The 22nd International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PerCom 2024)



## "Stitching Satellites to the Edge: Pervasive and Efficient Federated LEO Satellite Learning"

March 13, 2024, Biarritz, France

**Mohamed Elmahallawy and Tie Luo** 

Computer Science Department, Missouri University of Science and Technology, USA



Personalized Learning Orbital Model Retraining

Evaluation

### Low Earth Orbit (LEO) Satellite Networks

Motivation

The **recent surge** of interest and investment in large-scale LEO satellites



Personalized Learning Orbital Model Retraining

Evaluation

### Low Earth Orbit (LEO) Satellite Networks

Enable novel applications empowered by machine learning, such as:



Motivation

#### **5 petabytes** of image data per day (2019)!

**Disaster Detection** 





#### Border Monitoring





[1] P. Wang, H. Li, B. Chen, and S. Zhang, "Enhancing earth observation throughput using inter-satellite communication," IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 7990–8006, 2022

### Low Earth Orbit Satellite Networks

Conventional (i.e., centralized) ML:

- > Download high-resolution satellite images to a ground station (GS)
- > This is **impractical** because:

#### <u>Bandwidth</u>

Motivation

- 50~500MB (vs. 5 petabytes satellite data!)
- Privacy
  - Raw data transmission



Personalized Learning Orbital Model Retraining



Four-hour delay in downloading satellite images resulted in the **burning** of **135,000 acres** and the loss of **50 lives**<sup>1</sup>.



Motivation

Motivation Personalized Learning Orbital Model Retraining Evaluation

### Introducing Federated Learning (FL) into LEO Networks



## Challenges Personalized Learning Orbital Model Retraining

### **Challenges in SEC**

- X Limited computation and storage
  - > LEO satellites cannot train large-scale ML models onboard
  - > Overlooked by existing FL-LEO literature
- **Sporadic** and **irregular** visibility pattern
  - The iterative FL process will converge after several days or even weeks





# Contributions

Contributions

> We propose an innovative framework FL to enable satellite edge computing (SEC)

Personalized Learning

Personalized Learning via Divide-and-Conquer

Enables satellites to train lightweight ML models, addressing the computation and memory limitations.

Orbital Model Retraining



# Contributions

Contributions

We propose an innovative framework FL to enable satellite edge computing (SEC)

Orbital Model Retraining



Personalized Learning



### Contributions

Contributions

> We propose an innovative framework FL to enable satellite edge computing (SEC)

Personalized Learning



Orbital Model Retraining



### System Model

Walker 3-9

Walker\_3-10



Data size of satellite's n  $\min_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} F(w) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \underbrace{m_n}_{m} F_n(w)$ Data size of all satellites loss function of a satellite n $F_n(w) = \frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{x \in D_n} f_n(w; x)$ 

• Each satellite *n* trains a local model by minimizing  $F_n(\omega)$  through SGD:

• The server aggregates all the satellites' local models into a global model:





LEO network of N satellites

$$w^{\beta+1} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{m_n}{m} w_n^\beta$$

### **Personalized Learning**

#### 1. Personalized Learning via Divide-and-Conquer



#### **Before Training**

Each satellite filters its collected images for a single target class:

 $D_i^{\text{filtered}} = \{X_i \,|\, (X_i, y) \in D_i, \pi_i(y) = 1\}$ 

<sup>r</sup> This converts the original complex multi-class problem into a binary classification problem.

$$u_{\text{train}}^{i} = rac{
u_{i} \cdot J \cdot c_{\text{process}} + c_{\text{overhead}}}{f_{i}}, \text{ where } 
u_{i} = \left\lceil rac{m_{i}^{\text{filtered}}}{\kappa} \right\rceil$$

#### • During training

Each satellite trains a personalized ML model by employing the one-vs-all strategy.



### **Orbital Model Retraining**

#### Evaluation

#### 2. Orbital Model Retraining



#### **Objective**

Convert the binary classification tasks back to the original multi-class problem

#### Phase 1:

Distribute global model to all satellites within each orbit

Phase 2

Sink satellite aggregates all binary models received from satellites in the same orbit, forming an "orbital model"

#### Phase 3

Retrain the orbital model for several orbital rounds: essentially FL in an extreme non-IID scenario

$$w_n^{\beta,\upsilon+1} = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} rac{m_i^{ ext{filtered}}}{m_{\mathcal{I}_n}} w_i^{J,\upsilon}, ext{ where } m_{\mathcal{I}_n} = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} m_i^{ ext{filtered}}$$

