

Expanding across time to deliver bandwidth efficiency and low latency

William M. Mellette, Rajdeep Das, Yibo Guo, Rob McGuinness, Alex C. Snoeren, and George Porter
University of California San Diego

Abstract

Datacenters need networks that support both low-latency and high-bandwidth packet delivery to meet the stringent requirements of modern applications. We present Opera, a dynamic network that delivers latency-sensitive traffic quickly by relying on multi-hop forwarding in the same way as expander-graph-based approaches, but provides near-optimal bandwidth for bulk flows through direct forwarding over time-varying source-to-destination circuits. Unlike prior approaches, Opera requires no separate electrical network and no active circuit scheduling. The key to Opera’s design is the rapid and deterministic reconfiguration of the network, piece-by-piece, such that at any moment in time the network implements an expander graph, yet, integrated across time, the network provides bandwidth-efficient single-hop paths between all racks. We show that Opera supports low-latency traffic with flow completion times comparable to cost-equivalent static topologies, while delivering up to $4\times$ the bandwidth for all-to-all traffic and supporting up to 60% higher load for published datacenter workloads.

1 Introduction

Datacenter networks are tasked with providing connectivity between an ever-increasing number of end hosts whose link rates improve by orders of magnitude every few years. Preserving the “big-switch” illusion of full bisection bandwidth [2, 21] by augmenting the internal switching capacity of the network accordingly is increasingly cost prohibitive and likely soon infeasible [35]. Practitioners have long favored over-subscribed networks that provide all-to-all connectivity, but at only a fraction of host-link speeds [21, 41]. Such networks realize cost savings by dramatically reducing the amount of in-network capacity (in terms of both the number and rate of links and switches internal to the network fabric), providing full-speed connectivity between only a subset of hosts, and more limited capacity between others.

The catch, of course, is that any under-provisioned topology inherently biases the network toward certain workloads. Traditional over-subscribed Clos topologies only support rack-local traffic at full line rate; researchers have proposed alternate ways of deploying a limited amount of switching capacity—either through disparate link and switch technologies [31, 38, 40, 44], non-hierarchical topologies [27, 29, 42, 43], or

both [20, 34]—that can deliver higher performance for published workloads [4, 39] at similar costs. Because workloads can be dynamic, many of these proposals implement reconfigurable networks that allocate link capacity in a time-varying fashion, either on a fixed schedule [34, 40] or in response to recent demand [20, 31, 44]. Unfortunately, practical reconfigurable technologies require non-trivial delay to retarget capacity, limiting their utility for workloads with stringent latency requirements.

Under-provisioned networks often incorporate some flavor of indirect traffic routing to address inopportune traffic demands; because application workloads do not always align well with the structure of the network, some traffic may transit longer, less-efficient paths. The benefits of indirection come at significant cost, however: traversing more than a single hop through the network imposes a “bandwidth tax.” Said another way, x bytes sent over a direct link between two end points consume only x bytes of network capacity. If that same traffic is instead sent over k links, perhaps indirecting through multiple switches, it consumes $(k \cdot x)$ bytes of network capacity, where $(k - 1)x$ corresponds to the bandwidth tax. Hence, the effective carrying capacity of a network, i.e., net the bandwidth tax, can be significantly less than its raw switching capacity; aggregate tax rates of 200–500% are common in existing proposals.

Reconfigurable networks seek to reduce the overall bandwidth tax rate of a given workload by provisioning direct links between end points with the highest demands, eliminating the tax on the largest, “bulk” flows whose completion time is gated by available network capacity, rather than propagation delay. The time required to identify such flows [31, 44] and reconfigure the network [20, 34], however, is generally orders-of-magnitude larger than the one-way delay of even an indirect route through the network, which is the main driver of completion times for small flows. Hence, dynamic networks face a fundamental trade-off between amortizing the overhead of reconfiguration against the inefficiency of sub-optimal configurations. The upshot is existing proposals are either unsuitable for latency sensitive traffic (which is frequently shunted to an entirely separate network in so-called hybrid architectures [31, 34, 38]), or pay substantial bandwidth tax to provide low-latency connectivity, especially when faced with dynamic or unpredictable workloads.




Figure 1: Published empirical flow-size distributions.

