Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning: A Fully Distributed Collaborative Machine Learning



Table of Contents

- Decentralization of Machine Learning
- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
 - Characteristics
 - Theory
 - Benchmark Evaluation
 - Application
- Future Research Directions
- Conclusion

Table of Contents

- Decentralization of Machine Learning
- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
 - Characteristics
 - Theory
 - Benchmark Evaluation
 - Application
- Future Research Directions
- Conclusion

<< Background >> Machine Learning was Server-Centric and Data-Oriented.

 They collected data to a server,
 They formed Big Data,
 They trained ML models in their server internally.

ML is good at Image processing, Speech recognition, etc. Their interest was Data.

The Internet was just a platform for collecting data.

Mode 000

<< Background >> Federated Learning: Collaborative Machine Learning without Centralized Training Data https://ai.googleblog.com/2017/04/federated-learning-collaborative.html Emergence of Federated Learning (2017 – by Google, etc.)

Privacy Regulations (e.g., GDPR in Europe) motivated the emergence of Federated Learning (FL) which allows <u>machine learning without collecting user data</u>.

Point 2: FL can aggregate ML models

Point 1: without exchanging user data



However, this is still a Server-Client system!! (which is Centralized) Let's fully decentralize the system.

Toward Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL) Server-Client Architecture → Peer-to-Peer Architecture



- 1. Each node individually trains its ML model using its local data.
- 2. Each node encounters the other.
- 3. They can communicate with local wireless communication media such as <u>Wi-Fi Ad Hoc mode</u> or <u>Bluetooth</u>

Toward Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL) Server-Client Architecture → Peer-to-Peer Architecture



- 1. Each node individually trains its ML model using its local data.
- 2. Each node encounters the other.
- 3. They can communicate with local wireless communication media such as <u>Wi-Fi Ad Hoc mode</u> or <u>Bluetooth</u>
- 4. They exchange and aggregate the models to develop a new model.

5. This enables collaborative training.

Why nodes should collaborate?



1. Distribution of data on a node is not the same. e.g.,

- Noodle lovers may have a lot of noodles photos.
- Railway lovers may have a lot of railway photos.

This is called Non-IID. (Not Independent and Identically Distributed)

2. If the training dataset is non-IID, the trained model will not be generalized for prediction.
e.g., A noodle lovers device may recognize the photo of railway as noodle.

3. Mixture of the models will allow the generalization of model.

Hideya Ochiai et. al., "Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning – A Fully Distributed Cooperative Machine Learning", arXiv, 2022.

Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)

Encountering many nodes leads to generalization of the model.



9

Table of Contents

- Decentralization of Machine Learning
- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
 - Characteristics
 - Theory
 - Benchmark Evaluation
 - Application
- Future Research Directions
- Conclusion

Characteristics of Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)

- 1. No third-party (or broker) mechanisms
 - Learning among peers without any third-party intervention.
- 2. No power structure
 - In Server-Client architecture, the service provider has the power.
 - Server-Client architecture can lead to a Master-Slave structure.
 - Every node is flat in Peer-to-Peer systems.
- 3. WAFL can realize multi-vendor scenarios
 - Anyone can join the system if collaboration protocols are defined.

Theoretical Aspects of Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning



Review of Machine Learning Mechanism in General



(*) θ denotes a set of model parameters

If it hits 95 out of 100, the accuracy is 95%.

The learning algorithm of WAFL





How WAFL allows collaborative training (2/4): The Case of Individual Training at Node B

LOSS

If the distribution of the dataset is different, the minimum location is different.



How WAFL allows collaborative training (3/4): Not fully generalized without model aggregation

- Minimum point for D^A is optimized for Node A, but not for Node B (D^B).
- 2. Minimum point for D^B is optimized for Node B, but not for Node A (D^A).



How WAFL allows collaborative training (4/4): Aggregation finds an optimal model for Node A and B

LOSS

The model aggregation,

$$\theta^A \leftarrow \frac{\theta^A + \theta^B}{2}$$

attracts encountered models with each other in the parameter space θ .

