

# LLM4FaaS: No-Code Application Development using LLMs and FaaS

Minghe Wang

TU Berlin & ECDF  
Berlin, Germany  
mw@3s.tu-berlin.de

Trever Schirmer

TU Berlin & ECDF  
Berlin, Germany  
ts@3s.tu-berlin.de

Tobias Pfandzelter

TU Berlin & ECDF  
Berlin, Germany  
tp@3s.tu-berlin.de

David Bermbach

TU Berlin & ECDF  
Berlin, Germany  
db@3s.tu-berlin.de

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) are powerful tools that can generate code from natural language descriptions. While this theoretically enables non-technical users to develop their own applications, they typically lack the expertise to execute, deploy, and operate generated code. This poses a barrier for such users to leverage the power of LLMs for application development.

In this paper, we propose leveraging the high levels of abstraction of the Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) paradigm to handle code execution and operation for non-technical users. FaaS offers function deployment without handling the underlying infrastructure, enabling users to execute LLM-generated code without concern for its operation and without requiring any technical expertise. We propose LLM4FaaS, a novel no-code application development approach that combines LLMs and FaaS platforms to enable non-technical users to build and run their own applications using only natural language descriptions. Specifically, LLM4FaaS takes user prompts, uses LLMs to generate function code based on those prompts, and deploys these functions through a FaaS platform that handles the application’s operation. LLM4FaaS also leverages the FaaS infrastructure abstractions to reduce the task complexity for the LLM, improving result accuracy.

We evaluate LLM4FaaS with a proof-of-concept implementation based on *GPT-4o* and an open-source FaaS platform, using real prompts from non-technical users. Our evaluation based on these real user prompts demonstrates the feasibility of our approach and shows that LLM4FaaS can reliably build and deploy code in 71.47% of cases, up from 43.48% in a baseline without FaaS.

## Keywords

Large Language Models, Function-as-a-Service, No-Code Development

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable capabilities in processing natural language and generating corresponding code, thus bridging the gap between non-technical users and the technical world [13, 16, 21, 26, 27, 29, 32]. However, while non-technical users can use LLMs to generate code for their desired functionality, they typically lack the expertise to properly deploy and run the generated code. For most people, managing servers, configuring services, or even using the command line are high barriers to operating applications.

We believe that the Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) paradigm and its no-ops principle can help: FaaS platforms offer a scalable, event-driven, and fine-grained infrastructure abstraction [2, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 23, 25, 28, 30, 31]. By decoupling functionality from infrastructure management, FaaS aligns with the principle of separation of concerns in application development, allowing developers to focus on business logic rather than operational concerns.

We propose combining the capabilities of LLMs with the abstractions provided by FaaS to enable non-technical users to build and operate their own custom applications based solely on natural-language prompts. In this paper, we present LLM4FaaS, a novel no-code application development approach for end-users. LLM4FaaS leverages (i) the natural language processing capabilities of LLMs to transform user requirements into code snippets and (ii) FaaS abstractions to streamline code generation and accelerate and simplify application development. In this way, LLM4FaaS enables both application customization and development efficiency.

We make the following contributions:

- We introduce LLM4FaaS, a no-code application development approach based on LLMs and FaaS (§3).
- We implement a proof-of-concept prototype of LLM4FaaS using the *GPT-4o* [22] LLM and the *tinyFaaS* [24] lightweight FaaS platform, demonstrating the feasibility of our approach (§4.1).

- We collect a dataset of prompts on application descriptions from non-technical users (§4.2).
- Using our dataset, we assess the efficacy of LLM4FaaS compared to running LLM-generated code outside FaaS, showing that LLM4FaaS can reliably build and deploy code in 71.47% of cases, up from 43.48% in a baseline without FaaS (§4.3).

We make all artifacts and datasets used to produce this paper available publicly.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 Background


LLM4FaaS relies on two main components: LLMs for code generation from natural language descriptions and FaaS for application deployment and operation.

### 2.1 Large Language Models (LLMs) in Software Engineering

LLMs offer advancements in software engineering, addressing challenges in code understanding and generation, and improving developer productivity. An LLM is a type of deep learning model trained on extensive text corpora to understand, generate, and manipulate human language. LLMs excel in comprehending and addressing various natural language tasks, including text generation and translation as well as code generation, modification, and verification, which has made them a valuable tool for developers [13, 16, 21, 27, 29, 32]. While the advanced natural language interpretation ability of LLMs are also a promising avenue for the involvement of individuals without programming skills in software development [4, 6, 26], operational concerns remain a considerable barrier.