Opera is a network architecture that minimizes the bandwidth tax paid by bulk traffic—which makes up the vast majority of the bytes in today’s networks [4, 39]—while ensuring low-latency delivery for the (small fraction of) traffic that cannot tolerate added delays. Opera implements a dynamic, circuit-switched topology that constantly reconfigures a small number of each top-of-rack (ToR) switch’s uplinks, moving through a series of time-varying expander graphs (without requiring runtime circuit selection algorithms or network-wide traffic demand collection). Opera’s ever-changing topology ensures that every pair of end points is periodically allocated a direct link, delivering bandwidth-efficient connectivity for bulk traffic, while indirecting latency-sensitive traffic over the same, low-diameter network to provide near-optimal flow completion times.

By strategically pre-configuring the assignment of rack-to-rack circuits at each instant in time such that those circuits form an expander graph, Opera can always forward low-latency traffic over an expander without waiting for any circuits to be (re-)configured. Thus, on a per-packet basis, Opera can choose to either (1) immediately send a packet over whatever static expander is currently instantiated, incurring a modest tax on this small fraction of traffic, or (2) buffer the packet and wait until a direct link is established to the ultimate destination, eliminating the bandwidth tax on the vast majority of bytes. Our simulation results show this trade-off results in up to a $4\times$ increase in throughput for shuffle workloads compared to cost-equivalent static topologies. Moreover, for published, skewed datacenter workloads, Opera delivers an effective 8.4% bandwidth tax rate, resulting in up to a 60% increase in throughput while maintaining equivalent flow completion times across all flow sizes. We further validate the stability of this result across a range of workloads, network scales, and cost factors.

2 Network efficiency

The reality of datacenter networks is one of non-stop change: developers are continuously deploying new appli-




Figure 2: Oversubscribed folded-Clos networks allocate fewer uplinks than downlinks, and static expander-graph-based networks typically allocate more upward ports than downward ports. In Opera, the ToR switch is provisioned 1:1. When a circuit switch is reconfiguring, the associated ToR port cannot carry traffic through that uplink.

cations and updating existing applications, and user behavior is in a constant state of flux. As a result, operators cannot risk designing networks that support only a narrow range of workloads, and instead must choose a design that supports a wide range of workloads, applications, and user behavior.

2.1 Workload properties

One saving grace of the need to service a wide range of workloads is the likelihood that there will, in fact, be a spectrum of needs in practice. A concrete example is the distribution of flow sizes, which is known to be highly skewed in today’s networks: Figure 1 shows data published by Microsoft [4, 21] (Websearch and Datamining) and Facebook [39] (Hadoop) depicting the distributions of traffic according to individual flows (top) and total number of transmitted bytes (bottom) that we consider in this paper. The vast majority of bytes are in bulk flows, not the short, latency-sensitive ones, suggesting that to make the most out of available capacity, an ideal network must seek to minimize the bandwidth tax paid on bulk traffic while not substantially impacting the propagation delay experienced by short flows.

While there are myriad ways to measure a network’s suitability for a given workload, flow completion time (FCT) is frequently offered as a useful figure of merit [14] due to its applicability across a wide range of workloads. The flow completion time of small flows is constrained by the underlying network’s propagation delay. Thus, lowering the network diameter and/or reducing queuing reduces the FCT for this type of traffic. On the other hand, the FCT of bulk traffic is governed by the available capacity along a flow’s path.

Because the FCT of short flows is dictated by propagation delay, such traffic is commonly referred to as “latency-sensitive” or, equivalently, “low-latency”. (While applications may be equally sensitive to the FCT of larger flows, their FCT is dominated by available bandwidth.) In today’s networks, flows are classified into these categories either explicitly (e.g., by application type, port number, or sender-based rules), or implicitly (e.g., by remaining flow size for shortest-remaining-time-first (SRTF) scheduling). Opera is agnostic to the manner in which traffic is classified; for our purposes latency-sensitive and short flows are synonymous. Because latency-sensitive

traffic’s impact on network capacity is negligible in today’s workloads, it suffices to use priority queuing to ensure short flows receive unimpeded service while allowing bulk traffic to consume any remaining capacity [7, 22]. The challenge is to simultaneously provide high-capacity paths while maintaining a short path length.