This search for the optimal point for both nodes.



WAFLで学習が成立する仕組み(5/5): 収束の様子・・2次元での考察

モデルの合成結果

 $\theta^{A} \leftarrow \frac{\theta^{A} + \theta^{B}}{2}$ は必ずしも、盆地内にあるとは限らない

その後行われる調整、 $\theta^{A} \leftarrow \theta^{A} - \eta \nabla \left(\frac{\sum_{x,y \in D^{A}} loss(f(x,\theta^{A}),y)}{|D^{A}|} \right)$ によって、盆地内に引き戻される。

繰り返し行うことによって、 双方の共通の盆地にたどり着く



Table of Contents

- Decentralization of Machine Learning
- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
 - Characteristics
 - Theory
 - Benchmark Evaluation
 - Application
- Future Research Directions
- Conclusion

A Demonstration of Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning with Benchmark Evaluation





Benchmark Evaluation

- Why benchmark evaluation ?
 - For reproducibility, and standard
 - For understanding the technical characteristics
- ML model: Multilayer Perceptron (MLP)
- Dataset: MNIST
- Mobility Pattern
 - Static: 4 topologies
 - Dynamic Case 1: 3 Random Waypoint Mobility (RWP)
 - Dynamic Case 2: 3 Community-Structured Environment (CSE)
- Simulation
 - We carried out the experiment by simulation on a single computer.



Yann et.al., THE **MNIST** DATABASE of handwritten digits, 1998. http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/



Benchmark Evaluation: Experiment Setting 90% Non-IID MNIST Dataset

Training Data Distribution

90% of Node *n's* samples are label *n* samples.

Node	LO	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L8	L9	Summary
0	5341	76	64	76	61	57	57	61	74	50	5917
1	79	6078	67	52	57	59	58	79	59	68	6656
2	58	67	5374	80	64	68	87	73	57	61	5989
3	68	74	73	5537	51	56	72	65	67	77	6140
4	73	67	80	67	5301	59	53	69	70	64	5903
5	60	66	57	74	68	4896	61	59	66	69	5476
6	52	78	53	56	58	66	5312	56	65	65	5861
7	67	90	66	74	55	61	65	5683	63	77	6301
8	59	80	59	54	63	48	88	67	5268	57	5843
9	66	66	65	61	64	51	65	53	62	5361	5914
Summary	5923	6742	5958	6131	5842	5421	5918	6265	5851	5949	60000

Testing Data Distribution

All the labels appear with equal probability – which is *independent and identically distributed* (IID) We used the standard MNIST testing dataset.



2-layer fully-connected neural networks (FC-NNs)

Cross Entropy Loss Adam Optimizer Learning rate 0.001 Coefficient of Aggregation 1.0

Benchmark Evaluation

- 1. Evaluation on Static Network Topologies
 - If nodes are statically deployed, e.g., in wireless sensor network scenarios, the network topology becomes static.
 - We carried out WAFL assuming the four network topologies.



Epoch 5000



Finally, misclassifications were drastically reduced.

In the beginning, many testing records were misclassified into 9. E.g., True 4 was misclassified into 9. True 7 was 9.

ዔ

Epoch 1

static_line (node=9, epoch=1) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.02 0.00 0.01 0.18

2 0.01 0.00 0.79 0.04 0.02 0.00 0.02 0.02 0.07 0.04

3 0.00 0.00 0.02 0.80 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.03 0.13

static

0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.61 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.37

0.02 0.00 0.01 0.07 0.01 0.52 0.02 0.00 0.10 0.25

6 0.02 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.88 0.00 0.01 0.05

7 0.00 0.00 0.02 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.67 0.01 0.28

8 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.02 0.01 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.80 0.11

Predicted label

 \sim





Benchmark Evaluation Accuracy Trend (Static Network Topologies)