### 2.2 Function-as-a-Service (FaaS)

FaaS is flexible, fine-grained infrastructure abstraction that minimizes operational overhead and allows developers to focus on building and optimizing application functionality, while an underlying FaaS platform, e.g., managed by a cloud provider, manages and runs individual functions in response to specific events or requests [1, 20]. With features such as scale-to-zero, event-driven architecture, and fine-grained control, the FaaS paradigm is well-suited for software development [9, 11, 15, 18, 30, 31]. By automatically scaling functionality on demand, FaaS platform can quickly respond to changing user needs in real time. FaaS allows developers to concentrate on functions without burden of infrastructure configuration and maintenance, which accelerates the development process, reduces time-to-market, and empowers rapid iteration on key functionality.



**Figure 1: LLM4FaaS proposes an LLM-based no-code application development framework using FaaS for infrastructure abstraction. The prompt constructor combines a user’s application description with a system prompt for an LLM that generates application code. The function deployer uses that code to deploy a FaaS function on a FaaS platform.**

## 3 Architecture

LLMs are excellent tools for transforming natural language software descriptions into executable code, but are by themselves unable to deploy and operate that code for users. FaaS platforms can deploy small pieces of code as scalable, managed applications. With LLM4FaaS, we propose combining these two technologies into an end-to-end no-code application development platform. Our goal is to let non-technical users, i.e., individuals without experience in software development or operation, provide application descriptions in natural language and build fully-managed applications from those descriptions. Examples for such applications can be found, e.g., in the context of smart home automation, simple extensions of enterprise applications, or custom information aggregation from news websites, social media, and web APIs [3]. To support such applications, we design LLM4FaaS as shown in Figure 1.

LLM4FaaS comprises three main components: an LLM for generating user-specified code, a FaaS platform for efficient function deployment, and a bridge that orchestrates

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/Mhwww/llm4faas-python>

prompt construction and function deployment. Users provide their natural language application descriptions to LLM4FaaS, which combines them with a static system prompt in a *prompt constructor*. This structured prompt instructs an LLM to generate code based on the natural language description, including, e.g., details on programming language, application context, API references, and runtime environment. LLM4FaaS then parses the LLM’s answer for code in a *function deployer*. This generated code is deployed on the FaaS platform which abstracts the underlying application infrastructure complexities by providing containerized, auto-scaling environments for on-demand execution.

## 4 Evaluation

We evaluate LLM4FaaS in two different ways: First, we demonstrate the feasibility of LLM4FaaS with a proof-of-concept prototype (§4.1). Second, we explore to which degree our approach can generate ready-to-use applications. For this, we collect a dataset of natural language application descriptions from a group of non-technical users, which we use on our prototype to evaluate the efficacy of LLM4FaaS (§4.2). We present the evaluation results in §4.3 and discuss our findings in §4.4.

### 4.1 Proof-of-Concept Implementation

Our prototype of LLM4FaaS is a Python application that implements the bridge component outlined in §3. We use OpenAI’s GPT-4o model [22] as an LLM through the API, with the model temperature set to 0.7 and maximum token length set to 1,500. We provide details on the system prompt in Appendix B. Our prototype uses the open-source *tinyFaaS* [24] FaaS platform to deploy and manage functions. In our implementation, we use the *tinyFaaS* Python runtime and, accordingly, instruct the LLM to produce code in Python.

### 4.2 Study Design

Our evaluation is based on a dataset of natural language application descriptions provided by real users, which we use to run a number of experiments on our LLM4FaaS prototype.

**4.2.1 Dataset.** Our dataset was collected using a questionnaire answered by 26 users without prior programming experience, asking them to provide natural language descriptions of how they would instruct a smart home to automate four tasks with increasing complexity. We denote these tasks as *easy*, *medium*, *advanced*, and *complex* in the remainder of this paper. We provide a detailed description on the design of our questionnaire and data collection in Appendix A. All natural language descriptions provided by users are originally collected in Chinese language. We do not translate

these answers to preserve their intended meaning and nuance, yet we are aware that this can impact our results (see our discussion in §4.4). In our system prompt, we combine these answers with API descriptions for our fictional smart home.