#### Phase 4

The first visible satellite to the FL server (ground station) transmits orbital model to server

#### **Experimental Setup**

- LEO Satellite Network
  - Two LEO networks of 60 satellites evenly distributed over 6 orbits, one with inclination of 45° and the other 5 with inclination of 85°
  - > STK simulator was used to generate satellite visibility pattern
  - > Ground station is positioned in Rolla, MO, USA as the FL server
- <u>Satellite Training (Testbed)</u>
  - > Jetson Nano with NVIDIA Maxwell GPU to emulate each satellite
  - Dataset: EuroSat (high-resolution real-satellite images) containing 10 classes of land cover
  - Each satellite trains a VGG-16 model
  - Also uses MNIST, CIFAR-10, and CIFAR-100 datasets for comparison with SOTA



#### **Results 1: Convergence**

#### Comparing with SOTA

TABLE III: Comparison of convergence time and accuracy under non-IID settings (near-polar Constellation).

	FL-LEO	Accuracy (%)			Convergence time (h)	
	Approaches	MNIST	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100		
Sync FL	FedAvg [3]	79.41	70.68	61.66	60 ( $\mathcal{PS}$ located anywhere)	
	FedISL [7]	82.76	73.62	66.57	8 ( $\mathcal{PS}$ located at the NP)	
	FedISL [7]	61.06	52.11	47.99	72 (PS located anywhere)	
	NomaFedHAP [8]	82.73	77.36	62.81	24 (PS located anywhere)	
Async FL	FedAsync [25]	70.36	61.81	56.37	48 (PS located anywhere)	
	FedSpace [6]	52.67	39.41	36.04	72 (satellite uploads some of its data)	
	AsyncFLEO [14]	79.49	69.88	61.43	9 (sink satellite has sufficient visible period)	
	Ours	94.64	89.69	82.65	2.13 ( <i>PS</i> located anywhere)	

#### Classification results (EuroSat)







Ground Truth: PermanentCrop Predicated: PermanentCrop



Ground Truth: AnnualCrop Ground Truth: HerbaceousVegetation Ground Truth: PermanentCr Predicated: AnnualCrop Predicated: HerbaceousVepetation Predicated Annu





Ground Truth: Industri Predicated: Industria



#### **Results 1: Convergence**

#### Individual class accuracy for EuroSat

TABLE IV: Evaluation of our approach on EuroSat Dataset.

Metric	# of	Near-polar constellation (85°)				Inclined constellation (45°)				
Class	images	ACC(%)	PC (%)	RC (%)	F1 (%)	ACC(%)	PC (%)	RC (%)	F1(%)	
AnnualCrop	600	97.63	92.06	94.67	93.34	98.39	91.71	94.0	92.84	T
Forest	600	98.19	96.73	98.67	97.69	99.52	96.59	99.17	97.86	Ī
HerbaceousVegetation	600	99.32	93. <mark>0</mark> 5	93.67	93.36	98.5	92.12	94.5	93.33	T
Highway	500	99.61	97.74	95.0	96.35	99.31	97.93	94.60	96.24	Ī
Industrial	500	98.89	98.95	93.80	96. <mark>3</mark> 0	99.30	98.94	93.40	96.09	T
Pasture	400	99.23	96.42	94.25	95.32	99.33	96.67	94.25	95.44	T
PermanentCrop	500	97.46	95.14	9 <mark>0.0</mark>	92.50	98.54	94.50	<mark>89.4</mark> 0	91.88	Ī
Residential	600	99.01	91.45	99.83	95.46	99.04	92.15	99.83	95.84	I
River	500	99.56	98.17	96.60	97.38	99.44	97.37	96.60	96.99	Ī
SeaLake	600	99.11	98.66	98.0	98.33	99.63	99.15	97.50	98.32	Ī

Better visibility

Less visibility



(a) Near-polar constellation  $(85^{\circ})$ . (b) Inclined constellation  $(45^{\circ})$ .

Fig. 5: Confusion matrix that compares 10 predicted and ground-truth classes for 5400 test images.





#### **Results 2: Computation and Communication overhead; Energy Consumption**

#### A. Computation Overhead

 Measured by floating-point operations per second (FLOPS)

#### **B.** Communication Overhead

Measured by size of the global model

TABLE V: Comparison of computation and communication overheads of our approach in different settings.

(a) Computation overhead.

(b) Communication overhead.