Benchmark Evaluation 2. Evaluation on Dynamic Network Topologies



Benchmark Evaluation Change of Confusion Matrices to the Testing Data Epoch 1 Epoch 200 Epoch 5000



wp0500

cse02

0

RWP, CSE @Node 9

0.8

0.6

0.4

- 0.2

0.6

0.4

- 0.2

0.0

<u>୫</u>୦

5 6

Predicted label

0. 5 6 1

Predicted label

Misclassifications were drastically reduced. - 0.8

29

Table of Contents

- Decentralization of Machine Learning
- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
 - Characteristics
 - Theory
 - Benchmark Evaluation
 - Application
- Future Research Directions
- Conclusion

Applications of Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning



(1) Self-Localization

(2) Brainstormer

(3) Anomaly Detection

Collaborative Training for Self-Localization with WAFL

1. Self-localization with observed Wi-Fi AP's RSSI



- 2. Problems in the previous studies We had to collect RSSI list at all the locations for training.
- 3. WAFL allows model development with
 - (a) a node training around area 0,
 - (b) another node training around area 9,
 - (c) aggregating the developed models among them.
- 4. The aggregate model can predict the location at anywhere.



Collaborative Training for Self-Localization with WAFL

Experiment Setting

* Assumption Single node in each area. Each node communicate only with neighbors.







Network Topology

Collaborative Training for Self-Localization with WAFL

Node 8's Location Prediction Example



At the beginning of training, the model predicted wrong location from observed RSSIs, but finally, it could predict the location precisely.

Integration of Multiple Perspectives by WAFL

 People in a team react in different ways to a presented object, because they have different perspectives in their idea.





2. Integration of these perspectives of team members will develop the reaction model for the team.

1. Labeling by their own perspective

2. Model mixture by MT-WAFL



Integration of Multiple Perspectives by WAFL

Experiment Setting

X: Rotated and Resized Fashion-MNIST ImageY: Class of the object (0, 1, ..., 9)Z: Rotation of the object (0, 1, 2, 3)W: Size of the object (0, 1)