**4.2.2 Experiments.** We use our dataset of natural language descriptions to evaluate the efficacy of LLM4FaaS. For each of our four tasks, we consider two success metrics: First, we consider the result of LLM4FaaS for a single task description *syntactically correct* if the resulting application can run without errors or exceptions. Second, we also consider it *semantically correct* if it successfully passes our tests and implements the task functionality we outline in our questionnaire. Note that (i) syntactic correctness is a prerequisite for semantic correctness and (ii) a result may also be semantically incorrect if the user fails to understand or articulate the task functionality. This is by design: Although this would not be the fault of the LLM, we do consider the LLM4FaaS approach to fail if the user is unable to build the application they desire. We further discuss this in §4.4.

To isolate the impact of the abstractions of FaaS, we also run our experiments against a baseline without FaaS. Here, we modify the prompt to have our LLM also generate boilerplate code to run the application, including generating command line instructions to run the application. While this is unrealistic, as it requires manual work by us to build and run the applications, it allows us to evaluate to what extent FaaS can actually improve the output and reduce operational complexity of LLM-generated code.


Finally, note that we repeat a subset of experiments to ensure stable results.

## 4.3 Results

We show the syntactic and semantic success rate of LLM4FaaS and our baseline (without FaaS) in Figure 2. LLM4FaaS shows an average syntactic success rate of 87.58% across all tasks, with 91.30% and 90.77% for the easy and medium tasks, respectively. This performance is similar to the baseline, with a mean 88.42% success across all tasks.

LLM4FaaS achieves an average semantic success rate of 71.47%, with the easy and medium task reaching 86.96% and 81.54%, respectively. In contrast, the baseline exhibits a marked decline in semantic success rate, with an average of 43.48%.

**Syntactical Failure Reasons.** LLM4FaaS and the baseline exhibit similar rates of syntactical failures, primarily caused by import errors, improper data handling, and missing code. Import errors dominate, representing 81.82% of LLM4FaaS errors and 57.14% of baseline errors. For LLM4FaaS errors, 13.64% are due to improper data handling, and 4.55% are due



**Figure 2: Syntactic and semantic success rates across 26 user answers for tasks of varying complexity. We compare LLM4FaaS prototype with GPT-4o to a baseline without FaaS.**

to missing code. In contrast, 28.57% of baseline errors are from missing code and 14.29% due to improper data handling.

*Repeat Experiment.* We use three random responses to evaluate performance variation in LLM4FaaS. Specifically, we try to quantify to what extent randomness in LLM code synthesis affects the performance of LLM4FaaS. To that end, we invoke LLM4FaaS with identical natural language descriptions ten times, observing syntactic and semantic success for each repetition.

The results in Figure 3 show that syntactic success remains stable even across repetitions, with at most one unsuccessful invocation out of ten. Semantic success, however, has mixed results for more complex tasks. This shows how randomness in LLM responses even with identical requirements can impact the performance of LLM4FaaS. Note that for semantic correctness especially it is not feasible to simply repeat an invocation until it succeeds, as there exists no way to automatically confirm correctness (unlike with syntactic correctness, where, e.g., import errors can be detected).

## 4.4 Discussion


Our prototype implementation and experimental results demonstrate that the LLM4FaaS approach is feasible and is ready for adoption, especially for tasks of low complexity.

*4.4.1 Impact of FaaS.* While the use of FaaS in LLM4FaaS has no impact of the syntactic correctness of LLM-generated code in our experiments, we do see a significant improvement in semantic correctness. This shows that the reduced complexity of the FaaS programming model allows the LLM to focus its performance on understanding and correctly implementing user intentions rather than boilerplate code that addresses operational concerns.

*4.4.2 Task Complexity.* Our results also clearly show the impact of task complexity on the semantic success rate of LLM4FaaS. We consider two possible causes: First, the increased task complexity provides a challenge for the LLM, which must produce more complex code with more opportunity for failure. Second, increased complexity can also be challenging for our users, who must understand and articulate more complex requirements, a particular challenge for less experienced users. In future work, it would be interesting to compare human software developers as a baseline to determine if a semantic error is caused by incorrect understanding by the LLM or an insufficient user description.