Model	FLOPS (G)	Dataset	Size (MB)
CNN using MNIST	11.91	MNIST	0.437
CNN using CIFAR-10	15.58	CIFAR-10	0.798
CNN using CIFAR-100	28.13	CIFAR-100	7.76
VGG-16 using EuroSat	43.84	EuroSat	26.68

#### C. Energy Consumption

- > Jetson Nano experienced GPU usage of 17--58% during training on various datasets
- Energy consumption ranged between merely 1.38--2.25 watts for each local model, demonstrating the advantage of being highly lightweight



### From Lab to Space

- <u>Recent Launch (March 6, 2024)</u>
  - SpaceX launched an LEO satellite developed by Missouri University of Science and Technology, tasked with capturing Earth images.
  - > Equipped with Raspberry Pi
- Future Launch (Feb. 2026)
  - Currently working on building two other LEO satellites: Missouri Rolla (MR) and Missouri Rolla Second (MRS).
  - MR and MRS will be equipped with Jetson Nano to train ML models onboard





# Thank You

# Questions?



### Take-Home Message

- > AI-driven satellite edge computing (SEC) is coming.
- Federated learning integrated with LEO satellite networks (FL-LEO) is a promising approach but with challenges of computational and storage limitations
- We propose a solution to tackle this challenge in FL-LEO to enable SEC
  - Personalized ML model via divide-and-conquer
  - Orbital model retraining
- Validated by testbed





miellie communication (Salcon asaggiv sendine, in this par-framework for LED count L effetenen in Sate otfinnesk (idle vol nne of model si (Eise high

dress the arc adres the arc. Asyncf120 and "in the sky" ar deal "its the sky" as checked components (1) or, (2) a model propagation close algorithm with catching ong. Our extensive evaluation with those that Asynci LEO subjections were margin, catting down menerging to converse 14, 51

d terrendeg scenner to 49%. Los-Earth orbit (LEO), selefite communicu-e isorning, logis attitude platform (HAP) idas ke Defez -

u.e., salethies) and the PS. While this does not present as

big issue in large-capacity serverds, it cances a server slow-concorpose problem is the context of Katcom dae to the least propagatos and immenistors datas and more taking because of the highly spinnalic and imegalar with pattern of LEO satellity to the PS. This visit entron results from the distinction between untilities' and the P5' travel trajectory and the distinction forward specific orbitize speeds and the lacar and dailey to Soloran, taking urward days or even longer

To address this secondly slow conversions moblem of \$1 when applying to Satzana, we propose Async/VLEO, a moral enabling RL approaches control for profield because of their eccentrity periodic training time councel by the challenging worldba-GS communication rentrement. This paper propose data busical parameter servers (DS) into FL der Sacore (se new concrete), LED consideration, is a soliticer to start definition model training. FeIIIAP consists of three components: 11 a forecretional distribution of the components: 11 a forecretional merminatication exploritory. and 3) a model aggregation algorithm. Our extensive simulations demonstrate that FedHAP significantly accelerates FL model convergence as compared to state of the art baselines, exiting the training time from several days down to a few hours, yet achieving higher accorden. Index Toron-Federated learning (FL), low Earth whit (LEO). manication (Satesm), high-altitude platform (HAP)

to its promising prospects in LEO constellations [4-7]. Chen et al. [6] demonstrate some banefits when applying the origina Fed/log [8], anchanged, to Satcorn, as compared to traditional centralized ML Ranni et al. [5] attempted to reduce the our training time by proposing FedISL, which employs inter satellar-link (ISL) to improve performance. However, in order to address the poor visibility, they assured a median Earth orbit (MEO) satellite orbiting above the Equator to serve as the PS, which is hardly available. In addition, the Densder effect creath unplified by the large speed difference between MEO and LDO matilities is also courlooked by the study. Another work [7] proposes FedSat as an asynchronous FL algorithm to reduce the training diday, but it insurant as ideal reper when

1) We pressor a madel and waters where the measures the ional "wetkral" star topology between the FL server and LEO antidity, with "horsestal" roles alone communitake patheops aming satellites.

We propose a distributed scheduling abantitut that selects as optimal "sink" subline on each other to generate a paintal yieled would, and optimally schedules communication between sink satilities and the GS by exploiting the sectorships of adolfsic orbition cash

With the first descriptions of easility technology a large number of low facts othit (LEO) satellites have been lessched into arrays. Among the outing players of LPO and the deglarment are government spinoirs outh to NASA and ESA, and large composites such as DigitalGlobe, SpaceX (Starlink), and OreWeb

FeiLID drastically signifies FL convergence, without surrilicing-

L DURINGCOM

In addition, this paper also makes the following contributions b) Fedl FO addresses the challenging issue of data-discontance independent and identically distributed (non-fill) data.