2.2 The “big switch” abstraction

If cost (and practicality) were no object, a perfect network would consist of one large, non-blocking switch that connects all the end points. It is precisely such a “big switch” illusion that scale-out packet-switched network fabrics based on folded-Clos topologies [2, 21, 37] were designed to provide. These topologies rely on multiple stages of packet switches interconnected with shuffle networks. The abundance of packet switches at each stage and surfeit of links between them ensures that there is sufficient capacity to support any mixture of (admissible) inter-server communication. Proposals such as Hedera [3], pHost [19], HULL [5], NDP [24], PIAS [7], and Homa [36] introduce flow scheduling techniques that assign traffic to well-chosen paths to maximize throughput while minimizing in-network queuing when servicing a mixture of bulk and low-latency traffic.

2.3 Reduced capacity networks

While full-bandwidth “big switch” network designs are ideal in the sense that they provide operators with the maximum flexibility to deploy services, schedule jobs, and disaggregate storage and compute, they are impractical to construct at scale. Indeed, published reports confirm the largest datacenter networks in existence, while based upon folded-Clos topologies, are not fully provisioned [15, 41]. Moreover, some have observed that packet-switching technology may not be able to keep up as link rates surpass 400 Gb/s, so it is unclear how much longer the “big switch” abstraction will even be feasible [35]. Hence, researchers and practitioners alike have considered numerous ways to under-provision or “over-subscribe” network topologies.

One way to view over-subscription in a rack-based datacenter is to consider how each individual ToR switch is provisioned. Consider a scenario in which servers in a cluster or datacenter are organized into racks, each with a k -radix ToR packet switch that connects it to the rest of the network. We say that a ToR with d connected servers has d “downward” facing ports. A ToR with u ports connected to the rest of the network has u “upward” facing ports, or uplinks. (In a fully populated ToR, $d + u = k$.) In this context, we now overview existing proposals for interconnecting such racks.

Over-subscribed Fat Trees: As shown in the left-most portion of Figure 2, designers can build $M:1$ over-subscribed folded-Clos networks in which the network can deliver only $(1/M = u/d)$ the bandwidth of a fully-provisioned design. Common values of $(d : u)$ are between 3:1 and 5:1 [41]. The cost and bandwidth delivered in folded-Clos networks scale

almost linearly according to the over-subscription factor, and so decreasing overall cost necessitates decreasing the maximum network throughput—and vice versa. Routing remains direct, however, so over-subscription does not introduce a bandwidth tax; rather, it severely reduces the available network capacity between end points in different racks. As a result, application frameworks such as MapReduce [13] and Hadoop [18] schedule jobs with locality in mind in an effort to keep traffic contained within a rack.

Expander topologies: To address the limited cross-network bandwidth available in over-subscribed Fat Trees, researchers have proposed alternative reduced-capacity network topologies based on expander graphs. In these proposals, the u uplinks from each ToR are directly connected to other ToRs, either randomly [42] or deterministically [27, 29, 43], reducing the number of switches and inter-switch links internal to the network itself. Expander-graph-based network topologies are sparse graphs with the property that there are many potential short paths from a given source to a particular destination.

Because there are no in-network switches, packets must “hop” between ToRs a number of times to reach their ultimate destination, resulting in a bandwidth tax. An expander graph with an average ToR-to-ToR hop count of L_{Avg} pays an overall bandwidth tax rate of $(L_{Avg} - 1) \times$ in expectation because individual packets must indirect across a number of in-network links. The average path lengths for large networks can be in the range of 4–5 hops, resulting in a bandwidth tax rate of 300–400%. Moreover, a recent proposal [29] employs Valiant load balancing (VLB)—which imposes an additional level of explicit indirection—to address skewed traffic demands, doubling the bandwidth tax in some circumstances. One way that expanders counter-act their high bandwidth tax rate is by over-provisioning: ToRs in expander topologies typically have more upward-facing ports than down ($u > d$, as shown in the center of Figure 2)—and, hence, far more upward-facing ports than over-subscribed Fat Trees—which provides more in-network capacity. Said another way, the impact of the bandwidth tax is reduced by a factor of u/d .

Reconfigurable topologies: In an effort to reduce the bandwidth tax, other proposals rely on some form of reconfigurable link technology, including RF [28, 45], free-space optical [20, 23], and circuit switching [16, 31, 38, 40, 44]. Most reconfigurable topologies dynamically establish end-to-end paths within the network core in response to traffic demand, although RotorNet [34] employs a fixed, deterministic schedule. In either case, these networks establish and tear down physical-layer links over time. When the topology can be matched to the demand—and setting aside latency concerns—traffic can be delivered from source to destination in a single hop, avoiding any bandwidth tax. In some cases, similar to expander-based topologies, they employ 2-hop VLB [34, 40], resulting in a 100% bandwidth tax rate.