*4.4.3 Model Selection.* We chose GPT-4o as the primary LLM for LLM4FaaS due to its advanced performance and strong performance in non-English languages [22]. LLM4FaaS exhibits practical performance with GPT-4o, even with more complex tasks. Nevertheless, advances in LLMs will likely improve the performance of LLM4FaaS. In future work, we plan to further evaluate our approach with different LLMs, including models specifically trained for software development.

*4.4.4 User Description Language.* The natural language application descriptions collected from our users are all in Chinese language, which may negatively impact the performance of the LLM. While we cannot expect users to learn English to use a no-code development platform – in the same way that we cannot expect them to learn a programming language – we should be aware of the impact of input languages. In future work, we plan to further investigate this impact. We first plan to explore more language-specific models, e.g., those trained on mostly Chinese-language texts. Second, we



**Figure 3: Success rates of ten repetitions of LLM4FaaS code synthesis with three user answers. Syntactic success does not significantly change between repeat LLM invocations, either nine or ten out of ten correct in all cases. For the complex task, repeating an identical invocation can lead to different results.**

also plan to evaluate the feasibility of adding a separate translation step, which may carry the cost of lost nuance in the descriptions.

**4.4.5 Programming Language.** Similar to user description language, the choice of Python as a programming language in our evaluation could also have an impact on LLM4FaaS prototype performance. We choose Python as it is widely used and LLMs are likely to perform well with it, yet we also plan to explore other language performance in future work.

**4.4.6 Feasibility of Feedback Loops.** In LLM4FaaS, we give LLMs only a single opportunity to generate function code before we decide whether it is syntactically and semantically correct. However, LLMs are known to perform well with feedback, e.g., in a chat. It may be equally possible to provide feedback to the LLM on generated code, both from the FaaS platform for syntax errors, e.g., missing imports, and from the user for semantic errors, e.g., clarifying application logic.

## 5 Related Work

The advent of LLMs has led to a variety of research exploring its use in low-code and FaaS software development. Liu et al. [17] compare traditional and LLM-based low-code programming by analyzing the similarities and differences of developer discussions on Stack Overflow over the past three years. They show that LLM-based low-code programming is applicable to a broader range of scenarios and problem domains than its traditional counterpart.

Gao et al. [10] propose a zero-code, token-efficient approach for generating *trigger-action programs* based on user requirements for smart home automation. However, in the absence of FaaS abstractions, their method requires a complex

division of the TAP generation process into multiple sub-tasks, along with the design of a specialized conversational agent for each one. This is a burden that keeps non-technical users from following their approach in practice. Furthermore, there remains a gap between generating trigger-action programs and delivering a functional application to end users which we close through the FaaS platform.

Buchmann et al. [5] envision the use of white-box LLMs for low-code engineering tailored for citizen developers. In their approach, citizen developers design the initial domain model and provide optional natural language annotations for domain rules. The annotations guide LLM to refine Java code generated from the initial model. However, this approach requires users to have prior knowledge of the domain model, limiting its accessibility for non-technical end users. Moreover, achieving accurate code refinement involves iterative annotation rephrasing and repetition.

Hagel et al. [12] propose transforming DSL-based low-code platforms into no-code platforms by leveraging natural language descriptions to generate models. These models are then applied within the DSL-based low-code platform for application customization, significantly reducing task completion time compared to manual modeling. Their study involves technical participants working under supervision to ensure correct model generation. However, this reliance on supervision and technical expertise limits the accessibility for non-technical users. It also raises concerns about the accuracy of models generated by unsupervised users. Additionally, the approach is specific to DSL-based low-code platforms, limiting its broader applicability.

A number of research publications has also considered integrating LLMs with FaaS programming. For example, Esashi et al. [7] use LLMs to automatically generate FaaS workflows,

which can be used to assist cloud developers in configuring FaaS applications. While similar in approach to LLM4FaaS, they target technical users that already have experience in software development, especially in the context of FaaS.

