

FLaaS: Enabling Practical Federated Learning on Mobile Environments

Kleomenis Katevas*
Brave Software
London, UK

Diego Perino
Telefonica Research
Barcelona, Spain

Nicolas Kourtellis
Telefonica Research
Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

Federated Learning (FL) has recently emerged as a popular solution to distributedly train a model on user devices improving user privacy and system scalability. Major Internet companies have deployed FL in their applications for specific use cases (*e.g.*, keyboard prediction or acoustic keyword trigger), and the research community has devoted significant attention to improving different aspects of FL (*e.g.*, accuracy, privacy). However, there is still a lack of a practical system to easily enable FL training in the context of mobile environments. In this work, we bridge this gap and propose FLaaS, an end-to-end system (*i.e.*, client-side framework and libraries, and central server) to enable intra- and inter-app training on mobile devices, in a secure and easy to deploy fashion. Our design solves major technical challenges such as on-device training, secure and private single and joint-app model training while being offered in an “as a service” model. We implement FLaaS for Android devices and experimentally evaluate its performance in-lab and in-wild, on more than 140 users for over a month. Our results show the feasibility and benefits of the design in a realistic mobile context and provide several insights to the FL community on the practicality and usage of FL in the wild.

1 INTRODUCTION

Machine Learning as a Service (MLaaS) refers to a set of tools (*e.g.*, libraries, models, APIs) offered by cloud computing platforms enabling customers to easily use ML while minimizing their cost and risk. MLaaS is offered by many companies (*e.g.*, Amazon Web Services [5], Google Cloud [18] or Microsoft Azure [27]), and has become popular in the last years, a market expected to reach tens of billions in 5 years time [2].

MLaaS follows a centralized approach raising both technical and privacy concerns. On the one hand, data collection, processing and sharing generate scalability, storage, communication and processing challenges. On the other hand, a centralized design can expose users to privacy risks if data are not properly managed. Furthermore, ML models and tools themselves are vulnerable to potential attacks compromising data used and privacy of data owners. While recently enforced regulations (*e.g.*, GDPR) are trying to mitigate these risks with heavy penalties to data operators, the research community has proposed various Privacy-preserving ML (PPML) methods such as Federated Learning (FL) and (secure)Multi-Party Computation (MPC), also using Differential Privacy (DP) or Trust Execution Environments (TEE) to limit privacy risks.

In FL, the model is trained on user devices close to the data, and is being adopted by major industry leaders [7, 31]. These deployments are based on proprietary code, embedded in owner products and typically designed on a per application (app) basis. This clearly

limits the usage of FL to a few players able to sustain cost and risk of developing this technology. To change this status quo recent start-up or open source efforts (*e.g.*, [3, 11, 14, 30]) aim to provide FL tools for customers or end-users, while [22] advocates for an FL-as-a-Service system in mobile settings. Despite these early efforts, many system challenges remain to be solved to materialize this vision in the mobile context. First, there is lack of libraries supporting ML training on mobile devices both for single app, or joint training across multiple apps. Second, there is no support for cross-app data or model sharing: this requires secure and private mechanisms for storage, communication and permissions management across apps. Finally, existing FL methods do not provide an easy to use model for app developers based on simple APIs and tools as MLaaS counterparts.

In this paper, we focus on solving these challenges and present FLaaS, the first practical FL framework for mobile environments. Our design includes a client side middleware and library enabling a third-party mobile app to train an FL model on-device, either independently or in a joint fashion with other third-party apps. Cross-app training is based on a set of secure and private communication and storage primitives, while the library makes seamless the integration of FL into existing apps. FLaaS also includes a centralized component to automatically orchestrate the FL process, with an easy interface for app developers. Our design is end-to-end and includes several system optimizations required to deploy it in the wild in a scalable and robust fashion.

We implement FLaaS for Android based mobile devices (*i.e.*, client side elements), while leveraging a popular cloud-based platform for the centralized component. The complete source-code of our system is available under MIT License¹. Finally, we evaluate FLaaS feasibility, overhead and performance via in-lab and real world experiments with more than 140 real users. The former allows us to evaluate the cost of the system under controlled settings: we observe devices spend a limited amount of time (*i.e.*, few minutes) and resources (*i.e.*, energy and CPU) in training of an ML model during an FL round, and communication with the system. The evaluation with real users allows us to analyze the ML performance and cost in real settings, as well as derive critical insights for any FL system for mobile environments in the wild. We observe that even with a limited numbers of devices (a few tens) actually reporting trained models, FLaaS builds a useful global FL model while having very limited impact on user experience. To the best of our knowledge this is the first work to experimentally evaluate a practical FL system for third-party mobile apps in the wild.

*Work performed while at Telefonica Research

¹<https://github.com/FLaaSResearch>

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

2.1 FL overview

FL trains a ML model (typically a deep learning model) in a decentralized fashion without the need for users/devices to share nor reveal their data to a central entity, thus limiting privacy risks. Differently from distributed learning, participating users are a large number of heterogeneous mobile or IoT devices, potentially unreliable, geographically distributed and there are no assumptions on data distribution across them.

An FL training process begins with the *initialization* step where a general model is instantiated by a central entity (server). At this step, the model architecture is selected and parameters are initialized either randomly or from available private or public knowledge. Then, an iterative process starts between the server and the user devices. At each iteration, called *FL round*, the server verifies *device availability* and shares the general model to a subset of them selected with a given *scheduling* policy. These user devices perform local training on their own data by executing stochastic gradient descent (*SGD*) based on a given set of hyperparameters (*e.g.*, number of epochs, batch size). Once local training is finalized, such user devices send the updated model parameters to the server that aggregates the updates and generates a new global model using one of the various aggregation methods (typically Federated Averaging [25]). The iterative process ends when a given number of rounds is reached, or the model converges to a satisfying loss, test accuracy, etc.

2.2 FL Frameworks

The industrial, research and open source communities have proposed various frameworks for distributed or federated learning. On the industrial side, large Internet companies, such as Apple and Google, are using FL on Android and iOS phones for different tasks such as keyboard prediction and error correction, or acoustic keyword trigger [7, 31]. These frameworks are tailored for mobile devices but they are designed on a per-app basis and embedded in company products.

Training model with FL across companies (*i.e.*, cross-silo FL) has also received attention from major industry players, such as Nvidia, IBM, and Intel, as well as startups with focus on health or finance [8]. While these frameworks are relevant to our work, they are proprietary and not designed for generalized use in mobile apps. Similarly, other startups are also providing proprietary frameworks for FL or distributed training, but not for mobile environments [3]. Finally, all these efforts, including the cross-silo FL solutions, do not tackle the problem of how to enable third-party apps to collaborate and jointly build an ML model that solves same or new ML problems, on the user device. This paper proposes the first practical solution to enable this joint modeling between apps.

On the academic or open source community side, different frameworks have been proposed for decentralized, and/or secured PPML: Open source frameworks developed for simulations, optimization, high level programming language, or benchmarking for FL and decentralized computation systems, such as TensorFlow Federated (TFF) [36], coMind [10] or LEAF [9], though none of these frameworks have support for mobile environments. Also, *OpenMined* [30] proposes the libraries *PySyft* and *PyGrid* by employing *MPC*, homomorphic encryption, *DP* and *FL* for secured and *PPML* modeling.