Distribution of the Label Existence

	Label Y	Label Z	Label W
Node 0-4	99%	1%	1%
Node 5-7	1%	99%	1%
Node 8-9	1%	1%	99%



Integration of Multiple Perspectives by WAFL Node 8's Predictions for Object Class, Rotation, and Size Epoch 0 Epoch 1000 Epoch 2500 Epoch 100 Class (y) Class (y) Class (y) Class (y) 0-0.49 0.01 0.11 0.26 0.04 0.04 0.03 0.02 0.02 0.00 0-0.26 0.01 0.04 0.47 0.12 0.01 0.04 0.02 0.04 0.00 0-0.80 0.00 0.03 0.05 0.01 0.00 0.09 0.00 0.02 0.00 0.01 0.09 0.06 0.01 0.00 0.04 0.00 0.01 0.00 1-0.24 0.40 0.01 0.29 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.04 0.00 0.00 0.39 0.01 0.34 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.06 0.00 0.00 1 0.02 0.91 0.02 0.04 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 2-0.03 0.00 0.74 0.01 0.13 0.00 0.06 0.00 0.01 0.00 2 - 0.08 0.00 0.47 0.06 0.22 0.04 0.07 0.00 0.05 0.00 2-0.01 0.00 0.41 0.09 0.45 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.02 0.00 2 0.02 0.00 0.79 0.02 0.13 0.00 0.02 0.00 0.02 0.00 3-0.06 0.02 0.02 0.82 0.04 0.00 0.03 0.00 0.02 0.00 3-0.25 0.14 0.02 0.50 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.06 0.01 0.00 3-0.11 0.06 0.01 0.66 0.03 0.01 0.00 0.11 0.01 0.00 3-0.15 0.05 0.10 0.64 0.03 0.00 0.00 0.02 0.01 0.00 4-0.01 0.00 0.13 0.03 0.75 0.00 0.07 0.00 0.01 0.00 4-0.14 0.02 0.38 0.13 0.20 0.03 0.06 0.00 0.04 0.00 4-0.01 0.00 0.30 0.14 0.50 0.00 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.00 8 4 0.01 0.02 0.48 0.04 0.39 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.01 0.00 2 5 0.10 0.10 0.12 0.04 0.01 0.23 0.00 0.22 0.12 0.06 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.91 0.00 0.04 0.01 0.03 2 5 0.01 0.05 0.02 0.04 0.00 0.18 0.00 0.49 0.14 0.07 -0.01 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.00 0.79 0.01 0.08 0.02 0.05 6-0.17 0.01 0.12 0.04 0.11 0.00 0.52 0.00 0.03 0.00 6-0.23 0.00 0.33 0.15 0.15 0.04 0.05 0.01 0.04 0.00 6-0.07 0.00 0.25 0.23 0.37 0.00 0.03 0.01 0.04 0.00 6-0.19 0.00 0.44 0.05 0.15 0.00 0.14 0.00 0.03 0.00 7-0.00 0.02 0.00 0.03 0.00 0.04 0.00 0.89 0.02 0.01 7-0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.04 0.00 0.91 0.00 0.05 7 0.10 0.14 0.02 0.09 0.00 0.12 0.00 0.51 0.01 0.01 7 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.04 0.00 0.89 0.00 0.06 8-0.21 0.01 0.28 0.06 0.08 0.07 0.01 0.05 0.21 0.00 8-0.02 0.00 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.01 0.03 0.00 0.87 0.00 8-0.03 0.01 0.14 0.17 0.21 0.01 0.00 0.12 0.27 0.02 8-0.04 0.01 0.26 0.03 0.06 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.55 0.02 9-0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.02 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.92 9-0.05 0.00 0.23 0.01 0.04 0.16 0.01 0.12 0.29 0.08 9-0.00 0.00 0.04 0.00 0.00 0.10 0.00 0.31 0.36 0.18 9 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.05 0.00 0.12 0.01 0.81 0 6 **1** 8 2 3 × 5 6 **1** 6 1 0 2 3 N 5 6 ዔ r 3 De l 5 6 1 Predicted labe Predicted labe Predicted label Predicted label Rotation (z) Size (w) Rotation (z) Size (w) Rotation (z) Size (w) Rotation (z) Size (w) 0-0.96 0.01 0.02 0.01 0-0.67 0.12 0.08 0.14 0-0.84 0.04 0.06 0.06 9 0 - **1.00** 0-0.94 0.03 0.01 0.02 0.00 0.00 o.00 0.00 0.99 0.01 1.00 a 1 - 0.29 0.52 0.02 0.17 9 1 - 0.00 **1.00** ag 1 - 0.25 0.52 0.04 0.19 0.01 0.96 0.01 0.02 8 1-0.07 0.88 0.00 0.05 0.00 1.00 0.00 1.00 - 0.00 1.00 2 - 0.22 0.26 0.34 0.17 9 2 0.37 0.11 0.38 0.14 2 2 0.15 0.04 0.74 0.06 0.02 0.01 0.96 0.01 0 0 Predicted label Predicted labe Predicted labe Predicted label 3-0.17 0.23 0.06 0.55 0.23 0.14 0.01 0.61 0.02 0.03 0.00 0.94 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.96 0 ~ 2 3 r r $\gamma \gamma \gamma$ \sim \sim Predicted label Predicted label Predicted labe Predicted label

Node 8 originally has many labels in Size(w) perspective.

As the training proceeds, misclassifications in Object Class and Rotation predictions have improved. 40

Anomaly Detection in Non-IID Scenario

Local Anomaly

(Anomaly for the node, but not for some others)

Node 0

Node 1

Node 2

Node 3



Global Anomaly

(Anomaly for all the nodes)

Our target is "Global Anomaly"₄₂

To Detect a Global Anomaly



Experiment Setting

Distribution of Training Data (99.95% Non-IID)

Node	LO	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L8	L9	Total
Node 0	4736	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4736
Node 1	0	5418	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	5422
Node 2	0	0	4779	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4479
Node 3	1	0	0	4911	0	0	1	1	0	0	4914
Node 4	0	0	0	1	4733	0	0	0	0	0	4734
Node 5	0	0	0	0	0	4343	1	0	0	0	4344
Node 6	0	0	0	1	0	0	4712	0	0	0	4713
Node 7	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	5046	0	0	5051
Node 8	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4714	0	4716
Node 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4751	4752

For example, we expect the Autoencoder at Node 8 will give outputs as follows (if no WAFL).