Eskandani et al. [8] outline a vision for AI-powered software systems, theoretically emphasizing using LLMs solving FaaS challenges, e.g., cold starts, statelessness, and vendor lock-in. Kathiriya et al. [14] propose a conceptual architecture for banking applications that leverages LLMs to identify and perform basic data formatting tasks. These two works offer a theoretical perspective on the concepts outlined in our paper and do not provide an implementation or experimental evaluation. To the best of our knowledge, LLM4FaaS is the first no-code application development system based on FaaS that allows non-technical users to build applications from natural language descriptions.

## 6 Conclusion

LLMs are powerful tools to generate code from natural language descriptions, but their adoption by non-technical users is hindered by the complexity of application deployment and operation. With LLM4FaaS, we have proposed leveraging the high levels of abstraction of the FaaS paradigm to handle code execution and operation for non-technical users. Furthermore, we proposed to leverage the reduced complexity of the FaaS programming model to improve correctness of LLM-generated applications. Our evaluation of LLM4FaaS with a proof-of-concept prototype and a new dataset of real user application descriptions has demonstrated the feasibility of this approach and its benefits compared to operating LLM-generated code without FaaS.

## References

- [1] Ioana Baldini, Paul Castro, Kerry Chang, Perry Cheng, Stephen Fink, Vatche Ishakian, Nick Mitchel, Vinod Muthusamy, Rodric Rabbah, Aleksander Slominski, and Philippe Suter. 2017. Serverless Computing: Current Trends and Open Problems. In *Research Advances in Cloud Computing*. Springer.
- [2] David Bermbach, Abhishek Chandra, Chandra Krintz, Aniruddha Gokhale, Aleksander Slominski, Lauritz Thamsen, Everton Cavalcante, Tian Guo, Ivona Brandic, and Rich Wolski. 2021. On the Future of Cloud Engineering. In *Proceedings of the 9th IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E '21)*. 264–275.
- [3] David Bermbach and Erik Wittern. 2020. Benchmarking Web API Quality – Revisited. *Journal of Web Engineering* 19, 56 (2020), 603–646.
- [4] Reinhard Bernsteiner, Stephan Schlögl, Christian Ploder, Thomas Dilger, and Florian Brecher. 2022. Citizen vs. professional developers: differences and similarities of skills and training requirements for low code development platforms. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation (ICERI '22)*. 4257–4264.
- [5] Thomas Buchmann, René Peinl, and Felix Schwägerl. 2024. White-box LLM-supported Low-code Engineering: A Vision and First Insights. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 27th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (MODELS Companion '24)*. 556–560.
- [6] Flavio Corradini, Arianna Fedeli, Fabrizio Fornari, Andrea Polini, and Barbara Re. 2021. FloWare: an approach for IoT support and application development. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Process Modeling, Development and Support (BPMDS '21)*. 350–365.
- [7] Akiharu Esashi, Pawissanutt Lertpongjukorn, and Mohsen Amini Salehi. 2024. Action Engine: An LLM-based Framework for Automatic FaaS Workflow Generation. In *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing (UCC '24)*. 4257–4264.
- [8] Nafise Eskandani and Guido Salvaneschi. 2024. Towards AI for Software Systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM International Conference on AI-Powered Software (AIware '24)*. 79–84.
- [9] Phani Kishore Gadepalli, Gregor Peach, Ludmila Cherkasova, Rob Aitken, and Gabriel Parmer. 2019. Challenges and opportunities for efficient serverless computing at the edge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 38th Symposium on Reliable Distributed Systems (SRDS '19)*. 261–2615.
- [10] Yi Gao, Kaijie Xiao, Fu Li, Weifeng Xu, Jiaming Huang, and Wei Dong. 2024. ChatIoT: Zero-code Generation of Trigger-action Based IoT Programs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 8, 3 (2024), 1–29.
- [11] Poonam Mithailal Gupta. 2023. Integration Of Edge And Fog Computing In Iot-Based Healthcare Applications-A Review. *Journal of Positive School Psychology* 6, 12 (2023), 1940–1957.
- [12] Nathan Hagel, Nicolas Hili, and Didier Schwab. 2024. Turning Low-Code Development Platforms into True No-Code with LLMs. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 27th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (MODELS Companion '24)*. 876–885.
- [13] Kailun Jin, Chung-Yu Wang, Hung Viet Pham, and Hadi Hemmati. 2024. Can ChatGPT Support Developers? An Empirical Evaluation of Large Language Models for Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 21st International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR '24)*. 167–171.
- [14] Satish Kathiriya, Narayana Challa, and Siva Karthik Devineni. 2023. Serverless Architecture in LLMs: Transforming the Financial Industry's AI Landscape. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* 12, 10 (2023), 2131–2136.
- [15] Vojdan Kjorveziroski, Cristina Bernad Canto, Pedro Juan Roig, Katja Gilly, Anastas Mishev, Vladimir Trajkovikj, and Sonja Filiposka. 2021. IoT serverless computing at the edge: Open issues and research direction. *Transactions on Networks and Communications* 9, 4 (2021), 1–33.
- [16] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. In *Proceedings of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36 (NeurIPS '23)*. 1–15.
- [17] Yongkun Liu, Jiachi Chen, Tingting Bi, John Grundy, Yanlin Wang, Ting Chen, Yutian Tang, and Zibin Zheng. 2024. An Empirical Study on Low Code Programming using Traditional vs Large Language Model Support. *arXiv:2402.01156 [cs.SE]* (2024).
- [18] Antonio Maciá-Lillo, Higinio Mora, Tamai Ramírez-Gordillo, and Antonio Jimeno-Morenilla. 2023. Serverless Edge Providers for AI Applications. In *Proceedings of the The International Research & Innovation Forum (RIIFORUM '23)*. 697–705.
- [19] Mohammadreza Malekabbasi, Tobias Pfandzelter, Trever Schirmer, and David Bermbach. 2024. GeoFaaS: An Edge-to-Cloud FaaS Platform. In *Proceedings of the 12th IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E '24)*. 66–71.