Finally, Flower [24] is a framework close to this study’s goals, allowing FL to be deployed on heterogeneous devices, such as phones and tablets. However, while it supports Android-based devices using TFLite [38], it assumes an RPC connection always exists between server and FL clients, who are assumed to be always available for training. This design decision makes it unsuitable for ad-hoc or asynchronous FL modeling on mobile devices. Also, Flower does not support joint-app modeling, nor assumes the “as-a-service” paradigm, both which are essential design elements of FLaaS.

Overall, FLaaS provides an easy to use open-source framework for mobile app developers, currently not provided by the past solutions. Specifically, we advance the state-of-art in FL by designing, implementing and evaluating: i) a middleware for mobile phones enabling per/cross-app on-device training; ii) a set of secure and PP mechanisms to enable cross-app training; iii) a mobile app library and easy-to-use API for app developers to enable FL usage in a seamless fashion; iv) a robust end-to-end design for system scalability and in the wild deployment. Furthermore, we are the first to provide an in-depth evaluation of the benefits of cross-silo FL in the context and at the level of mobile apps (not at cross-silo servers), and in-the-wild analysis of this proposal.

3 FLAAS DESIGN PRINCIPLES

We discuss 5 main challenges that FLaaS addresses in providing a practical end-to-end FL system for mobile apps.

1. Easy to use. FLaaS needs to be easy to incorporate in existing apps, as well as provide a simple interface to configure the FL training process. For the first issue, we design two on-device components: a service and a library. The service is to be installed in the devices participating in the FL process. The library is to be integrated in existing apps and can be used by calling its APIs, thus, requiring to add only a few lines of code. For the second issue, we provide a user interface (UI) similar to the ones provided by existing MLaaS.

2. Multi use case coverage. FLaaS should be able to support at least two types of ML modeling scenarios:

i) Single-app FL modeling: Typically, a specific app is interested in building a ML model to solve a specific task: *e.g.*, a streaming music app that wants to model its users’ music preferences to provide better recommendations, and therefore wants to utilize the local data per user/device.

ii) Joint-app FL modeling: A group of two or more apps, concurrently installed on the same device, want to collaborate and build a shared model to solve a task, identical for each app, but on more, shared and homogeneous data. For example, Instagram, Messenger and Facebook (owned by the same company, *Meta*) may want to build a joint ML model for better image recognition, on images of similar quality and scope, but coming from each app’s local data.

3. On-device training. As discussed, currently there are no libraries enabling intra- or inter-app training for mobile apps, and to support our envisioned use cases. Thus, we design an on-device training module building on the TensorFlow Lite framework that we extend to be integrated and support the different functionalities of FLaaS, and to provide the different training modes, *i.e.*, single-app and joint-app.

4. Secure and private training. FLaaS needs to enable a secure and private training process. First, we enable a secure communication channel between apps embedding the library and the FLaaS service supporting different types of data, *i.e.*, numerical, text and binary. Second, data and model storage on device are secured using per app and service spaces with permissions specified by developers, and enforced using an on-device data management engine. Finally, we need to guarantee secure authentication and communication between the FLaaS back-end and the training client devices. This is achieved via authentication tokens for apps and FLaaS service, and using state of art encrypted communication mechanisms. We assume developers and the system are trusted, and that attacks to the training process or models, such as membership/attribute/data inference attacks [29, 33, 35] can be solved by integrating in our design solutions with TEEs such as [28], or by injecting DP noise during the FL process [15].

5. Production ready. FLaaS needs to be deployable in the wild and to deal with production environment challenges such as scalability and robustness. To this goal, we leverage several system and software engineering optimizations both at the back-end (*e.g.*, easy scalability for load balancing, notification service, etc.), and device (*e.g.*, opportunistic ML training based on available battery, optimized data storage and inter-app communication for joint-app modeling).

4 FLAAS DESIGN

In this section, we describe the main components of FLaaS. Figure 1 provides an overview of the FLaaS architecture, along with the list of steps required to perform an FL training process. The four core system elements are the following:

- *Admin Interface* (§ 4.1): The main front-end interface for app developers, which is used to bootstrap, configure, execute and monitor an FL project within FLaaS.
- *Server* (§ 4.2): A scalable, cloud-hosted service orchestrating and monitoring the FL process on developer’s behalf.
- *Client Devices* (§ 4.4): The set of mobile devices that could execute the FL tasks on the apps’ local data.
- *Notification Services* (§ 4.3): Mobile push notification services used for push communications to the client devices for new FL projects and rounds execution: typically Apple Push Notification (APNs) [20] and Firebase Cloud Messaging (FCM) [21] are used in the mobile context.

4.1 Admin Interface

This is the administrator UI for developers to bootstrap, configure, monitor, and terminate an FL project executed within FLaaS. Developers can use the UI for registering their apps with the system, produce the authentication tokens that will be used in their app and configure the data and model access policies to be enforced by FLaaS at device level. Thus, they can create new FL projects to be executed from FLaaS-registered devices, make a pre-selection of participating apps and devices, and initiate the FL training process. For details on device registration with FLaaS see § 4.4.

Each app developer interested in running an FL project using FLaaS can configure their project with a number of available system, ML and FL parameters:

- *ML model architecture*: A list of available ML models that can be used in the on-device ML training task. New models can also be uploaded by the developer, as long as they are supported by the on-device ML training engine.
- *ML model training mode*: 1) *Single-app (SA)* (*i.e.*, a model per app); 2) *Joint Samples (JS)* (*i.e.*, data shared between apps); 3) *Joint Models (JM)* (*i.e.*, model trained on data, then model shared between apps). More in §4.4.
- *ML model training epochs*: Number of epochs (or iterations) the SGD will be executed on the data of an app, while training the model, during a given FL round.
- *Policy Management*: Depending on model training mode selected, different policy options are available to the developer: how data or model parameters would be shared between which apps, for how long, etc. More in § 4.4.
- *FL training rounds**: Number of iterations of the FL process (*i.e.*, global model sent to clients, trained locally, and returned to server for aggregation).
- *FL training round duration**: Maximum time duration that an FL training round can last.
- *FL model loss**: Minimum value of optimization function loss to be achieved by the aggregated FL model.
- *Device power availability*: Power of devices that should participate in the FL project: only devices power-plugged AND/OR devices battery-powered, with battery level $> X\%$ (if defined). Lower $X\%$ allows more devices to participate.
- *Number of available devices*: Number of devices that need to be reached based on the device power availability setting, for an FL training round start request to be sent to available and responded devices.
- *Number of model parameters received*: Number of ML model parameters that should be successfully received for an FL training round to be considered valid.

*: Can be used as a stopping criterion for the FL round.

When the developer defines a new project using the UI (step 3, Fig. 1), the project is pushed to the FLaaS Server (step 4) for (i) storing its configuration, (ii) executing the project in the available client devices, (iii) monitoring the project’s health and progress, (iv) terminating the project when stopping criteria are reached. The Admin UI is highly scalable using a Load Balancer to accommodate concurrent developers managing their FLaaS projects.

4.2 FLaaS Server

It is a cloud-hosted service in charge of executing the FL project previously created at the Admin Interface, while coordinating the Client Devices. It consists of the following modules: 1) Database, 2) Device Schedulers, 3) Model Aggregator, 4) Device Workers. Next, we explain each of them.