A fundamental limitation of any reconfigurable topology, however, is that during the time a link/beam/circuit (for simplicity we will use the latter term in the remainder of the paper) is being provisioned, it cannot convey data. Moreover, most proposals do not provision links between all sources and destinations at all times, meaning that traffic may incur significant delay as it waits for the appropriate circuit to be provisioned. For existing proposals, this end-to-end delay is on the order of 10–100s of milliseconds. Hence, previous proposals for reconfigurable network topologies rely on a distinct, generally packet-switched, network to service latency-sensitive traffic. The requirement for a separate network built using a different technology is a significant practical limitation and source of cost and power consumption.

3 Design

We start with an overview of our design before working through an example. We then proceed to describe how we construct the topology of a given network, how routes are chosen, how the network moves through its fixed set of configurations, and address practical considerations like cabling complexity, switching speeds, and fault tolerance.

3.1 Overview

Opera is structured as a two-tier leaf-spine topology, with packet-switched ToRs interconnected by reconfigurable circuit switches as shown in Figure 5. Each of a ToR’s u uplinks are connected to one of u circuit switches, and each circuit switch has a number of ports equal to the number of ToRs in the network. Opera’s design is based around two fundamental starting blocks that follow directly from the requirements for small network diameter and low bandwidth tax.

Expansion for short paths: Because the FCT of short, latency-sensitive flows is gated by end-to-end delay, we seek a topology with the lowest possible expected path length. Expander-based topologies are known to be ideal [27]. Expanders also have good fault-tolerance properties; if switches or links fail, there are likely to be alternative paths that remain. Thus, to efficiently support low-latency traffic, we require a topology with good expansion properties at all times.

Reconfigurability to avoid the bandwidth tax: A fully-connected graph (i.e. full mesh) could avoid a bandwidth tax entirely, but is infeasible to construct at scale. Rather than providing a full mesh in space, reconfigurable circuit switches offer the ability to establish, over time, direct one-hop paths between every rack pair using a relatively small number of links. Because bulk flows can generally amortize modest reconfiguration overheads if they result in increased throughput, we incorporate reconfigurability into our design to minimize the bandwidth tax on bulk traffic.

Opera combines the elements of expansion and reconfigurability to efficiently (and simultaneously) serve both low-latency and bulk traffic with low FCTs. Similar to Rotor-




Figure 3: Reconfiguring all switches in unison (a) leads to periodic disruptions; staggered reconfigurations (b) ensure some paths are always available.

Net [34], Opera incorporates reconfigurable circuit switches that cyclically set up and tear down direct connections between ToRs, such that after a “cycle time” of connections, every ToR has been connected to every other ToR. We leverage ToR-uplink parallelism to stagger the reconfigurations of multiple circuit switches, allowing “always-on” (albeit ever-changing) multi-hop connectivity between all ToR pairs.

Critically, the combination of circuits at any time forms an expander graph. Thus, during a single cycle, every packet has a choice between waiting for a bandwidth-tax-avoiding direct connection, or being immediately sent over a multi-hop path through the time-varying expander. The end result is a single fabric that supports bulk and low-latency traffic as opposed to two separate networks used in hybrid approaches. As we will show, Opera does not require any runtime selection of circuits or system-wide collection of traffic demands, vastly simplifying its control plane relative to approaches that require active circuit scheduling, such as ProjecToR [20] and Mordia [38]. We leave to future work the possibility (and complexity) of adjusting Opera’s matchings over long timescales to, for example, adapt to diurnal traffic patterns.

3.1.1 Eliminating reconfiguration disruptions

Circuit switches impose a technology-dependent reconfiguration delay, necessitating that flows be re-routed before reconfiguration. Even in a network with multiple circuit switches, if all switches reconfigure simultaneously (Figure 3a), the global disruption in connectivity requires routes to reconverge. For today’s switching technologies, this would lead to traffic delays that could severely impact the FCTs of short, latency-sensitive flows. To avoid this scenario and allow for low-latency packet delivery, Opera offsets the reconfigurations of circuit switches. For example, in the case of small topologies with few switches, at most one switch may be reconfiguring at a time (Figure 3b), allowing flows traversing a circuit with an impending reconfiguration to be migrated to other circuits that will remain active during that time period (for large-scale networks with many circuit switches, it is advantageous to reconfigure more than one switch at a time as described in Appendix C). As a result, while Opera is in near-constant flux, changes are incremental and connectivity is continuous across time.