- [20] Garrett McGrath and Paul R Brenner. 2017. Serverless computing: Design, implementation, and performance. In *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE 37th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems Workshops (ICDCSW '17)*. 405–410.
- [21] Ansong Ni, Sridi Iyer, Dragomir Radev, Veselin Stoyanov, Wen-tau Yih, Sida Wang, and Xi Victoria Lin. 2023. Lever: Learning to verify language-to-code generation with execution. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML '23)*. 26106–26128.
- [22] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o Documentation. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models#gpt-4o> Last accessed: December 10, 2024.
- [23] Tobias Pfandzelter. 2023. Serverless Abstractions for Edge Computing in Large Low-Earth Orbit Satellite Networks. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Middleware Conference Doctoral Symposium (Middleware '23)*. 3–6.
- [24] Tobias Pfandzelter and David Bermbach. 2020. tinyFaaS: A Lightweight FaaS Platform for Edge Environments. In *Proceedings of the Second IEEE International Conference on Fog Computing (ICFC '20)*. 17–24.
- [25] Trever Schirmer, Nils Japke, Sofia Greten, Tobias Pfandzelter, and David Bermbach. 2023. The Night Shift: Understanding Performance Variability of Cloud Serverless Platforms. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Serverless Systems, Applications and Methodologies (SESAME '23)*. 27–33.
- [26] Greg Smith, Michael Papadopoulos, Joshua Sanz, Michael Grech, and Heather Norris. 2020. Unleashing innovation using low code/no code—The age of the citizen developer. *Prism* 1 (2020), 60–75.
- [27] Priyan Vaithilingam, Tianyi Zhang, and Elena L Glassman. 2022. Expectation vs. experience: Evaluating the usability of code generation tools powered by large language models. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts (CHI EA '22)*. 1–7.
- [28] Minghe Wang, Trever Schirmer, Tobias Pfandzelter, and David Bermbach. 2023. Lotus: Serverless In-Transit Data Processing for Edge-based Pub/Sub. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Edge Systems, Analytics and Networking (EdgeSys '23)*. 31–35.
- [29] Justin D Weisz, Michael Muller, Stephanie Houde, John Richards, Steven I Ross, Fernando Martinez, Mayank Agarwal, and Kartik Talamadupula. 2021. Perfection not required? Human-AI partnerships in code translation. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI '21)*. 402–412.
- [30] Jinfeng Wen, Zhenpeng Chen, Yi Liu, Yiling Lou, Yun Ma, Gang Huang, Xin Jin, and Xuanzhe Liu. 2021. An empirical study on challenges of application development in serverless computing. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE '21)*. 416–428.
- [31] Rich Wolski, Chandra Krintz, Fatih Bakir, Gareth George, and Wei-Tsung Lin. 2019. Cspot: Portable, multi-scale functions-as-a-service for iot. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC '19)*. 236–249.
- [32] Frank F Xu, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Graham Neubig. 2022. In-ide code generation from natural language: Promise and challenges. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 31, 2 (2022), 1–47.