4.2.1 Database (DB). The FLaaS system requires two separate databases responsible for storing and querying data: a *Relational DB* and a *Object Storage DB*. On the one hand, the *Relational DB* is an SQL-based database for hosting project-related metadata. These include the FL project configuration as defined by the developer through the Admin Interface, information reported by the devices (*e.g.*, power availability, status, step 1+2), authentication credentials, project status (training or waiting), etc. On the other hand, *Object*




Figure 1: Overview of FLaaS ML modeling architecture. We assume a set of client devices participating in FLaaS device infrastructure, and periodically reporting their status through the back-end’s REST API (1) to the DB for logging (2). An app developer uses the Admin Interface to create a new FLaaS FL project (3), whose configuration is stored in the DB (4). The Device Scheduler detects the new FLaaS project (5), queries the device statuses from the DB (5), and sends an FL training request using its Notification Service provider (6a) to external services such as APN and FCM (6b). Each device’s FLaaS Local receives the FL training request (7) and requests from the participating third-party apps to receive either their local samples for training, or to train their own models (8a, b and c). It then conducts the necessary on-device model training (if it received samples) or model aggregation and averaging depending on the training mode. When a substantial number of reported models is received by the Server (1), the Device Scheduler instructs the Model Aggregator to accumulate the received models (9a and 9b), marks the FL round as complete, and continues with the next FL round until the project is complete (*i.e.*, stopping requirements are reached).

Storage DB is a file storage for hosting files. These include the ML model parameters received by Client Devices, ML performance results (in JSON), ML performance plots created and to be shown to the developer via the Admin Interface, etc.

4.2.2 Device Schedulers. This is a set of workers, one per FL project, configured to be executed every T minutes. T can be set by the system administrator depending on the FL project load, device availability and FL project requirements. The role of this module is to verify the status of all active FLaaS FL projects, which can either be at *waiting* or *training* mode, and execute the related management tasks per project. Each new FL project has an initial state of *waiting* and for the scheduler there are two possible conditions:

- 1. FL project is in *waiting* state.** In this case, the scheduler executes a query on the Relational DB to identify how many devices meet the `device power availability` criterion defined by the developer via the Admin Interface. This query also returns the list of devices available across the system that have the desired power status (battery of at least $X\%$ and/or plugged-in), for an FL training round to be performed for the specific FL project. If the `device power availability` criterion is reached, a new FL round can start: the specific scheduler changes the state of the FL project to *training*, stores this information to the Relational DB for future reference and sends a *Device FL Training Request* through the *Notification Service* to the devices identified as available (see next paragraph for details).
- 2. FL project is in *training* state.** In this case, the *Device Scheduler* checks how many model training responses (model training parameters and on-device ML performance results) have been received from devices. If the FL round is *completed* (*i.e.*, enough models were received), the *Device Scheduler* requests from the *Model Aggregator* to apply Federated Aggregation (FedAg) to the parameters

of received models to generate a new global FL model (see details next), and sets the project in *waiting* state to begin a new round.

An alternative option supported by the system is to wait for FL training round duration expiration before it performs FedAg and subsequent steps: this would potentially collect more models from clients thus improving accuracy, but would extend the round duration to its maximum. If the FL training round duration is reached and there are not enough ML models received (as defined earlier), the specific FL round is marked as *invalid*, and the project is set to *waiting* state to begin a new FL round.

This iterative process is followed until the requirement of number of FL training rounds is fulfilled. Alternatively, the developer may also define a desired FL model loss for the project to be reached, before it is completed. If this parameter is set, at the end of each round, the scheduler also requires from the *Model Aggregator* to assess the global ML model’s performance such as Test Accuracy (evaluated at the Server) and optimization function loss (as reported by the Client Devices), and persists them on the Object Storage DB. Thus, the Scheduler continues to initialize FL training rounds for the specific project until any of the desired FL model loss or FL training rounds are reached.

4.2.3 Model Aggregator. This component requests from the *Object Storage DB* for all ML models (weights) reported by devices for a specific FL project and FL round. Then, it accumulates and applies the appropriate FedAg algorithm (*e.g.*, FedAVG [25]) in order to produce the global FL model of the next (or final) FL round of the given project. Optionally, *DP* applied in a centralized fashion [17] can be enforced to the produced model for protecting the users’ privacy from relevant model attacks, such as data reconstruction [16, 19] and other types of inference attacks [19, 26].

4.2.4 Device Workers. This module contains a series of containerized workers responsible for interacting with the client devices for FL model training assigning and responses received. Each worker includes a dedicated REST-based communication API that allows the interaction of the worker with the client devices involved in a particular FL project. Such interaction is initiated by the client device (*e.g.*, to report its device status). However, it can also be indirectly triggered by the Server through a push notification (*e.g.*, a training request) to the device, that in turn contacts the Server. Which worker to handle what FL project is decided by the system Load Balancer, as explained in the next paragraph. Each worker includes the following REST endpoints, all exposed to the client devices using a token-based authentication:

- **Report Availability:** Device status (*e.g.*, battery level, charging state, memory available, etc.) reported to the system and used by the Device Scheduler to find opportune moments for requesting device training tasks.
- **Get model:** Download the model’s parameters of a particular round of a project.
- **Join Round:** Declares that a device has received the training request and will execute the requested training task of a particular round.
- **Submit Model:** Upload the parameters of a trained model to the server.
- **Submit Results:** Upload training results (*i.e.*, loss, device performance during training, etc.) to the server.

4.2.5 Load Balancer. This is the entry point of the Server when interacting with the Client Devices. It automatically distributes all HTTP(S) requests sent to the Server’s hostname(s) to the Device Workers. It also monitors the performance of the Device Workers and automatically creates new instances when required (*i.e.*, when the Server is under heavy network traffic load due to several, simultaneous devices reporting status, models, results, etc.).

4.3 Notification Service

The Notification Service (NS) is used for secure, asynchronous and one-way communication from the Server to Client Devices. While it can generally depend on various types of technologies (*e.g.*, message brokers, TCP connections, etc.), in the context of mobile computing it takes the form of a Push NS. These are cloud-based, highly efficient services for iOS and Android to propagate information to a previously registered mobile app, either in a form of a visual popup, but also invisible notifications that deliver JSON structured data to an app. They use secure TCP communication to directly push data to a device’s registered app through dedicated cloud services provided by Apple (APNs) [20] and Google (FCM) [21]. To utilise such services, a NS Provider is required: either custom made or an existing one (*e.g.*, Amazon SNS, Pushwoosh, etc.). Silent notifications (*i.e.*, notifications that do not appear to the user but wake up the app in the background) are usually received with an unspecified delay from the app.

In our system, such communication is used for sending FL training requests to the participating devices. Each training request sent to devices consists of the following fields:

- **Request ID:** A unique ID per request.




Figure 2: Inter and intra-app modules on Client Devices

- **Expiration Date:** The date after which the request will be ignored from the participating device.
- **Project ID:** A unique ID of the FL project that the ML training will be conducted.
- **FL round:** The round for which this request is relevant.
- **ML training mode:** A selection between JS or JM, as explained in § 4.4.

As it is apparent from the information included in each notification, these messages from the Notification Service are used to alert the devices of pending FL training tasks in the system, that they can contribute to if available.

4.4 Client Devices

Last, but yet most important, piece of FLaaS is the set of client devices in charge of computing the ML training tasks orchestrated by the Server for the execution of a FLaaS FL project. On such devices, there are two main modules: FLaaS Local and FLaaS Library. These modules facilitate the FLaaS on-device functionalities (overviewed in Figure 2): App authentication, inter-app communication, access policy management, ML model training, data storing, and status reporting. Each function is elaborated next.

