among the trained client models. Figure 1 shows the impact of non-IID data distribution among FL clients on the accuracy of the trained global model on the CIFAR-10 dataset. Across all model architectures, we observe a 27.1% average decrease in the accuracy of the trained global model with FedAvg [39]. To this end, each FL client needs to have the flexibility to choose their own model architecture personalized to their private data distribution while simultaneously benefiting from other collaborating clients.

To address these challenges in practical FL systems, we utilize Knowledge Distillation (KD) [19] in this paper. KD is a popular technique used in ML that facilitates the transfer of knowledge from a large and complex model, known as the *teacher model*, to a smaller and more efficient model, referred to as the *student model*. KD enables heterogeneous client models in FL since knowledge transfer is achieved by distilling model prediction probabilities or logits instead of directly exchanging model parameters between the student and teacher models. In addition, KD supports a high level of flexibility in the choice of client model architectures in contrast to other approaches like parameter decoupling [3] that tolerate flexibility in only particular layers of the overall model architecture.

Most KD strategies in FL, such as FedMD [35] and MHAT [22], typically involve a series of steps, such as private training, prediction on public datasets, and aligning the local client models to the obtained logits. However, the synchronous nature of these algorithms introduces inefficiencies where the central server must wait for all the participating clients to complete a particular step before moving on



**Figure 2: Synchronous conventional KD and serverless KD.**

to the subsequent steps. Due to the statistical and resource heterogeneity in FL, most clients in conventional KD-based FL systems remain idle, leading to resource wastage and unnecessary costs (Figure 2). Moreover, managing complex infrastructure for clients can be overwhelming for all data administrators. The FaaS computing model offers several advantages, such as no infrastructure management, automatic scaling to zero when resources are unused, and an attractive fine-grained *pay-per-use* billing policy [7]. Adapting and optimizing existing conventional KD-based FL techniques to utilize stateless FaaS technologies in both entities of an FL system can improve resource efficiency, reduce training costs, and address practical challenges in FL systems (Figure 2). To this end, our key contributions are:

- We propose novel optimized serverless workflows for two popular conventional KD-based FL strategies, i.e., FedMD and FedDF.
- We implement the two workflows by introducing several extensions to an open-source serverless FL system called FedLess [17]<sup>1</sup>. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first system in the literature that supports training heterogeneous client models using serverless KD.
- We comprehensively evaluate the implemented strategies on multiple datasets across varying levels of client data heterogeneity using heterogeneous client model architectures wrt accuracy, fine-grained training times, and costs.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. §2 provides an overview of KD in FL. In §3, we describe the previous approaches related to our work. §4 describes our extensions to FedLess. In §5, we describe the workflow of the serverless implementations of the two algorithms. §6 describes our experimental setup, while in §7 our experimental results are presented. Finally, §8 concludes the paper and presents an outlook.

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Knowledge Distillation in FL

When applied to FL, KD offers several advantages. These include model compression, heterogeneous and personalized client models, reduced communication overhead, and increased client privacy [40]. Unlike traditional FL approaches [39] that require exchanging the entire model parameters, most KD-based techniques typically only

<sup>1</sup>Our implementation can be found here: <https://github.com/Serverless-Federated-Learning/FedLess/tree/serverless-knowledge-distillation>.




Figure 3: Different steps in the FedMD [35] algorithm.

involve the transmission of class scores. This reduces the communication overhead and minimizes the data transferred between clients and the server during model aggregation. In addition, this prevents *model inferring attacks* [14] in FL. Towards this, several strategies that leverage KD in FL have been proposed. These strategies can be classified into four categories: ① distillation of knowledge to each FL client to learn stronger personalized models, ② distillation of knowledge to the central server to learn stronger server models, ③ bidirectional distillation to both the FL clients and the server, and ④ inter-client distillation.

FedMD [35] belongs to the first category of KD algorithms, focusing on strengthening personalized models for each FL client. It requires a carefully selected labeled public dataset and offers flexibility in various learning tasks, including image and text data applications. In the second category of KD strategies, we considered two specific approaches, i.e., MHAT [22] and FedDF [37]. Both strategies focus on learning stronger (student) server models with the help of several (*ensemble*) candidate (teacher) client models. For distilling knowledge to the server models, MHAT requires a labeled public dataset, while FedDF does not impose this restriction. FedET [11] is a bidirectional distillation technique that uses a weighted consensus algorithm with diversity regularization to train small client models and a large server model. Distributed distillation (DD) [5] is a semi-supervised FL strategy where knowledge is transferred amongst all neighboring clients in a network. In each communication round, clients exchange soft targets with all their neighbors and update their own targets using a consensus algorithm. Following this, the updated soft targets are used by each client to update its private model weights.

Strategies belonging to categories three and four either require frequent communication between the server and the clients or amongst clients leading to significantly high communication costs. Therefore, we don't consider any distillation strategies from these categories for our serverless implementation. In this paper, we adapt and optimize the strategies FedMD and FedDF using FaaS functions. We choose FedDF over MHAT due to its superior robustness in handling heterogeneous data distributions and its flexibility regarding the type of public dataset required [37].

## 2.2 FedMD

The FedMD [35] algorithm supports a unique model architecture for each participating client. In this strategy, the central server does not require any information about the client models and treats them as a black box. Furthermore, in addition to their private datasets, each client has access to a labeled public dataset. The collaborative training process in FedMD consists of seven synchronous steps, each of which is shown in Figure 3. In the first step (①), each participating client trains on the labeled public dataset until convergence and




Figure 4: Different steps in the FedDF [37] algorithm.

then on its private dataset for a few epochs. Following this, each participating client performs a forward-pass inference on the public dataset and sends the generated class logits to the central server (②-③). The central server aggregates the obtained class logits (④) and sends them back to the participating clients (⑤). After this, each participating client trains its model using the aggregated logits as soft targets on the public dataset (⑥). Finally, each participating client trains the model on its private dataset for a few epochs for personalization (⑦). While step ① only occurs during the start of the training process, steps ②-⑦ are repeated until the required client model accuracy is reached. The final output layer of the client model architecture must have a total number of output neurons equal to the sum of the number of classes in the private dataset and the number of classes in the public dataset. This is because the model is trained on both datasets during the complete training process, and in most cases, the classes in the two datasets are mutually exclusive. Therefore, a good public dataset (§2.1) minimizes the total number of output classes while maximizing the amount of available data.