Figure 4: CDF of path lengths for equal-cost 648-host Opera, 650-host $u = 7$ expander, and 648-host 3:1 folded-Clos networks. (CDFs staggered slightly for clarity.)

3.1.2 Ensuring good expansion

While offsetting reconfigurations guarantees continuous connectivity, it does not, by itself, guarantee complete connectivity. Opera must simultaneously ensure that (1) multi-hop paths exist between all racks at every point in time to support low-latency traffic, and (2) direct paths are provisioned between every rack-pair over a fixed period of time to support bulk traffic with low bandwidth tax. We guarantee both by implementing a (time-varying) expander graph across the set of circuit switches.

In Opera, each of a ToR’s u uplinks is connected to a (rotor) circuit switch [33] that, at any point in time, implements a (pre-determined) random permutation between input and output ports (i.e., a “matching”). The inter-ToR network topology is then the union of u random matchings, which, for $u \geq 3$, results in an expander graph with high probability [6]. Moreover, even if a switch is reconfiguring, there are still $u - 1$ active matchings, meaning that if $u \geq 4$, the network will still be an expander with high probability, no matter which switch is reconfiguring. In Opera, we let $u = k/2$ where k is $O(10)$ to $O(100)$ ports for today’s packet switches (depending on the configured per-port bandwidth).

Figure 4 shows the distribution of path lengths in one example 648-host network considered in our evaluation, where $u = 6$. Opera’s path lengths are almost always substantially shorter than those in a Fat Tree that connects the same number of hosts, and only marginally longer than an expander with $u = 7$ which we argue later has similar cost, but performs poorly for certain workloads. Clearly, ensuring good expansion alone is not an issue with modest switch radices. However, Opera must also directly connect each rack pair over time. We achieve this by having each switch cycle through a set of matchings; we minimize the total number of matchings (and thus the time required to cycle through them) by constructing a disjoint set.

3.2 Example

Figure 5 depicts a small-scale Opera network. Each of the eight ToRs has four uplinks to four different circuit switches (with one potentially down due to reconfiguration at any particular moment). By forwarding traffic through those ToRs,

they can reach any ToRs to which they, in turn, are connected. Each circuit switch has two matchings, labeled A and B (note that all matchings are disjoint from one another). In this example topology, any ToR-pair can communicate by utilizing any set of three matchings, meaning complete connectivity is maintained regardless of which matchings happen to be implemented by the switches at a given time. Figure 5 depicts two network-wide configurations. In Figure 5a switches 2–4 are implementing matching A , and in Figure 5b, switches 2–4 implement matching B . In both cases switch 1 is unavailable due to reconfiguration.

In this example, racks 1 and 8 are directly connected by the configuration shown in Figure 5b, and so the lowest bandwidth-tax way to send bulk data from 1 to 8 would be to wait until matching B is instantiated in switch 2, and then to send the data through that circuit; such traffic would arrive at ToR 8 in a single hop. On the other hand, low-latency traffic from ToR 1 to ToR 8 can be sent immediately, e.g. during the configuration shown in Figure 5a, and simply take a longer path to get to ToR 8. The traffic would hop from ToR 1 to ToR 6 (via switch 4), then to ToR 8 (via switch 2), and incur a 100% bandwidth tax. Although not highlighted in the figure, similar alternatives exist for all rack pairs.

3.3 Topology generation

The algorithm to generate an N -rack Opera topology is as follows. First, we randomly factor a complete graph (i.e. $N \times N$ all-ones matrix) into N disjoint (and symmetric) matchings. Because this factorization can be computationally expensive for large networks, we employ graph lifting to generate large factorizations from smaller ones. Next, we randomly assign the N matchings to u circuit switches, so that each switch has N/u matchings assigned to it. Finally, we randomly choose the order in which each switch cycles through its matchings. These choices are fixed at design time, before the network is put into operation; there is no topology computation during network operation.

Because our construction approach is random, it is possible (although unlikely) that a specific Opera topology realization will not have good expander properties at all points across time. For example, the combination of matchings in a given set of $u - 1$ switches at a particular time may not constitute an expander. In this case, it would be trivial to generate and test additional realizations at design time until a solution with good properties is found. This was not necessary in our experience, as the first iteration of the algorithm always produced a topology with near-optimal properties. We discuss the properties of these graphs in detail in Appendix E.