4.4.1 FLaaS Local. This is a standalone service that needs to be installed on the device and provides the core FL functionality to the device in accordance to the requests sent by the Server. We do not make any assumption on how this service is installed. We envision this service can be pre-installed on the device by the device or OS manufacturer or provider. Alternatively, an interested third-party FLaaS app developer can recruit a device owner to install its app with proper user incentives (*e.g.*, a promise for better app experience due to ML model personalized on user data).

FLaaS Local provides authentication and secure communication of the device to the Server, and periodically reports the device status (akin to a heartbeat), with different details such as battery level, charging state, connectivity state, to the Server for consideration. The set of statuses from all participating client devices is in fact the one collected and analyzed by the Server to decide which devices to invite for upcoming FL training tasks (as explained in § 4.2.2).

FLaaS Local is also the module that receives messages from the *Notification Service* with configurations for pending FL project tasks related to specific third-party apps. These task configurations are then communicated to the appropriate apps for execution, within their FLaaS Library (see next).

4.4.2 FLaaS Library. This is a mobile app library integrated within each FLaaS-enabled third-party app willing to participate in FL training processes. This library has a set of simple APIs that

are called by the developer in the app code. More particularly, the API consists of calls to register the app’s secure token (created through the Admin Interface) and to provide controlled (secured through policies) access to data the app is willing to share. Under the hood, it implements a set of functions that allows the app to securely communicate with FLaaS Local to receive ML modeling configurations based on FL project of relevance to the app, execute the appropriate on-device ML training, and share data or model parameters with FLaaS Local.

4.4.3 FLaaS Security. Our system depends on two communication channels:

Back-end communication of FLaaS Server with each user’s FLaaS Local. Security, integrity and confidentiality are automatically enforced using secure *TLS* communication. Device authentication is implemented using a set of pre-installed authentication tokens, saved within the device’s keystore system (*i.e.*, Android keystore or iOS keychain).

Inter-app communication between FLaaS Local and third-party apps. An app authenticates with the Server via its FLaaS Library through the FLaaS Local, to enable inter-app communication and collaborative ML model training. We use a symmetric key approach [40], based on authentication tokens produced by the Developer through the Admin Interface and also securely stored to the device’s keystore system. Each token has an expiration date but can also be invalidated by FLaaS Local at any moment a developer needs to. All communication takes place within the device and can support encrypted numerical, text and binary types of data. The purpose of this channel, materialized via the FLaaS Library instantiated in each app and FLaaS Local, is to enable communication between FLaaS Local and apps, and communicate project-related settings, get training samples, or trained models, etc. In the future, we will explore advanced cryptographic methods using public key cryptography with external certification authority.

4.4.4 On-device ML Training. There are two types of ML training supported by FLaaS and executed on the client devices: Single-app and Join-app FL modeling. In the first type, each app interested in building their own FL model can utilize FLaaS to build it via the typical FL approach. In the second type, FLaaS allows apps to jointly build models to solve the same ML task, in a privacy preserving way.

Both of these options require ML modeling at the app or at the FLaaS Local level. This is performed by an on-device ML training engine that exists in FLaaS Library. Next, we elaborate on the two types of on-device ML training.

1. Single-app FL modeling. In this, each app trains a model on its own data only. The configuration for this training is received by the FLaaS Library of the specific app involved, and includes the model to be trained, access policy requirements on the local data to be used (see details next), and model hyperparameters. If the developer requires DP-noise to be injected, this is done at this ML training stage.

2. Joint-app FL Modeling. Third-party apps interested in collaborating in order to build a joint ML model that solves the same ML task faced by these apps (*e.g.*, object recognition on images from both Facebook and Instagram apps) have two ML training modes offered by FLaaS: JS and JM.

2a. Joint Samples (JS) training mode: The apps share training samples with FLaaS Local. These samples are appropriately packaged to a pre-agreed by the FLaaS developers format. Furthermore, DP-noise may be added at each app, in a pre-training stage. FLaaS Local checks the received samples from each app for formatting, and then merges them before performing ML model training on all. If these third-party apps require it, FLaaS Local may also inject further DP-noise during the ML training. FLaaS Local then communicates with the Server the resulting ML model parameters (weights), in a usual FL fashion.

2b. Joint Models (JM) training mode: The apps conduct the ML model training individually using their local samples, as in the Single-app modeling mode (with or without DP-noise). Then, each app shares only its ML model parameters with FLaaS Local, which then conducts FedAVG on the received models and produces a joint model. It finally communicates to the Server the joint ML trained weights.

4.4.5 On-device FLaaS data management. To support these two training modes, FLaaS Local and Library are responsible for the following data management functions:

Access Policy Management: A policy enforcement engine (*e.g.*, [6]) defined by the FLaaS developer in the Admin Interface. The developer can define:

- Which data (for *JS*) or ML models (for *JM*) to share with FLaaS Local for the Joint-app training.
- What type of pre-processing (*e.g.*, data filtering) (for *JS*) should be applied before sharing.
- How much DP-noise should be added on samples before sharing (in case of *JS*), or while training the model (in case of *JM*) (following best practices in FL with DP [17]).
- Which other apps can receive these shared data or ML models (for now, only FLaaS Local can receive them, but future FLaaS training modes could require sharing data and/or models with other apps).
- How many times to allow this sharing between apps: a) only once, b) N times (*i.e.*, for N FL rounds), c) until certain deadline is reached.
- Minimum loss of the locally trained model (in case of *JM*).

Data Store: This is a secure data store of FLaaS Local and FLaaS Library (one for each involved app). FLaaS Local can temporarily host binary data such as training samples sent by apps and prepared for on-device training by FLaaS Local, or ML weights sent by apps and prepared for FedAVG by FLaaS Local. Each app’s FLaaS Library can host training weights sent by FLaaS Local and used as basis for in-app ML training. Each datum has an expiration condition and automatically gets deleted when the condition is met (*e.g.*, trained model is sent). Assuming developers and system are trusted, these functionalities can be securely executed with security mechanisms described in § 4.4.3.

5 FLAAS IMPLEMENTATION

Here, we provide all implementation details for the four FLaaS main components presented earlier, *i.e.*, Admin Interface, Server, Notification Service and Client Devices.

5.1 FLaaS Back-end

The back-end incorporates the roles of both the Admin Interface and Server, hosted in Heroku Cloud Application platform [1], under the EU region. The platform uses Linux-based shared containers called *Dynos* to enable easy deployment and scaling of the FLaaS modules. In fact, we use Standard-1X Dynos (512MB RAM) and leverage platform load balancing and scheduling functions. The NS Provider is hosted in a separate organization domain (Pushwoosh [4]). Overall, the back-end is implemented in 1.6k lines of Python code.

Admin Interface: This module is hosted on Heroku using the *gunicorn* web server v20.1.0. An instantiation of the Web interface is executed inside a Web Dyno container. A Heroku Load Balancer allows scaling to more Dynos to accommodate concurrent developers interacting with FLaaS.

Databases: All data are stored into two separate databases, as explained earlier. A PostgreSQL v13.4 instance is used for the Relational DB, and an Amazon S3 Data Store is used as an Object Storage DB.

Device Schedulers: Each scheduler is implemented within a separate one-off (worker) Dyno that is only instantiated periodically every T minutes, as defined earlier. This periodic launching is handled by the *Heroku Scheduler service*, by starting a new Dyno (one per FL project) to perform its assigned tasks: 1) start a new or pending FL round (if device availability requirement is met), 2) stop an earlier FL round if completion criteria have been met, 3) launch the Model Aggregator for preparation of new global model, 4) terminate the FL project if completion criteria have been met.