## 2.3 FedDF

The FedDF [37] algorithm proposes an ensemble distillation approach for model fusion that supports heterogeneous FL client model architectures. In contrast to FedMD (§2.2), it supports distillation with an unlabelled public dataset that can also be generated using Generative adversarial networks. As a result, it does not require any changes to the client training process. The different synchronous steps involved in the FedDF strategy are shown in Figure 4. At the start of each training round, the central server randomly selects a group of clients to participate in that round. Following this, the randomly selected clients train their local teacher models for a specified number of epochs (①). After local training, each participating client sends the updated model weights to the central server (②). For each unique client model architecture, the central server aggregates the received model weights to initialize a student server model. To distill knowledge to the initialized server model, each teacher client model is evaluated on mini-batches of the public dataset, and their generated logit outputs are used to train the student server model using a custom loss function [37]. This training process continues until a stable validation loss is reached for the student server model (③). After the ensemble distillation process, we obtain distilled server models for each unique model architecture that contains collaborative knowledge from all the participating clients across all model architectures. The weights from these distilled server models are then distributed back to the clients based on their respective model architectures for the next training round (④). Steps ①-④ are repeated until the desired accuracy is reached for each model architecture.

### 3 RELATED WORK

#### 3.1 Serverless Federated Learning

Using serverless computing technologies, particularly FaaS, for designing efficient systems for FL is a relatively new research direction. Existing works in this domain can be categorized into two groups: (i) systems that employ serverless functions exclusively in the central server [24–26] and (ii) systems that leverage serverless functions in both entities of an FL system [8, 17, 32] (§1). In [25], Jayaram et al. propose  $\lambda$ -FL, a serverless aggregation strategy for FL to improve fault tolerance and reduce resource wastage. The authors use serverless functions as aggregators to optimize the aggregation of model parameters in conventional FedAvg [39] over several steps. They implement their prototype using message queues, Kafka, and use Ray [41] as the serverless platform. In [26] and [24], the authors extend their previous strategy to enable adaptive and just-in-time aggregation of client model updates using serverless functions. In the second group, *FedKeeper* [8] was the first serverless FL system that enabled the training of Deep Neural Network (DNN) models using FL for clients distributed across a combination of heterogeneous FaaS platforms. However, it lacked crucial features required for practical FL systems, such as security and support for large DNN models. To address these drawbacks, *FedLess* [17] was introduced as an evolution of *FedKeeper* with multiple new enhancements. These include: (i) support for multiple open-source and commercial FaaS platforms, (ii) authentication/authorization of client functions using AWS Cognito, (iii) training of arbitrary homogeneous DNN models using the TensorFlow library, and (iv) the privacy-preserving FL training of models using Differential Privacy [42]. In addition, *FedLess* incorporates several optimizations for serverless environments, such as global namespace caching, running average model aggregation, and federated evaluation. A more recent work by Kotsehub et al. [32] introduces *Flox*, a system built on the funcX [10] serverless platform. *Flox* aims to separate FL model training/inference from infrastructure management, providing users with a convenient way to deploy FL models on heterogeneous distributed compute endpoints. However, its tight integration with funcX restricts its compatibility with other open-source or commercial FaaS platforms, limiting its applicability and generality. As a result, in this paper, we use *FedLess* as the serverless FL system.

#### 3.2 Model-agnostic Serverless FL

Existing research on model-agnostic KD is limited to conventional Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) based FL systems (§2.1). In addition, the experiments performed for FedMD [35] are simulated locally with only 10 participating clients and overlook crucial infrastructure components. As a result, they fail to provide a comprehensive understanding of the algorithm performance in distributed settings, which involves factors such as system heterogeneity and stragglers [23]. Moreover, the performed experiments do not account for varying levels of data heterogeneity among FL clients. Similarly, for FedDF [37], little emphasis has been placed on the distributed infrastructure, its optimization, and execution time in such settings, leaving these aspects as future work. To the best of our knowledge, this work represents the first implementations of multiple KD algorithms within the serverless FL paradigm. Furthermore, we comprehensively analyze the performance and cost of

```

1  model:
2    name: "my_network"
3    dataset:
4      name: "mnist"
5    input_shape: [32, 32, 3]
6    block:
7      layers: &ref_block
8        - name: &lay_1_ref "layer_1"
9          type: Conv2D
10         input: [auto]
11         params: [...]
12        - name: &lay_2_ref "layer_2"
13          type: Dense
14         input: [*lay_2_ref]
15         params:
16           units: 10
17         activation: "softmax"
18     layers:
19       - name: &layer_1 "layer_1"
20         type: Conv2D
21         input: [auto]
22         params: [...]
23       - name: &layer_2 "layer_2"
24         type: "ReferenceBlock"
25         input: [*layer_1]
26         layers: *ref_block
27     outputs: [*layer_1, *layer_2]

```

**Listing 1: Example model description representing a 3-layer CNN in YAML. Ellipses signify parameters that are omitted for brevity.**

the two algorithms in a distributed setting with 100 participating clients for multiple ML tasks.

### 4 SYSTEM DESIGN

#### 4.1 Supporting Heterogeneous Client Model Architectures

The initial version of *FedLess* [17] only supports FL with homogeneous client model architectures managed by the controller (Figure 5). To enable heterogeneous model training, we extend *FedLess* to create and initialize diverse model architectures for each FL client based on the input configuration. Towards this, we implement a Model Loader module that parses a human-readable network configuration YAML file to generate and train arbitrary DNN models. Our module generates a directed acyclic graph (DAG) representing the DNN model from the input file that can be used directly to initialize a model in TensorFlow.