3.4 Forwarding

We are now left to decide how to best serve a given flow or packet: (1) send it immediately over multi-hop expander paths and pay the bandwidth tax (we refer to these as “indirect” paths), or (2) delay transmission and send it over one-hop paths to avoid the bandwidth tax (we refer to these as “di-




Figure 5: An Opera topology with eight ToR switches and four rotor circuit switches (from RotorNet [34]). Two different paths from rack 1 to rack 8 are highlighted: (a) a two-hop path in red, and (b) a one-hop path in blue. Each direct inter-rack connection is implemented only once per configuration, while multi-hop paths are available between each rack-pair at all times.

rect” paths). For skewed traffic patterns that, by definition, leave spare capacity in the network, two-hop paths based on Valiant load balancing can be used to carry bulk traffic in Opera. Our baseline approach is to make the decision based on flow size. Since the delay in waiting for a direct path can be an entire cycle time, we only let flows that are long enough to amortize that delay use direct paths, and place all other traffic on indirect paths. However, we can do even better if we know something about application behavior. Consider an all-to-all shuffle operation, where a large number of hosts simultaneously need to exchange a small amount of data with one another. Although each flow is small, there will be significant contention, extending the flow completion time of these flows. Minimizing bandwidth tax is critical in these situations. With application-based tagging, Opera can route such traffic over direct paths.

3.5 Synchronization

Opera employs reconfigurable circuit switches, and so its design requires a certain level of synchronization within the system to operate correctly. In particular, there are three synchronization requirements that must be met: (1) ToR switches must know when core circuit switches are reconfiguring, (2) ToR switches must update their forwarding tables in sync with the changing core circuits, and (3) end hosts must send bulk traffic to their local ToR only during the timeslots when the ToR is directly connected to the destination (to prevent excessive queuing in the ToR). In the first case, since each ToR’s uplink is connected directly to one of the circuit switches, the ToR can monitor the signal strength of the transceiver attached to that link to re-synchronize with the circuit switch. Alternatively, the ToR could rely on IEEE 1588 (PTP), which can synchronize switches to within $\pm 1 \mu\text{s}$ [1]. For low-latency traffic, end hosts simply transmit packets immediately, without any coordination or synchronization. For bulk traffic, end hosts transmit when polled by their attached ToR. To evaluate the practicality of this synchronization approach, we built a small-scale prototype based on a programmable P4 switch, described in Section 6.

Opera can tolerate arbitrary bounds on (de-)synchronization by introducing “guard bands” around each configuration, in which no data is sent to ensure the network

is configured as expected when transmissions do occur. To analyze the impact of guard bands, we hold the circuit timings constant and reduced the effective time of the slot during which data can be transmitted. Each μs of guard time contributes a 1% relative reduction in low-latency capacity and a 0.2% reduction for bulk traffic. In practice, if any component becomes de-synchronized beyond the guard-band tolerance, it can simply be declared failed (see Section 3.6.2).

3.6 Practical considerations

While Opera’s design draws its power from graph-theoretic underpinnings, it is also practical to deploy. Here, we consider two real-world constraints on networks.

3.6.1 Cabling and switch complexity

Today’s datacenter networks are based on folded-Clos topologies which use perfect-shuffle cabling patterns between tiers of switches. While proposals for static expander graphs alter that wiring pattern [42] leading to concerns about cabling complexity, Opera does not. In Opera, the interconnection complexity is contained within the circuit switches themselves, while the inter-switch cabling remains the familiar perfect shuffle. In principle, Opera can be implemented with a variety of electronic or optical circuit switch technologies. We focus on optical switching for our analysis due to its cost and data-rate transparency benefits. Further, because each circuit switch in Opera must only implement N/u matchings (rather than $O(N!)$), Opera can make use of optical switches with limited configurability such as those proposed in RotorNet [34], which have been demonstrated to scale better than optical crossbar switches [17, 33].

3.6.2 Fault tolerance

Opera detects, shares, and recovers from link, ToR, and circuit switch failures using common routing protocol practices. We take advantage of Opera’s cyclic connectivity to detect and communicate failures: each time a new circuit is configured, the ToR CPUs on each end of the link exchange a short sequence of “hello” messages (which contain information of new failures, if applicable). If no hello messages are received within a configurable amount of time, the ToR marks the link in question as bad. Because all ToR-pair connections are established every cycle, any ToR that remains connected




Figure 6: (a) A set of c circuit switches with offset reconfigurations forms a series of topology slices. (b) The time constants associated with a single slice: ϵ is the worst-case end-to-end delay for a low-latency packet to traverse the network and r is the circuit switch reconfiguration delay.

to the network will learn of any failure event within two cycles (<10 ms). Upon receiving information of a new failure, a ToR recomputes and updates its routing tables to route around failed components.