Device Workers: Each Worker is implemented within a separate, continuously running Web Dyno. All HTTPS traffic is handled by a Load Balancer instantiating new Dynos to handle elevated incoming workload from Devices. Each Device Worker uses Django v3.2 under Python v3.8.12 and has a dedicated REST API based on Django REST framework v3.12.4. Communication between Device Workers and Client Devices is encrypted using TLS v1.3 over HTTPS.

Notification Service Provider: We use the Pushwoosh push notification services [4] configured with both FCM (for Android devices) and APN (for future extension to iOS).

5.2 Client Devices

Supported Mobile Operating System: The FLaaS currently supports Android-based (≥ 8.0) devices, since iOS does not provide (yet) in-app communication features necessary for instructing third-party apps to perform on-device joint ML training, either using shared data or shared models.

Device Authentication: Device authentication with the back-end is implemented using JWT with *django-rest-framework-simplejwt* v5.0.0. The framework is configured to produce tokens expiring after 10 minutes, but can be refreshed automatically by the client using *refresh tokens* function, with rotating expiration time of 1 day.

FLaaS Library: Third-party apps participating in FLaaS projects implement this library to: receive configuration setups and perform ML tasks in single-app or JM modes, send samples to FLaaS Local for JS mode, or communicate model parameters to FLaaS Local for FedAVG. The Library is implemented with 1.5k lines of Java code, with:

- TensorFlow Lite v2.6.0: Deep learning framework used for on-device ML inference.
- *transfer_api* (from Google): Example api supporting CPU-based on-device training via TensorFlow Lite.
- WorkManager v2.7.0: Android framework for scheduling deferrable, asynchronous tasks within apps.

FLaaS Local: This app can be implemented as an OS core service, or a regular app. The former implementation requires changes in Android design, and thus impacts all stakeholders involved in the chain, making it more difficult to roll-out. However, device and OS manufacturers could opt for such choice and include FLaaS Local in their customized OS. In the latter implementation, the app can be standalone, or included in other apps (*e.g.*, a phone provider main app).

The limitation of using the regular app option is the *App Standby Bucket* system introduced by Android 9 to manage app's requests for resources depending on their frequency of usage. Apps that are not essential (*i.e.*, whitelisted by the phone vendor or OS) and/or have not been used in a while by the user receive lower priority or placed on standby. As FLaaS Local does not require user interaction, the app would receive lower priority. Therefore, the app may not be immediately responsive to FLaaS notifications, and may not execute, or significantly delay tasks and message processing. This issue can be solved with two approaches: 1) FLaaS Local app is whitelisted in the unrestricted bucket list, *i.e.*, the common case of apps installed by phone vendors. 2) FLaaS Local is included in a frequently used app to remain in the high priority bucket. Regardless of the implementation decision, the design of § 4 remains the same.

Currently, we implement FLaaS Local as a standalone app and use the *whiteList* approach. The implementation counts 2,414 lines of Java code and uses the following:

- FLaaS Library v1.0.0, to handle app authentication, inter-app communication, on-device ML training.
- Retrofit v2.9.0, an HTTP networking library for managing the communication with the back-end's REST API.
- Pushwoosh Android SDK v6.3.5 as a Push Notification library for receiving and parsing the push notification messages sent by the back-end.

Inter-App Communication: This functionality is required to exchange messages (*i.e.*, dictionary-based numerical and text) and data (*i.e.*, in binary format such as training samples and model parameters) between FLaaS-enabled apps and FLaaS Local. In Android, inter-app communication for both messages and data can be achieved with explicit, manifest-declared *Broadcast Receivers*. Similar communication can also be achieved with the *ContentProvider API* or Android 10's only *Scoped Storage*. In our implementation, we use the approach of Broadcast Receivers for simplicity.

App Workers: For executing ML tasks in the background, we utilise Android's WorkManager API, a robust framework for executing tasks (workers) asynchronously for optimal usage of device resources. Depending on training mode (*JS* or *JM*), a different combination of workers is used:

JS: Step A: Download model parameters and request samples from third-party apps. Step B: FLaaS Local conducts model training. Step C: Submit model to server.

JM: Step A: Download model parameters and distribute to involved third-party apps. Step B: Each app performs model training. Step C: FLaaS Local conducts model aggregation & averaging. Step D: Submit model to server.

All workers are executed sequentially when they belong to the same app. The only exception is the on-device training per app in JM mode, where the OS can decide to execute in parallel. Delays between workers can be introduced by the OS for better battery performance. We identify these delays or pauses in our experiments with real devices, discussed next.

6 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

This experimental evaluation aims to assess FLaaS system overhead and ML performance while computing FL projects, in both client devices and server, with in-lab experiments and deployment on real user devices. In fact, we go beyond in-lab settings and devices to assess the practical deployability and functionality of FLaaS’s on-device components on real user Android devices. To this goal, we design and execute a large-scale user study with 144 real devices (§ 6.2). In this study, we compare the ML performance of a Deep Neural Network (DNN) model trained using FLaaS, as opposed to ideal simulation conditions that past studies have presented (§ 6.3). Finally, we measure device cost of executing such on-device ML training in different training modes on real devices, in the wild (user study). We compare with in-lab settings (test devices) for more granular data collection (§ 6.4).

6.1 Experimental Setup

6.1.1 Third-party apps. We create three simple apps (named Red, Green and Blue or *RGB*), with 101 lines of Java code each. Each app includes FLaaS Library v1.0.0 for supporting system functions and to demonstrate the simplicity and efficiency of a third-party app registering with FLaaS.

6.1.2 ML Dataset. As a dataset for the ML model training and testing, we use *CIFAR-10* [23], a benchmark dataset commonly employed by FL researchers. We do not anticipate drastic changes in system overhead if we use other datasets. This dataset consists of 50k training samples and 10k test samples of images (32×32×3) representing one of 10 types of objects, or classes. We partition the training set into subsets of 150 samples, and each subset is assigned to an instance of a third-party app (Red, Green and Blue) to be installed on a user device. Two data distributions are constructed from *CIFAR-10* data: i) Independent and Identically Distributed (IID), where an app has samples of all 10 classes; ii) Non-IID, where an app has samples only from two random classes.

6.1.3 ML model & hyperparameters. As a base DNN model we use MobileNetV2 [34], which is pre-trained with ImageNet [12] dataset with image size of 224×224. As a head of the DNN (used for model personalization on user local data), we use a single dense layer with 32 neurons and *RELU* activation function, followed by *softmax* activation function (SGD optimizer with 0.001 learning rate, 0.0001 kernel regularizer, and 0.0001 for bias regularizer). Furthermore, we applied typical parameter values used in other FL works with *CIFAR-10*: 20 samples per batch and 20 epochs per batch. We experimented with 10 up to 30 FL rounds.




Figure 3: Portion of unique devices available for FL training per hour, during the study. Error bars: 1 st. deviation.

6.1.4 Performance Metrics. We measure the performance of the ML model trained in FL fashion with FLaaS on client devices, by computing Accuracy when testing the global FL model on 1000 samples of *CIFAR-10* test set. This ML performance is measured on FL global models built in ideal scenarios (via simulation) when all user devices would participate in all FL modeling rounds, and compared to real scenarios with real user devices freely joining and completing, or dropping their FL rounds depending on their actual phone usage. The simulation environment uses Keras TensorFlow v2.6.0 under Python v3.8.12. It replicates the system implementation but depends on a JSON-based input for instructing the total rounds and user participation per round.