Listing 1 shows an example DNN model description written in YAML. Each element under the key `layers` describes a neural network unit where its inputs, parameters, and layer type are specified. Our module currently supports all layer types present till Keras version 2.7. A block represents a repeatable collection of layers that can be defined once and re-used throughout the configuration file to define a network. To resolve dependencies between layers, our module relies on the key name for each layer. In addition, we use the anchor-alias (&,\* ) syntax from the YAML standard to enable easy referencing and dereferencing of elements. For instance, the `layers` elements in the block are referred to as `&ref_block` in Line 7. After the file is parsed, those elements will appear as `layers` in the second layer (Line 26) due to the alias `*ref_block`. However, due to the dynamic nature of referenceable blocks, defining inputs may lead to duplicating keys in the configuration file. To avoid this, our module uses the keyword `auto` to support automatic input interpretation. If a layer sets its input as `auto` then our module uses its parent to resolve its inputs. For instance, `&lay_1_ref` (Line 8) will take its input from the input value described in Line 25. This relation between referenced blocks and the parent’s inputs enables




Figure 5: Proposed extensions (green) to FedLess [17].

nested blocks beyond the first-level nesting shown in Listing 1. To this end, our implemented module offers data holders the flexibility to select any model architecture for their clients.

## 4.2 Extending FedLess

Figure 5 presents an overview of the enhanced system architecture of FedLess. The highlighted components in green represent our specific extensions to enable serverless KD with the system. To support unique model architectures for each FL client, we added a *Client Parameter Server*. This parameter server is a MongoDB instance responsible for storing the model architecture and its hyperparameters for each client. To optimize certain steps in the workflow of the two individual algorithms, we made two major changes to the system. These changes are described in the following two aspects.

**4.2.1 Serverless Parallel Transfer Learning for FedMD.** Prior to the distillation process, the FedMD algorithm requires an initial pre-training phase where all heterogeneous client models are trained on the public dataset until convergence (§2.2). However, the time-intensive nature of this training process prevents its execution directly within the FaaS-based FL clients due to function time limitations imposed by most commercial FaaS platforms. For instance, AWS Lambda restricts the maximum function execution time to 15 minutes [1]. Towards this, we extend FedLess with the popular Ray [41] distributed computing platform. We chose Ray due to its several advantages, such as arbitrarily long serverless functions, support for accelerators such as GPUs, seamless integration with popular Python libraries such as numpy and TensorFlow, and its elastic autoscaling capabilities. We deploy Ray on top of Kubernetes (k8s) using the KubeRay operator. In addition, we utilize the Ray tune [36] feature that enables seamless distributed parallel training of individual client models. The FedLess controller can directly invoke client function instances for model training on the Ray cluster. On invocation, Ray creates *actors* for each client function instance [41]. These actors are independent Python processes that execute in a distributed and parallel manner across the cluster. Depending on the number of function invocations, Ray’s autoscaler can request additional k8s pods to execute the client functions in parallel. Moreover, the autoscaler can also aggressively scale the




Figure 6: Serverless FedMD workflow.

number of pods to zero when resources are unused. By leveraging Ray in FedLess, we can parallelize the initial transfer learning process using functions, support a large number of FL clients, and optimize resource utilization. To facilitate ease of use, we provide scripts to setup and configure Ray with FedLess.

**4.2.2 Serverless Parallel Ensemble Distillation for FedDF.** The FedDF algorithm incorporates an ensemble distillation process, where knowledge is transferred from multiple teacher client models with heterogeneous architectures to a student server model (§2.3). In the original FedDF implementation [37], this process is performed sequentially for each unique model architecture. However, since there are no dependencies across model architectures, this step can be easily parallelized. Towards this, we extend FedLess to support multiple aggregator functions. Each aggregator function is responsible for performing the ensemble distillation process for a specific model architecture. These functions are triggered in parallel as soon as the distillation process begins. Moreover, these functions are generic and can be implemented using any FaaS platform. This design choice provides developers greater flexibility and prevents vendor/platform lock-in. To enable ease of development, we provide reference implementations of these functions for OpenFaaS [43] and Knative platforms. By parallelizing ensemble distillation across model architectures in FedLess, we can significantly decrease training times in practical FL systems, as demonstrated in our evaluation.

## 5 SERVERLESS KNOWLEDGE DISTILLATION

### 5.1 Serverless FedMD

The training workflow for FedMD in the serverless paradigm with FedLess is shown in Figure 6. For simplicity, we omit some technical details related to the authentication/authorization of client functions, as well as some other minor interactions with the parameter server. Initially, the FL admin configures the client models, datasets, and the required client and FedMD-specific hyperparameters before starting the training process. Following this, the FedLess controller (§4) initializes the heterogeneous client models according to the provided configuration files (§4.1) and creates the required data loaders for each client. In FedMD, each FL client has access to three datasets: (i) a private training dataset, (ii) a private testing dataset, and a (iii) public training dataset (§2.2). After this, we perform a one-time initial transfer learning process for all the individual client models




Figure 7: Serverless FedDF workflow.

before starting the collaboration phase (§2.2). To optimize this process, we divide it into two consecutive steps. In the initial step, we leverage Ray (§4.2.1) to simultaneously train all client models on the public dataset until convergence. In the second step, the controller triggers individual FL clients to perform additional training of their models on their private datasets. Following the initial transfer learning phase, we proceed to the collaborative training rounds, where the clients engage in knowledge distillation to collectively improve overall test accuracies. Each collaborative training round consists of five steps, which are executed as individual invocations of FL clients and the aggregator. In the communication step, all FL clients generate predictions on a random subset of the public dataset and store the corresponding prediction logits in MongoDB. Following this, the controller invokes the aggregator function, which aggregates the prediction logits from all the FL clients. In the digest step, each client trains its model to approach the aggregated prediction logits. The objective is to achieve logit alignment, thereby facilitating knowledge distillation among the clients. Following this, each client fine-tunes their model on their private dataset for a few epochs for model personalization. Finally, in the evaluation step, the controller performs an evaluation invocation to obtain the performance of each client model on the public test dataset. The five different steps continue until the desired accuracy is reached on the individual client models.