Mobility Model: rwp0500

Reconstructions at Node 8 with WAFL In case of Legitimate Inputs

 WAFL (epoch 0 − after Self-Training) the autoencoder gave 8 to any inputs 0 ~ 9.

 As the WAFL training proceeds, WAFL's model aggregation allowed the precise reconstruction of all the legitimate samples (0 ~ 9).



- Reconstructions at Node 3 with WAFL In case of Global Anomaly Inputs.
 - WAFL (epoch 0 after Self-Training) the autoencoder gave 3 to any global anomalies.

2. Even though the WAFL training proceeded, the autoencoder did not reconstruct the global anomaly input (which is succeeded).



Anomaly Detection (@Node 0)

- At Epoch 0 (after Self-Train) many samples except 0 were recognized as anomaly.
- 2. At Epoch 100, anomaly samples were recognized as legitimate.
- After Epoch 1000, it could recognize legitimate or anomaly precisely (except Occluded-MNIST).

vith WAFL		0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				- 1.0
))	MNIST-1	0.98	0.96	0.92	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
	MNIST 2	0.32	0.21	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01				
		0.37	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			F	- 0.8
	MNIST-3	0.57	0.41	0.32	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			alse	
1	MNIST-4	0.50	0.11	0.52	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			Posi	
zed	MNIST-5	0.25	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	Ì	_	tive	- 0.6
	MNIST-6	0.11	0.11	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01			Rate	
	MNIST-7	0.70	0.47	0.33	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00			S	
	MNIST-8	0.25	0.07	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01				- 0.4
	MNIST-9	0.55	0.28	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
M	NIST(ALL)	0.41	0.27	0.19	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	۲		г	
Noi	isy-MNIST	0.50	0.26	0.14	0.06	0.04	0.26	0.94	1.00	1.00			ue P	- 0.2
Occluded-MNIST ·		0.88	0.70	0.63	0.07	0.02	0.00	0.09	0.40	0.14	ļ	_	ositi	
Fashi	on-MNIST	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.44	0.96	0.99			ve Ra	
Kuzusł	niji-MNIST ·	0.64	0.31	0.17	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.65	0.96	0.99			ates	- 0.0
		0	20	50	-200	200	500	,000	2000	2000			A –	5.6
					F	Epoch	h	<i>y</i>	v				4/	

Table of Contents

- Decentralization of Machine Learning
- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
 - Characteristics
 - Theory
 - Benchmark Evaluation
 - Application
- Future Research Directions
- Conclusion

Open Research Questions (Open Issues)

- MNIST is just a simple dataset
 - How about general images or videos?
 - How about text?
 - How about audio?
 - How about IoT or Industrial data?
 - Can we combine with sensors?
 - How about the logs of computers?
 - Can we use for network security?
- How about Generative models (e.g., GAN)?
- How about Multi-Domain Adaptation (Out-of-Distribution) Issues?
- How about the security of WAFL?
- How about the implementation?
- How about the protocol for discovery and model exchange?
- How can we operate WAFL as a learning system?

Conclusion

- A Fully Autonomous and Distributed Collaborative Machine Learning
 - -- Wireless Ad Hoc Federated Learning (WAFL)
- Characteristics of WAFL
 - All the nodes are even no centralized power mechanism.
 - WAFL allows multi-vendor system if protocol is defined.
- Current Stage of Research
 - Benchmark-based evaluation in basic and application-oriented scenarios
- Future Research Directions
 - Expansion into various applications
 - Implementation, operation, protocol design