We assess the cost of on-device FLaaS functionalities by measuring computing cost via CPU utilization (in %), time delay (in seconds), and battery discharge (in mAh) taken to compute said ML tasks. These metrics are computed in a coarse-grained fashion on real user devices while training ML models, as well as in a fine-grained, lab-controlled fashion on test devices using the BatteryLab infrastructure [39].

6.2 FLaaS in the Wild: A User Study

We assess system deployability and overhead by designing a user study and deploying the various FLaaS components on real user devices. Recruited users are paid for their participation over two weeks providing their consent for:

- (1) Installing four mobile apps: FLaaS Local and RGB apps, each pre-loaded with *CIFAR-10* 150 samples.
- (2) The FLaaS Server to receive regular status from their device, to decide if it is available for local ML training inside the third-party apps and FLaaS Local.
- (3) The FLaaS Server to invite their device to join FL projects and perform ML training on the pre-loaded data.

Notice that these ML models are never trained on user personal data, but instead only on the *CIFAR-10* sets of pre-allocated samples in each of the RGB apps installed by users. In fact, this user study followed strict principles of ethical information research and the use of shared measurement data [13, 32], as well as ethical, privacy and security policies of our institution, in compliance with GDPR on getting informed consents from users for handling their personal data.

6.2.1 User statistics and device availability. We actively recruit users for two weeks, asking each to participate for at least 2 weeks to allow us enough time to perform essential ML training tasks. However, users are free to join and exit the study at any moment creating a dynamic set of client devices available for FLaaS-related ML tasks. The overall duration of the user study is 4 weeks, with a total of 144 unique users from 5 EU countries joining and installing the FLaaS apps for at least 1 day. We observe a fairly balanced breakdown of users with respect to gender (61% male, 39% female) and age groups (18-29y: 34%, 30-39y: 41%, 40-49y: 17%, 50+y: 8%). Furthermore, we identify 116 unique models of Android phones, from 15 unique smartphone manufacturers. The top 3 are Samsung (44%), Xiaomi (24%) and Huawei (12%).

We found an average of 94-99% of total (or 76-94 unique) devices available per day for FLaaS ML tasks. This ratio was fairly constant across all days of the week. When studying device availability on a more granular level (*i.e.*, per hour, Fig. 3), we find that there are 37-82% of total (or 33-73 unique) devices available for training at any given hour of the day. We observe a slight diurnal behavior of user devices (since they are a proxy of users being active on their phones), with a slight dip in availability during early morning hours, and an increase during work and dinner hours.

6.2.2 User perception of FLaaS impact. Users are also prompted 3 times per day to fill-in a simple user survey of 4 questions to provide feedback on 1) their mobility through the day (scale 1-5), 2) their phone usage through the day (scale 1-5), 3) their phone performance through the day (with 3 possible answers, *e.g.*, if during the day, their phone performed slower or was heating more often than usual) and 4) the battery performance through the day (with 3 possible answers, *e.g.*, if during the day, their phone was running out of battery more often than usual).

We observe these prompts produced 3 corresponding spikes in device availability at 10am, 2pm and 6pm CET (Fig. 3). We collect 3780 survey responses across users and time. In summary, 90.8% remarked no change in phone performance, 8.5% noticed some change (device was slower/warmed-up a bit), and only 0.8% noticed a drastic change (device was very slow/warmed-up a lot). Also, 73.7% remarked no change of phone battery, 22.7% noticed their battery was somewhat lower than usual and only 3.6% noticed a drastic change on battery/had to charge it more than usual. Perhaps expectedly, we noticed a significant correlation between users' declared mobility and usage of phone ($\rho=0.365$, $p\text{-value}<2.2e^{-16}$), stating the obvious: users use their phone more often when they moved. Similarly, we find a significant correlation between users' declared phone overall performance and phone battery consumption ($\rho=0.413$, $p\text{-value}<2.2e^{-16}$). These results confirm that users who noticed their phone having performance slowdown, also found their battery performing worse.

Summary: Overall, we find more than 94% of registered devices available per day for ML training tasks (~33-73 unique devices at any hour of day), and a slight diurnal behavior of user devices in their availability. Also, users appear to be OK with the way their phone is performing during the day and while FLaaS ML training tasks are executed at the same time as their daily phone tasks. These results demonstrate that running FL model training on real users'

phones is practical when utilising available OS APIs, even with the introduced restrictions that affect the duration of a FL round.

6.3 FL Performance in the Wild

The user study aims to investigate to what extent real devices can execute FL tasks with a variable number of devices. During the study, we execute more than 50 different FL projects, while varying experimental parameters such as:

- type of local ML modeling: single-app vs. joint-app
- type of joint-app modeling: *JS* vs. *JM*
- number of apps participating in training: {1, 2, 3}
- type of data distribution per app: *IID* vs. *NonIID*
- FL round duration: {1, 1.5, 2, 8, 12, or 24} hours

Due to limited space, here, we only present results from the more challenging scenarios, involving joint-app FL modeling with the 3 apps (RGB) computing models, either in *JS* or *JM* mode, and using *IID* or *NonIID* data. In fact, we compare the ML test accuracy achieved per experimental configuration (under 90 minute long FL rounds) on the FLaaS infrastructure using incrementally smaller subsets of user devices:

- All registered user devices (~100 at any moment) are assumed available and join FL project rounds (results from simulation on GPU cluster).
- Only user devices that reported availability are assumed to join FL project rounds; on average 30-70 devices per hour (results from simulation on GPU cluster).
- Only user devices that actually joined an FL project, but not necessarily reported a model; on average, 30-70 devices per hour (results from simulation on GPU cluster).
- Only user devices that were available, joined the FL project and actually reported a model trained for the FL project; ~20-40 devices per hour (results from real user devices).

Results in Figure 4(left) show that with a sufficient number of client devices joining an FL project (*e.g.*, a few tens of devices), FLaaS can produce a useful model. In particular, even though the number of user devices joining and delivering ML models is much lower than the ideal, the model trained performs comparatively well. We also note that *IID* data lead to ML models with 36.43% better accuracy, on average, than *NonIID* data, at the end of the 10th round. However, this is to be expected, as also found in other FL studies. *NonIID* data provide a more realistic view of how data would be distributed across users, since real users cannot be expected to have examples of all classes of a data distribution.

Finally, from Figure 4(center) we note a higher ML performance of models trained by building them while sharing samples with FLaaS Local (*i.e.*, *JS*), vs. training individual models, one per third-party app, and then averaging them at FLaaS Local (*i.e.*, *JM*). In fact, *JS* mode leads to a model with 6.57% higher test accuracy than *JM* mode for *IID* data, and 32.22% higher for *NonIID* data, at the end of the 10th round. This improved performance is expected since sharing data with FLaaS Local allows it to train the joint model on 3x more data and thus optimize it better, than averaging models from the RGB apps, trained on 1/3 of samples. Similar improvements in test accuracy (10.53% for *IID* and 37.5% for *NonIID*) are also

observed when comparing joint to single-app modeling (results not shown due to space limitation).

Summary: The ML performance results show the feasibility of our design. With a few 10s of devices reporting trained models, FLaaS builds a useful FL model, comparable to ideal scenarios of all devices participating and reporting models. We also show that joint-app modeling with shared samples, in comparison to joint models, achieves 6.57% (32.22%) higher test accuracy for IID (NonIID) data. Expectedly, NonIID data distribution, while being a more realistic scenario, leads to models with lower accuracy.