## 5.2 Serverless FedDF

Figure 7 shows the training workflow for the server-side distillation algorithm FedDF with *FedLess*. Similar to FedMD (5.1), the FL admin first configures the client models, datasets, as well as the required client and FedDF-specific hyperparameters before starting the training process. After this, the iterative training process in FedDF is initiated. In the original FedDF [37] algorithm (§2.3), a random subset of clients is selected to participate in each training round. However, due to resource and statistical heterogeneity of clients in FL, random selection can often lead to significantly higher training times because of *stragglers*, i.e., slow clients [33]. To mitigate this, we adapt the intelligent clustering-based client selection algorithm in FedLesScan [13] and integrate it with FedDF. FedLesScan is a training strategy designed to facilitate efficient FL in serverless environments. It incorporates an adaptive clustering-based client selection algorithm that selects a subset of clients for training based on their behavior in previous training rounds. However, the original clustering process in FedLesScan does not

No.	Task	Type	FedMD		FedDF	
			Private	Public	Private	Public (Unlabeled)
1	CV	Classification	MNIST	EMNIST Letters	MNIST	EMNIST Letters
2	CV	Classification	CIFAR100 (Subset)	CIFAR10	CIFAR10	CIFAR100
3	NLP	Character Prediction	Shakespeare	Nietzsche	Shakespeare	Nietzsche

Table 1: Evaluation tasks and datasets for serverless FedMD and FedDF.

account for the heterogeneous client model architectures. This is important because clustering metrics such as training times can vary based on the complexity of different model architectures. In the extended version of FedLesScan, we first perform clustering among clients having the same model architecture. Following this, we perform a round-robin selection of the *sorted clients* [13] from each client model architecture group until the desired number of clients is selected. For sorting clients, we use the metric exponential moving average that relies on the training duration of clients.

In the initial step of the iterative training process, the controller uses our adapted FedLesScan algorithm to intelligently select a subset of clients from the client pool. Following this, the chosen clients are invoked to perform training on their private datasets. After training, the clients store the updated models back in the MongoDB database. Once all clients have finished training, the controller invokes the different aggregator functions for the ensemble distillation process (§4.2.2, §2.3). These aggregator functions are invoked in parallel for each unique client model architecture. After completion, each aggregator function updates the weights of clients associated with their particular model architecture with the obtained new distilled weights. The iterative training process continues until a desired test accuracy is reached for each model architecture.

## 6 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP


### 6.1 Datasets

In our experiments, we evaluate the implemented serverless KD algorithms (§5) for a variety of tasks. Table 1 shows the different public/private datasets for the two algorithms.

MNIST is a handwritten digit dataset comprising of 60,000 training images and 10,000 testing images. It has ten classes corresponding to the respective digits. On the other hand, EMNIST Letters consists of handwritten letters from the English language, comprising 145,600 characters distributed evenly among 26 classes. For more complex image classification tasks, we use the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. Both datasets have 60,000 color images divided uniformly into ten and 100 mutually exclusive classes, respectively. For the language modeling domain, we use the Shakespeare dataset from the LEAF [6] FL benchmark suite and the openly available Nietzsche text corpus [2]. The Shakespeare dataset consists of 4,226,158 sequences of length 80 across 1,129 different users, while the Nietzsche dataset consists of 200,271 sequences of length 80. In Shakespeare, each user has their own training and testing dataset. For both datasets, the task is to predict the next character given a sequence.

### 6.2 Heterogeneous Client Data Distribution

One of the major challenges in FL is the non-independent and identical (non-IID) data distribution among the participating clients [20] (§1). To analyze the behavior and robustness of the two serverless KD strategies toward different degrees of data heterogeneity, we



**Figure 8: Private client training data distributions for the different algorithms and datasets for varying values of  $\alpha$ . For a particular client ID, the size of each data point represents the number of samples belonging to a particular class.**

Model ID	#Clients	#Layer 1 Conv. Filters	#Layer 2 Conv. Filters	#Layer 3 Conv. Filters	#Trainable Parameters
0	10	128	256	-	729,856
1	30	128	512	-	1,458,176
2	20	64	128	128	193,280
3	20	64	128	256	352,640
4	10	128	128	128	226,816
5	10	128	128	256	386,176

**Table 2: Different client CNN models for FedMD/FedDF in task one (Table 1).**

Model ID	#Clients	#Layer 1 Conv. Filters	#Layer 2 Conv. Filters	#Layer 3 Conv. Filters	#Trainable Parameters
0	10	128	256	-	729,856
1	10	64	128	192	274,112
2	30	64	128	128	104,128
3	30	64	128	256	352,640
4	20	128	128	128	226,816

**Table 3: Different client CNN models for FedMD/FedDF in task two (Table 1).**

use the Dirichlet distribution as in [21] to create disjoint non-IID client training data partitions. A parameter  $\alpha$  controls the degree of non-IID data distribution, where a smaller  $\alpha$  value increases the probability of clients holding training samples from only one class and vice-versa.