## A Questionnaire Design

To determine how well LLM4FaaS performs, we evaluate it in a smart home scenario with four automation ideas in varying levels of complexity, i.e., remote device control (*easy*), scheduled plans (*medium*), comfort homes (*advanced*), and

energy-efficient homes (*complex*). These automation ideas increase in complexity, covering a range of common smart home needs.

We design a questionnaire to gather users’ natural language descriptions of these four smart home automation ideas. The resulting descriptions serve as the primary input for the LLM to generate code snippets, which will then be deployed to FaaS platform.

Our questionnaire contains:

- an introduction that includes the questionnaire objective, participants information, and data processing statement,
- the context of questions to familiarize participants with project context before proceeding with questions, i.e., a smart home layout and a list of available smart devices along with their functionality (Table 1),
- four questions about smart home automation ideas (our tasks) for participants to provide their natural language descriptions.

We avoid leading questions and design our questions to be sufficiently general to not guide answers while being clear enough for our participants to understand them. Our questions for task descriptions are arranged in increasing order of complexity to enhance understanding. We also collect users’ professional occupations to confirm that they have no relevant technical expertise. Before sending our questionnaire to users, we conduct test runs with five additional participants.

Our tasks are as follows:

- (1) *Easy*: turn on/off a specific device in the smart home in response to an event
- (2) *Medium*: routinely turn on/off a set of devices at a specific time of day
- (3) *Advanced*: automatically adjust a specific device in the smart home in response to a sensor reading
- (4) *Complex*: automatically turn on/off a set of devices in response to a sensor reading

## B Prompt Design

LLM4FaaS combines natural language application descriptions with system prompts to guide the LLM to generate code for a FaaS platform. Our system prompt has three components:

- Contextual information and key elements needed for the LLM to generate a response, e.g., the directive to generate FaaS code
- The user’s natural language description
- Reference materials that the LLM should use, e.g., API descriptions

We show the prompt used in our experiments (§4) in Listing 1. We provide source code for a smart home library that

**Table 1: Smart devices and their functionality**

<b>Smart Device</b>	<b>Functionality</b>
Light	Turn on/off, set brightness level (low, medium or high)
Cleaning robot	Turn on/off, run a cleaning routine
Music player	Turn on/off, play playlist ('morning vibes', 'daily news', etc.)
Coffee machine	Turn on/off, make a coffee (Americano, cappuccino, etc.)
Heater	Turn on/off, set a temperature (e.g., 25°C)
Air conditioner	Turn on/off, set a temperature (e.g., 25°C)
Humidifier	Turn on/off
Curtain	Turn on/off
TV	Turn on/off
Socket	Turn on/off
Door	Open/close
Window	Open/close
Temperature sensor	Read temperature (°C)
Humidity sensor	Read relative humidity (%)
Light sensor	Read light intensity (strong, normal, or weak)
Smoke sensor	Read smoke levels (safe or warning)

**# Preparation**

Hi, I want you to provide me a 'function.py' file for my current smart home project based on my given functional description. Four code files in my project, i.e., sensor.py, actuator.py, home\_plan.py and config.py, are in the 'home' folder. The required 'function.py' should locate in the 'functions' folder, function.py should contain main function. I will first give you the functional description, then give you the 4 python source code.

**# Functional Description**

```
<!-- INSERT HERE -->
```

**# Source Code**

```
## sensor.py
...
## actuator.py
...
## home_plan.py
...
## config.py
...
```

**Listing 1: LLM4FaaS Prompt: The prompt explicitly requires a Python function designed to address specific user needs within a smart home scenario, with references offering foundational implementations, APIs, and related methods for seamless integration.**

can interact with our smart home and that is available for the LLM to use to read sensors or talk to devices.

Our baseline prompt further includes the instruction to build a full Python application (rather than a FaaS function) and provide a single command that is to be executed from a Linux command line.