6.4 FLaaS Device Cost

6.4.1 Real User Devices. Having shown that real user devices with their intermittent participation in FL rounds do enable an FL project to build a well-performing ML model, next we assess the cost that different FLaaS functions impose on the executing device. In particular, we look into how much time is required for each of the four fundamental functions of a FLaaS ML training task to be completed from devices participating in the user study:

- (1) Join the FL round (includes communication with Server + Relational DB)
- (2) Download model parameters of current global FL model from Server (includes communication with Server + Object Storage DB)
- (3) Load local samples into on-device ML training engine
- (4) Conduct the ML training on local app data

In Figure 4(right), we study the Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) of total time taken to complete an FL round, for the joint modeling types (*JS* vs. *JM*). This duration incorporates potential pauses of the FL training process, if, for example the device OS put to sleep the ML training process. Interestingly, the great majority of FL rounds, in both *JS* and *JM* modes have a short duration: the 80th percentile duration of an FL round is 6.15 minutes for *JS* and 4.65 minutes for *JM*. This means FLaaS or other FL-based ML systems can train full FL rounds in short periods of time. However, there are straggler devices needing hundreds of minutes to complete the same FL tasks, creating a long tail distribution. In fact, the 90th(99th) percentile for the two modes is 12.1(48.7) minutes for *JS* and 40.3(2527.3) minutes for *JM*.

Then, in Figure 5, we measure average time needed per FLaaS-related device function. Note that the plots are independent of data distribution (IID vs. NonIID), but dependent on type of joint modeling (*JS* vs. *JM*). We find that the most costly function is to load the data on device and prepare them for ML training, with median time 1.94 and 0.80 minutes, for *JS* and *JM*, respectively. The rest of functions are very fast: median time for both *JS* and *JM* being 0.01 minutes when joining a round, and 0.02 minutes when downloading the global model parameters (weights). Finally, there is a difference when conducting ML training for *JS* and *JM*, with a median of 0.39 and 0.18 minutes, respectively.

6.4.2 In-Lab Test Devices. Next, we dive deeper into the cost of FLaaS FL training function on a mobile device by performing several experiments with three popular Google Pixel devices (specs shown in Table 1) as test devices in a controlled setting: the devices are forced to perform the ML task on IID data, from beginning

Table 1: Device Specification (CPU and Memory)

Model	Device Specification
Pixel 3a (P3a)	Octa-core (2x2.0 & 6x1.7 GHz), 4GB RAM
Pixel 4 (P4)	Octa-core (1x2.84, 3x2.42 & 4x1.78 GHz), 4GB RAM
Pixel 5 (P5)	Octa-core (1x2.4, 1x2.2 & 6x1.8 GHz), 8GB RAM

(received notification of new ML task) until the end (delivery of ML model to FLaaS Server) without any breaks. All devices were updated to the latest version of the OS (Android 12) and with deactivated OS-related automated process that would influence the measurements (*i.e.*, automatic updates, adaptive battery and brightness). During the evaluation, all devices are connected to a stable 5GHz WiFi network while CPU and Battery Discharge data are collected using the Android Device Bridge (ADB) tool. All RGB apps are whitelisted (*i.e.*, set to Unrestricted Battery usage) aiming to measure the most optimal scenario where all apps are responsive to the ML training requests, without further scheduling delays introduced by Android’s Work Manager.

Table 2 shows the average time taken for a device to perform the ML training task, for the three test devices and two modes of training (*JS* vs. *JM*) with a total of 450 samples. On the one hand, we notice that the average time of the older device (Pixel 3a) is always higher than the other two, newer devices. This is true regardless of the modeling mode. Also, and as expected, the *JS* is slower than *JM* since apps have to first transfer data to FLaaS Local, and then Local to train the model on them. On the other hand, *JM* builds 3 individual models, even in parallel, if the OS’s Work Manager supports it. Interestingly, this parallelized execution in *JM* is reflected in the results for CPU usage, which is, on average, 74.7% higher on *JM* than *JS*, across devices. Finally, the reduced execution time, even at higher CPU usage, leads to overall reduction in consumed power from *JM*: 41% lower than *JS*.

Summary: Overall, a regular user device is expected to spend small amount of time for completing the FL round: a median of 131.7s and 69.6s in optimal case (test devices) and 178.2s and 85.2s in regular case (real users), for *JS* and *JM*, respectively. Notably, there are straggler devices that may require significantly more time to complete the same task. This means a practical FL system needs to account for such behavior and stop waiting for these devices very early on in the FL round. Also, the most costly function in the process is loading data for the ML training. Future work could further optimized this step. Further, *JS*, in comparison to *JM*, requires 90.00% more execution time, but uses 74.68% less CPU. However, it requires 40.96% more power to process the same number of samples but in 1 app (FLaaS Local). Finally, older devices (*e.g.*, Pixel 3a) require more execution time (44.2% and 36.6% increase) and more power (35.2% and 21.7% increase) to perform the same ML task in *JS* and *JM*, respectively.

It is worth mentioning that in the Android ecosystem, and in contrast to Apple’s iOS, on-device training is only available through TensorFlow Lite with limitations: only utilizing CPU (and not available GPU) and no support of multi-processing. Future releases from Google TensorFlow could allow great performance increases, as indicated in their roadmap [37].

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented FLaaS, the first practical Federated Learning system for mobile environments, that supports single and




Figure 4: Test accuracy achieved per FL round, for different experimental configurations: Joint Samples (left) vs. Joint Models (center) with IID vs. NonIID included. Right: Total duration of FL round, across projects using JS or JM mode.




Figure 5: Average time taken to perform different functions related to participation in an FL project using JS (left) or JM (right) mode.

Table 2: Cost for on-device ML training: Training duration, CPU usage, and Power discharge. Means and standard deviation (SD) computed on distribution of each metric on each device and modeling mode, over 10 rounds.

	Duration(sec)		CPU usage(%)		Power Discharge (mAh)	
	JS Mean(SD)	JM Mean(SD)	JS Mean(SD)	JM Mean(SD)	JS Mean(SD)	JM Mean(SD)
P3a	167.3(13.1)	85.3(1.5)	17.9(2.1)	29.7(0.6)	56.8(8.6)	37.8(0.5)
P4	117.1(1.1)	62.1(0.8)	15.4(0.1)	27.8(0.4)	41.3(0.9)	29.7(0.5)
P5	115.0(0.4)	62.8(0.9)	16.1(0.1)	28.8(0.4)	42.7(1.0)	32.4(0.7)

joint-app ML modeling, in a secure, private and “as-a-Service” fashion. We implemented FLaaS for Android-based mobile devices, and performed extensive in-lab and in the wild experiments with 144 real users. Our results show the feasibility of the FLaaS design: with a few tens of devices, FLaaS can build a useful ML model having an almost negligible impact on user phone experience and requiring a few minutes to perform each FL round. We also showed the impact of different strategies for joint ML model training across third-party mobile apps, and presented several insights on real devices with actual users’ availability and opportunities for FL training. The complete source-code of our system will be available upon acceptance of the paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project received funding from EC under grant agreements No 830927 (Concordia), No 871370 (Pimcity) and No 871793 (Accordia).

REFERENCES

[1] Heroku cloud application platform. <https://www.heroku.com>, 2021.
 [2] Machine learning as a service market size. <https://www.prnswire.com/news-releases/machine-learning-as-a-service-market-size-is-projected-to-reach-22-10-bn-in-2027-growing-with-39-2-cagr-says-brandessence-market-research-301408538.html>, 2021.