Figure 8a visualizes the private client training data distributions for the MNIST dataset for 100 clients and different values of  $\alpha$ . A value of  $\alpha = 100$  represents uniform data distribution, while a value of  $\alpha = 0.1$  represents an extreme non-IID scenario. For task one (Table 1), we use the same public and private data distributions for FedMD and FedDF. However, in FedDF, only the image features and no labels are utilized for the distillation process. Each client model gets evaluated on the complete MNIST test dataset comprising 10000 testing images (§6.1). In task two for FedMD, we use a subset of six classes from the CIFAR-100 dataset as in [35] for the main learning task. Figure 8b shows the private client data distribution in this scenario for various values of  $\alpha$ . The complete CIFAR-100 dataset is employed as the public distillation dataset for this task (§2.2). During testing, each client’s performance is evaluated on the complete global CIFAR-100 test dataset subsetted for the six classes. On the other hand, for FedDF in task two, we use CIFAR-10 as the private dataset and CIFAR-100 as the public dataset. The private training data distribution for FedDF with CIFAR-10 is shown in Figure 8c. For evaluating individual client models, we use the complete CIFAR-10 test dataset comprising 10000 images. Similar to task one, we use the same public and private dataset distributions for the two algorithms in task three, as shown in Table 1. For the non-IID scenario, we use the pre-provided non-IID partitions for the Shakespeare dataset from the LEAF FL benchmark suite [6]. We don’t use the Dirichlet distribution for creating non-IID partitions

Model ID	#Clients	#Units	Embedding Dim	#Trainable Parameters
0	60	128	8	81,378
1	10	64	8	24,674
2	30	256	8	293,090

**Table 4: Different client LSTM models for FedMD/FedDF in task three (Table 1).**

for Shakespeare since that is only suitable for classification tasks. Note that for all tasks, the public dataset is uniformly distributed.


### 6.3 Heterogeneous Client Model Architectures

In our experiments, we use multiple model architectures distributed among 100 participating clients based on the machine learning task (Table 1). For tasks one and two, we utilize 2-layer and 3-layer convolutional neural networks (CNNs). These model architectures are unevenly distributed among the clients to simulate real-world scenarios, as shown in Tables 2 and 3. Each convolution filter layer is followed by batch normalization, ReLU activation, and a dropout of 0.2. Dropout enables regularization and prevents client models from overfitting on small amounts of private local data. To ensure a fair comparison between the performance of FedMD and FedDF in the serverless paradigm, we use the same client model distributions for both algorithms. For task three, we utilize LSTM Recurrent Neural Networks with a single layer and a varying number of units, as shown in Table 4. Every network takes an input sequence length of 80, followed by an initial embedding size of 8 and then a single LSTM layer. For all tasks, we chose the model architectures that have been used previously in this domain [8, 13, 35, 37]. Due to space limitations, we omit the specific hyperparameters used for the two algorithms but will describe them in detail in our code repository.

### 6.4 Infrastructure Setup

For our experiments, we deployed *FedLess* (§4.2) on a virtual machine hosted on our institute’s compute cloud. The VM was configured with 40vCPUs and 177GiB of RAM. For the training cluster utilizing Ray (§4.2.1), we assigned each function instance with 4 vCPUs and 16 GiB of RAM. Moreover, we set the maximum number of function instances to eight in the Ray autoscaler. Furthermore, for hosting our datasets, we used a nginx store running on a VM with 10vCPUs and 45GiB of RAM.

For FaaS-based FL clients and the different aggregator functions, we used OpenFaaS [43] as the FaaS platform. We used 100 client functions for our experiments. Each client had a limit of 2vCPUs



**Figure 9: Comparing Top-1 model accuracies across heterogeneous model architectures for the serverless implementations of FedMD and FedDF.**

and 4GiB of RAM. For FedMD, we sample 100 clients per round while limiting the number of clients per round to ten for FedDF. We deployed a single aggregator function for FedMD with 4vCPUs and 8GiB of RAM. In contrast, for FedDF, we used six aggregator functions (§4.2.2). Each aggregator function had a limit of 6vCPUs and 16GiB of RAM.

## 7 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

For all our experiments, we follow best practices while reporting results and repeat them three times.

### 7.1 Comparing Accuracy

In this subsection, we focus on demonstrating the convergence and improved accuracy obtained through serverless knowledge distillation among heterogeneous client models rather than pursuing state-of-the-art accuracies on these tasks. Towards this, we limit our experiments to 20 communication rounds for the two algorithms across all datasets and levels of data heterogeneity (§6.1, §6.2). Figure 9 presents the top-1 model accuracies for FedMD and FedDF across the different datasets. Top-1 model accuracy is a common evaluation metric and represents the accuracy of a model in correctly predicting the most probable class label for a given input out of all possible class labels. For FedMD, each line in Figures 9a, 9b, and 9e represents the average model accuracy across all clients belonging to a particular unique model architecture group (§6.3). On the other hand, for FedDF, each line in Figures 9c, 9d, and 9e corresponds to the accuracy of the global server model for that particular unique model architecture group. For the MNIST dataset with FedMD, we observe that the KD process is predominantly concentrated in the initial collaboration rounds. Following this, the accuracy curve stabilizes, indicating a plateau in performance improvement. For the scenario with uniform data distribution (§6.2), we observed a maximum accuracy of 96% for model 4 as shown in Figure 9a. In contrast, for  $\alpha = 0.1$ , we observed a 46.5% average accuracy drop across all model architectures as compared to the IID scenario with  $\alpha = 100$ . This can be attributed to the divergence of the globally aggregated logits due to the significantly high variance in the private data distribution among the FL clients [20] (§2.2, §5.1). In contrast to the MNIST dataset, we observe a more gradual increase in accuracy with collaboration rounds for the CIFAR dataset with FedMD. For the i.i.d. scenario, we observe a maximum test accuracy of 66.4% with model two as shown in Figure 9b. Furthermore, we observe a 13% average drop in accuracy for  $\alpha = 0.1$  as compared to the scenario with uniform data distribution. Figure 9e shows

the performance of FedMD on the Shakespeare dataset for the IID and non-IID scenarios. For both scenarios, model one achieved the maximum accuracy of 36% and 37.8%, respectively. We observe faster convergence for the different model architectures in the IID scenario but do not observe any significant difference in the highest achieved accuracy between the two scenarios. This is because in FedMD, the transfer learning step was performed on the Nietzsche dataset (§6.1) that predicts the same set of classes as the Shakespeare dataset. Hence, the initial models after the transfer learning process were already strong in character prediction, and the subsequent collaborative fine-tuning among the FL clients only involved adapting the models to the specific characteristics of the Shakespeare dataset. Figure 9c shows the performance of the FedDF algorithm with the MNIST dataset for varying levels of data heterogeneity. We observe a maximum accuracy of 97% with  $\alpha = 100$  and a accuracy of 94.8% with  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Figures 9d and 9e show the performance of the FedDF algorithm with the CIFAR and the Shakespeare datasets, respectively. In the IID scenario, we observed maximum model accuracies of 57.5% and 40% for the two datasets. On the other hand, in the non-IID scenario, we observed maximum accuracies of 55% and 43% for the two datasets. We observe that FedDF demonstrates greater robustness to higher non-IID data distributions compared to FedMD, as it maintains higher model accuracies even for lower values of  $\alpha$ . This can be attributed to two reasons. First, the usage of ensemble distillation in FedDF enhances the robustness of the global model to noise and outliers. Second, FedDF leverages unlabeled data in the distillation process, thereby enhancing its capacity to generalize to unseen data.

### 7.2 Comparing Performance and Cost

Analyzing FL systems involves considering important factors such as the time and the cost required to complete different training tasks. This is particularly relevant in our case, as we utilize FaaS, in which users are only billed for the execution time of functions [7]. To present summarized results, we aggregate the timings and costs across all clients for the different levels of data heterogeneity. For computing training costs, we use the cost computation model [12] used by Google to estimate the cost for each function based on the number of invocations, allocated memory, and execution duration (§6.4).

To offer detailed insights into the serverless KD training process, Figure 10 shows the timings of the individual training steps and the collaborative round durations for the two algorithms. For relevance,




Figure 10: Comparing individual training steps and collaborative round durations for the serverless implementations of FedMD and FedDF across different datasets (§6.1).

Dataset	Metric	Aggregate	Communicate	Revisit	Transfer Learning (Private)	Digest	Overall
MNIST	Duration (min)	55.2	378.4	867	42.5	1329.8	<b>2672.9</b>
	Cost (USD)	0.37	1.32	3.02	0.15	4.63	<b>9.49</b>
CIFAR	Duration (min)	47.7	579.4	111.6	6.5	746.4	<b>1491.6</b>
	Cost (USD)	0.32	2.02	0.39	0.02	2.6	<b>5.35</b>
Shakespeare	Duration (min)	64.5	300.8	5945.2	122.7	656.3	<b>7089.5</b>
	Cost (USD)	0.43	1.05	20.69	0.43	2.28	<b>24.88</b>

Table 5: Comparing total execution time and cost for serverless FedMD across the different datasets.

Dataset	Metric	Aggregators	Clients	Overall
MNIST	Duration (min)	152	56.4	<b>208.4</b>
	Cost (USD)	6.07	0.2	<b>6.27</b>
CIFAR	Duration (min)	163.87	213.55	<b>377.42</b>
	Cost (USD)	5.46	0.74	<b>6.2</b>
Shakespeare	Duration (min)	134.4	466.9	<b>601.3</b>
	Cost (USD)	2.68	1.62	<b>4.3</b>

Table 6: Comparing total execution time and cost for serverless FedDF across the different datasets.

we omit the timings for the initial one-time pre-training process in FedMD (§5.1). For the MNIST dataset with FedMD, we observe that each collaborative training round takes between 360 to 390 seconds, as shown in Figure 10a. A significant portion of this time (40%) is spent within the single aggregator function for aggregating prediction logits from all 100 participating clients. The digest and revisit steps take a comparable amount of time, while the communicate step is the fastest as it involves only a forward pass inference on the public dataset by all clients (§5.1). We observe relatively shorter round durations for the CIFAR dataset with FedMD compared to MNIST, as shown in Figure 10b. This can be attributed to the shorter revisit step due to the smaller private client dataset as described in §6.2. For the Shakespeare dataset with FedMD, a majority of the time (90%) is spent in the revisit step, as shown in Figure 10c. This can be attributed to the significantly large number of epochs required by the LSTM text models for this training step as compared to the CNN models for image tasks (§6.3). Figures 10d, 10e, and 10f present the total collaborative round duration along with the timings for private client training and ensemble distillation for the different datasets with FedDF. The highlighted area in these plots represents the variability observed for multiple runs across different data heterogeneity levels (§6.2). For the MNIST and CIFAR datasets, we observe that the majority of the round duration (>90%) is spent in the ensemble distillation process that occurs in the aggregator

Model ID	Maximum Top-1 accuracy (%)					
	MNIST $\alpha = 1$		CIFAR $\alpha = 1$		Shakespeare $\alpha = 1$	
	FedMD	FedDF	FedMD	FedDF	FedMD	FedDF
0	0.86	<b>0.90</b>	0.40	<b>0.52</b>	0.33	<b>0.43</b>
1	0.86	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.58</b>	0.52	<b>0.38</b>	0.37
2	0.90	<b>0.96</b>	0.54	<b>0.55</b>	0.34	<b>0.40</b>
3	0.89	<b>0.96</b>	0.51	<b>0.55</b>	-	-
4	0.92	<b>0.93</b>	0.51	<b>0.56</b>	-	-
5	0.91	<b>0.96</b>	-	-	-	-

Table 7: Comparing maximum Top-1 accuracy for FedMD and FedDF across all datasets and heterogeneous client model architectures.

Optimizations	MNIST	CIFAR	Shakespeare
Transfer Learning with Ray	3.2x	3.7x	3.6x
Parallel Ensemble Distillation	1.83x	1.8x	1.67x

Table 8: Summary of speedups obtained with our extensions to FedLess (§4.2) for the different datasets.

functions for each unique model architecture (§5.2). On the other hand, for the Shakespeare dataset, we observe similar durations for the ensemble distillation and private client training process. This can again be attributed to the higher number of local epochs required in private client training for LSTM networks.