[3] Machine learning for decentralized data. <https://integrate.ai>, 2021.
 [4] Pushwoosh notification service. <https://www.pushwoosh.com>, 2021.
 [5] AMAZON. Machine learning on aws. <https://aws.amazon.com/machine-learning/>, 2020.
 [6] BAGDASARYAN, E., BERLSTEIN, G., WATERMAN, J., BIRRELL, E., FOSTER, N., SCHNEIDER, F. B., AND ESTRIN, D. Ancile: Enhancing privacy for ubiquitous computing with use-based privacy. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society (2019)*, pp. 111–124.
 [7] BONAWITZ, K., EICHNER, H., GRIESKAMP, W., HUBA, D., INGERMAN, A., IVANOV, V., KIDDON, C., KONEČNÝ, J., MAZZOCCHI, S., MCMAHAN, H., OVERVELDT, T., PETROU, D., RAMAGE, D., AND ROSELANDER, J. Towards federated learning at scale: System design. In *2nd SysML Conference (2019)*.
 [8] BONAWITZ, K., KAIROUZ, P., MCMAHAN, B., AND RAMAGE, D. Federated learning and privacy: Building privacy-preserving systems for machine learning and data science on decentralized data. *Queue* 19, 5 (oct 2021), 87–114.
 [9] CALDAS, S., MEHER KARTHIK DUDDU, S., WU, P., LI, T., KONEČNÝ, J., MCMAHAN, H. B., SMITH, V., AND TALWALKAR, A. Leaf: A benchmark for federated settings. <https://leaf.cmu.edu>, 2019.
 [10] COMIND. comind: Collaborative machine learning. <https://comind.org>, 2019.
 [11] DATAFLEETS. Datafleets: The federated intelligence platform. <https://www.datafleets.com>, 2020.
 [12] DENG, J., DONG, W., SOCHER, R., LI, L.-J., LI, K., AND FEI-FEI, L. ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database. In *CVPR09 (2009)*.
 [13] DITTRICH, D., AND KENNEALLY, E. The menlo report: Ethical principles guiding information and communication technology research. Tech. rep., 2012.
 [14] DML. Decentralized machine learning. <https://decentralizedml.com>, 2018.
 [15] DWORK, C., ROTH, A., ET AL. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science* 9, 3-4 (2014), 211–407.
 [16] GEIPING, J., BAUERMEISTER, H., DRÖGE, H., AND MOELLER, M. Inverting gradients—how easy is it to break privacy in federated learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.14053 (2020)*.
 [17] GEYER, R. C., KLEIN, T., AND NABI, M. Differentially private federated learning: A client level perspective. In *NIPS Workshop: Machine Learning on the Phone and other Consumer Devices (2017)*.
 [18] GOOGLE. Ai platform. <https://cloud.google.com/ai-platform>, 2020.
 [19] HITAJ, B., ATENIESE, G., AND PEREZ-CRUZ, F. Deep models under the gan: information leakage from collaborative deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (2017)*, pp. 603–618.
 [20] INC., A. Setting up a remote notification server. https://developer.apple.com/documentation/usernotifications/setting_up_a_remote_notification_server, 2021.
 [21] INC., G. Firebase cloud messaging. <https://firebase.google.com/docs/cloud-messaging>, 2021.
 [22] KOURTELLIS, N., KATEVAS, K., AND PERINO, D. Flaas: Federated learning as a service. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Distributed Machine Learning (New York, NY, USA, 2020)*, DistributedML’20, Association for Computing Machinery, p. 7–13.
 [23] KRIZHEVSKY, A., HINTON, G., ET AL. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.
 [24] MATHUR, A., BEUTEL, D. J., PORTO BUARQUE DE GUSMAO, P., FERNANDEZ-MARQUES, J., TOPAL, T., QIU, X., PARCOLLET, T., GAO, Y., AND D. LANE, N. On-device federated learning with FLOWER. In *On-device Intelligence Workshop at the 4th Conference on Machine Learning and Systems (MLSys) (April 2021)*.
 [25] MCMAHAN, H. B., MOORE, E., RAMAGE, D., AND AGÜERA Y ARCAS, B. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS) (2017)*.
 [26] MELIS, L., SONG, C., DE CRISTOFARO, E., AND SHMATIKOV, V. Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP) (2019)*, IEEE, pp. 691–706.

- [27] MICROSOFT. Azure machine learning. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/machine-learning/>, 2020.
- [28] MO, F., HADDADI, H., KATEVAS, K., MARIN, E., PERINO, D., AND KOURTEL-
LIS, N. Ppfl: Privacy-preserving federated learning with trusted execution envi-
ronments. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Mobile
Systems, Applications, and Services* (New York, NY, USA, 2021), MobiSys '21,
Association for Computing Machinery, p. 94–108.
- [29] NASR, M., SHOKRI, R., AND HOUMANSADR, A. Comprehensive privacy
analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against
centralized and federated learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and
Privacy (SP)* (2019), IEEE, pp. 739–753.
- [30] OPENMINED. Openmined. <https://www.openmined.org>, 2020.
- [31] PAULIK, M., SEIGEL, M., MASON, H., TELAAR, D., KLUIVERS, J., VAN
DALEN, R., LAU, C. W., CARLSON, L., GRANQVIST, F., VANDEVELDE, C.,
AGARWAL, S., FREUDIGER, J., BYDE, A., BHOWMICK, A., KAPOOR, G.,
BEAUMONT, S., ÁINE CAHILL, HUGHES, D., JAVIDBAKHT, O., DONG, F.,
RISHI, R., AND HUNG, S. Federated evaluation and tuning for on-device person-
alization: System design & applications, 2021.
- [32] RIVERS, C. M., AND LEWIS, B. L. Ethical research standards in a world of big.
F1000Research 3 (2014).
- [33] SABLAYROLLES, A., DOUZE, M., SCHMID, C., OLLIVIER, Y., AND JÉGOU, H.
White-box vs black-box: Bayes optimal strategies for membership inference. In
International Conference on Machine Learning (2019), pp. 5558–5567.
- [34] SANDLER, M., HOWARD, A., ZHU, M., ZHMOGINOV, A., AND CHEN, L.-C.
Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks, 2018.
- [35] SHOKRI, R., STRONATI, M., SONG, C., AND SHMATIKOV, V. Membership
inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on
Security and Privacy (SP)* (2017), IEEE, pp. 3–18.
- [36] TENSORFLOW. Tensorflow federated: Machine learning on decentralized data.
<https://www.tensorflow.org/federated>, 2020.
- [37] TENSORFLOW, G. Tensorflow lite roadmap. [https://www.tensorflow.org/lite/
guide/roadmap](https://www.tensorflow.org/lite/guide/roadmap), 2021.
- [38] TENSORFLOW, G. Deploy machine learning models on mobile and iot devices.
<https://www.tensorflow.org/lite>, 2022.
- [39] VARVELLO, M., KATEVAS, K., PLESA, M., HADDADI, H., AND LIVSHITS,
B. Batterylab, a distributed power monitoring platform for mobile devices. In
Proceedings of the 18th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (2019), pp. 101–
108.
- [40] YASSEIN, M. B., ALJAWARNEH, S., QAWASMEH, E., MARDINI, W., AND
KHAMAYSEH, Y. Comprehensive study of symmetric key and asymmetric key
encryption algorithms. In *IEEE International Conference on Engineering and
Technology (ICET)* (2017).