Tables 5 and 6 present the total execution times and costs for the serverless implementations of the two algorithms. For the MNIST and CIFAR datasets with FedMD, we observe that most of the total costs are due to the digest step, which is executed on each client for every round. For the Shakespeare dataset, we observe a significant increase in costs primarily driven by the longer training duration in the revisit step. In contrast to FedMD, we observe comparatively lower costs for FedDF. This is because we only select a fraction of clients, i.e., ten, to participate in each training round using our intelligent selection algorithm (§6.4, §5.2). To summarize, FedDF demonstrates cost savings of 34% and 82.7% compared to FedMD for the MNIST and Shakespeare datasets, respectively, while incurring approximately 16% higher costs for the CIFAR dataset. The higher costs associated with the CIFAR dataset in FedDF can be attributed to the utilization of the entire CIFAR-100 dataset for the ensemble distillation process leading to a higher number of local knowledge distillation steps in every communication round, in contrast to the use of a subset in FedMD (§6.2).

### 7.3 Comparing FedDF and FedMD

Table 7 shows the maximum Top-1 model accuracy for the two algorithms across all datasets and heterogeneous client model architectures. For the MNIST and CIFAR datasets, we present results with  $\alpha = 1$ , while for the Shakespeare dataset, we present results for the non-IID data partition. We chose  $\alpha = 1$  since it represents a standard non-IID scenario and enables us to compare the robustness of the algorithms toward data heterogeneity. The model architecture level comparison is fair since we use the same architectures for both algorithms. For MNIST, FedDF exhibits higher accuracy levels across all model types compared to FedMD, with an average performance improvement of 5% across the six unique model architectures. Similarly, for the CIFAR dataset, FedDF generally outperforms FedMD, except for model 1, where FedMD exhibits better performance. However, on average, across the five unique model architectures, FedDF leads to 3.2% better accuracy. Finally, for Shakespeare, FedDF consistently outperforms FedMD by an average of 5% across the three unique model architectures.

### 7.4 Effect of performance optimizations

Table 8 presents summarized results for speedups obtained with our optimizations compared to the original sequential implementation of the two algorithms (§4.2, §2.2, §2.3). To ensure a fair comparison, we execute the original algorithms after migrating them to the serverless paradigm. For the initial transfer learning process in FedMD (§5.1), we obtain an average speedup of 3.5x across all datasets with our implementation using Ray. On the other hand, for the ensemble distillation process using multiple aggregators in FedDF (§5.2), we observe an average speedup of 1.76x across all datasets.

## 8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we took the first step towards training heterogeneous client models in FL via KD using the serverless paradigm. Towards this, we proposed novel optimized serverless workflows for two popular conventional KD techniques, i.e., FedMD and FedDF. To enable adoption, we integrated the two strategies into an open-source serverless FL system called *FedLess* by extending it. With our experiments, we successfully demonstrated that the serverless implementations of the two strategies converge for heterogeneous model architectures across multiple datasets. In the future, we plan to explore the suitability of more advanced data-free knowledge distillation algorithms that do not require a separate public transfer dataset in serverless environments.

## 9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research leading to these results was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) in the scope of the Software Campus program under the grant agreement 01IS17049.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2023. *AWS Lambda Limits*. <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/lambda/latest/dg/gettingstarted-limits.html>
- [2] 2023. Nietzsche Text corpus. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/text-datasets/nietzsche.txt>
- [3] Manoj Ghuhan Arivazhagan et al. 2019. Federated Learning with Personalization Layers. *CoRR* abs/1912.00818 (2019). arXiv:1912.00818 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00818>
- [4] Daniel J. Beutel et al. 2020. Flower: A Friendly Federated Learning Research Framework. *arXiv* (jul 2020), 1–22. arXiv:2007.14390 <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.14390>
- [5] Ilai Bistriz et al. 2020. Distributed Distillation for On-Device Learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (NIPS'20). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 1894, 12 pages.
- [6] Sebastian Caldas et al. 2018. LEAF: A Benchmark for Federated Settings. In *Workshop on Federated Learning for Data Privacy and Confidentiality, NeurIPS*. 1–9. arXiv:1812.01097 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.01097>
- [7] Paul Castro, Vatche Ishakian, Vinod Muthusamy, and Aleksander Slominski. 2019. The Rise of Serverless Computing. *Commun. ACM* 62, 12 (Nov. 2019), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368454>
- [8] Mohak Chadha, Anshul Jindal, and Michael Gerndt. 2020. Towards Federated Learning Using FaaS Fabric. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Sixth International Workshop on Serverless Computing* (Delft, Netherlands) (WoSC'20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 49–54. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3429880.3430100>
- [9] Mohak Chadha, Anshul Jindal, and Michael Gerndt. 2021. Architecture-Specific Performance Optimization of Compute-Intensive FaaS Functions. In *2021 IEEE 14th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*. 478–483. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CLOUD53861.2021.00062>
- [10] Ryan Chard et al. 2020. FuncX: A Federated Function Serving Fabric for Science. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on High-Performance Parallel and Distributed Computing* (Stockholm, Sweden) (HPDC '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3369583.3392683>
- [11] Yae Jee Cho et al. 2022. Heterogeneous Ensemble Knowledge Transfer for Training Large Models in Federated Learning. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.12703>
- [12] Google Cloud. 2022. Cloud Functions pricing. <https://cloud.google.com/functions/pricing>
- [13] Mohamed Elzohairy, Mohak Chadha, Anshul Jindal, Andreas Grafberger, Jianfeng Gu, Michael Gerndt, and Osama Abboud. 2022. FedLesScan: Mitigating Stragglers in Serverless Federated Learning. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 1230–1237. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData55660.2022.10021037>
- [14] David Enthoven and Zaid Al-Ars. 2021. An overview of federated deep learning privacy attacks and defensive strategies. *Federated Learning Systems: Towards Next-Generation AI* (2021), 173–196.
- [15] Brian M. Gaff et al. 2014. Privacy and Big Data. *Computer* 47, 6 (2014), 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2014.161>
- [16] Google Cloud. 2022. Cloud Functions Second Generation | Google Cloud. <https://cloud.google.com/functions/docs/2nd-gen/overview>
- [17] Andreas Grafberger, Mohak Chadha, Anshul Jindal, Jianfeng Gu, and Michael Gerndt. 2021. FedLess: Secure and Scalable Federated Learning Using Serverless Computing. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9672067>
- [18] Jianfeng Gu, Yichao Zhu, Puxuan Wang, Mohak Chadha, and Michael Gerndt. 2023. FaST-GShare: Enabling Efficient Spatio-Temporal GPU Sharing in Serverless Computing for Deep Learning Inference. In *Proceedings of the 52nd International Conference on Parallel Processing* (Salt Lake City, UT, USA) (ICPP '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 635–644. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3605573.3605638>
- [19] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. 2015. Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network. (2015). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1503.02531>
- [20] Kevin Hsieh et al. 2020. The non-iid data quagmire of decentralized machine learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 4387–4398.
- [21] Tzu-Ming Harry Hsu, Hang Qi, and Matthew Brown. 2019. Measuring the effects of non-identical data distribution for federated visual classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06335* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1909.06335>
- [22] Li Hu et al. 2021. MHAT: An efficient model-heterogenous aggregation training scheme for federated learning. *Information Sciences* 560 (2021), 493–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2021.01.046>
- [23] Dzmityry Huba et al. 2022. Papaya: Practical, private, and scalable federated learning. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 4 (2022), 814–832.
- [24] KR Jayaram et al. 2022. Adaptive Aggregation For Federated Learning. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 180–185. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData55660.2022.10021119>
- [25] KR Jayaram et al. 2022. Lambda FL: Serverless Aggregation For Federated Learning. In *International Workshop on Trustable, Verifiable and Auditable Federated Learning*. 9.
- [26] K. R. Jayaram et al. 2022. Just-in-Time Aggregation for Federated Learning. In *2022 30th International Symposium on Modeling, Analysis, and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems (MASCOTS)*. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MASCOTS56607.2022.00009>
- [27] Anshul Jindal, Mohak Chadha, Shajulin Benedict, and Michael Gerndt. 2022. Estimating the Capacities of Function-as-a-Service Functions. In *Proceedings of the 14th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing Companion* (Leicester, United Kingdom) (UCC '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 19, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3492323.3495628>

- [28] Anshul Jindal, Mohak Chadha, Michael Gerndt, Julian Frielinghaus, Vladimir Podolskiy, and Pengfei Chen. 2021. Poster: Function Delivery Network: Extending Serverless to Heterogeneous Computing. In *2021 IEEE 41st International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*. 1128–1129. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDCS51616.2021.00120>
- [29] Anshul Jindal, Julian Frielinghaus, Mohak Chadha, and Michael Gerndt. 2021. Courier: Delivering Serverless Functions Within Heterogeneous FaaS Deployments. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 14th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing (UCC'21)* (Leicester, United Kingdom) (UCC '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468737.3494097>
- [30] Anshul Jindal, Michael Gerndt, Mohak Chadha, Vladimir Podolskiy, and Pengfei Chen. 2021. Function delivery network: Extending serverless computing for heterogeneous platforms. *Software: Practice and Experience* 51, 9 (2021), 1936–1963. <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.2966>
- [31] Michael Kiener, Mohak Chadha, and Michael Gerndt. 2021. Towards Demystifying Intra-Function Parallelism in Serverless Computing. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on Serverless Computing (WoSC7) 2021* (Virtual Event, Canada) (WoSC '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3493651.3493672>
- [32] Nikita Kotsehub et al. 2022. FLoX: Federated Learning with FaaS at the Edge. In *2022 IEEE 18th International Conference on e-Science (e-Science)*. 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1109/eScience55777.2022.00016>
- [33] Fan Lai et al. 2020. Oort: Informed Participant Selection for Scalable Federated Learning. *CoRR* abs/2010.06081 (2020). arXiv:2010.06081 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.06081>
- [34] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *nature* 521, 7553 (2015), 436–444.
- [35] Daliang Li and Junpu Wang. 2019. FedMD: Heterogenous Federated Learning via Model Distillation. (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1910.03581>
- [36] Richard Liaw, Eric Liang, Robert Nishihara, Philipp Moritz, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2018. Tune: A Research Platform for Distributed Model Selection and Training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.05118* (2018).
- [37] Tao Lin et al. 2020. Ensemble Distillation for Robust Model Fusion in Federated Learning. 33 (2020), 2351–2363. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/18df51b97ccd68128e994804f3ecc87-Paper.pdf>
- [38] Heiko Ludwig et al. 2020. Ibm federated learning: an enterprise framework white paper v0. 1. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.10987* (2020).
- [39] Brendan McMahan et al. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [40] Alessio Mora et al. 2022. Knowledge distillation for federated learning: a practical guide. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.04742* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.04742>
- [41] Philipp Moritz et al. 2018. Ray: A Distributed Framework for Emerging AI Applications. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 18)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 561–577.
- [42] Viraaji Mothukuri et al. 2021. A survey on security and privacy of federated learning. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 115 (feb 2021), 619–640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2020.10.007>
- [43] OpenFaaS. 2019. OpenFaaS - Serverless Functions Made Simple. <https://www.openfaas.com/https://docs.openfaas.com/>
- [44] Christopher Peter Smith, Anshul Jindal, Mohak Chadha, Michael Gerndt, and Shajulin Benedict. 2022. FaDO: FaaS Functions and Data Orchestrator for Multiple Serverless Edge-Cloud Clusters. In *2022 IEEE 6th International Conference on Fog and Edge Computing (ICFEC)*. 17–25. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICFEC54809.2022.00010>