4 Implementation

Here, we describe the implementation details of Opera. To ground our discussion, we refer to an example 108-rack, 648-host, $k = 12$ topology (we evaluate this topology along with a larger one in Section 5).

4.1 Defining bulk and low-latency traffic

In Opera, traffic is defined as low-latency if it cannot wait until a direct bandwidth-efficient path becomes available. Thus the division between low-latency and bulk traffic depends on the rate at which Opera’s circuit switches cycle through direct matchings. The faster Opera steps through these matchings, the lower the overhead for sending traffic on direct paths, and thus the larger the fraction of traffic that can utilize these paths. Two factors impact cycle speed: circuit amortization and end-to-end delay.

Circuit amortization: The rate at which a circuit switch can change matchings is technology dependent. State-of-the-art optical switches with the large port counts needed for practical datacenter deployment have reconfiguration delays on the order of $10 \mu\text{s}$ [20, 34, 38]. A 90% amortization of this delay would limit circuit reconfigurations to every $100 \mu\text{s}$. In Opera, each switch cycles through N/u matchings, which could range from 10 matchings for small networks (e.g. $N = 320$ racks and $u = 32$ uplinks) to 32 matchings for larger networks (e.g. $N = 4096$ racks and $u = 128$ uplinks). This means any flow that can amortize a 1–3 ms increase in its FCT could take the bandwidth-efficient direct paths (and shorter flows would take indirect paths).

End-to-end delay: Perhaps surprisingly, a second timing constraint, end-to-end delay, has a larger impact on cycle time. In particular, consider a low-latency packet that is emitted from a host NIC. At the first ToR, the packet is routed toward its destination, and in general, at each hop along the way,

each ToR routes the packet along an expander-graph path. If, during the packet’s journey, the circuit topology changes, it is possible the packet could be caught in a loop or redirected along a sub-optimal path. Dropping the packet immediately (and expecting the sender to resend it) would significantly delay the flow completion time of that flow.

Our approach, depicted in Figure 6, to avoid the problems described above, requires that subsequent circuit reconfigurations be spaced by at least the sum of the end-to-end delay under worst-case queuing, ϵ , and the reconfiguration delay, r . We refer to this time period $\epsilon + r$ as a “topology slice”. Any packets sent during a slice are not routed through the circuit with an impending reconfiguration during that slice. This way, packets always have at least ϵ time to make it through the network before a switch reconfigures.

The parameter ϵ depends on the worst-case path length (in hops), the queue depth, the link rate, and propagation delay. Path length is a function of the expander, while the data rate and propagation delay are fixed; the key driver of ϵ is the queue depth. As explained in the following section, we choose a shallow queue depth of 24 KB (8 1500-byte full packets + 187 64-byte headers). When combined with a worst-case path length of 5 ToR-to-ToR hops (Figure 4), 500-ns propagation delay per hop (100 meters of fiber), and 10-Gb/s link speed, we set ϵ to $90 \mu\text{s}$. In our example 108-rack network, there are 6 circuit switches, meaning the inter-reconfiguration period of a single switch is 6ϵ , yielding a duty cycle of 98%. Further, our example network has $N/u = 108/6 = 18$ matchings per switch, yielding a cycle time of $N \times \epsilon = 10.8$ ms. We use this cycle time of 10.8 ms in our simulations in Section 5. For these time constants, flows ≥ 15 MB will have an FCT well within a factor of 2 of their ideal (link-rate-limited) FCT. As we will show in Section 5, depending on traffic conditions, shorter flows may benefit from direct paths as well.

4.2 Transport protocols

Opera requires transport protocols that can (1) immediately send low-latency traffic into the network, while (2) delaying bulk traffic until the appropriate time. To avoid head-of-line blocking, NICs and ToRs perform priority queuing. Our design replaces the typical TCP stack with the protocols below, but keeps the familiar sockets application interface.

4.2.1 Low-latency transport

As discussed in the previous section, minimizing the cycle time is predicated on minimizing the queue depth for low-latency packets at ToRs. The recently proposed NDP protocol [24] is a promising choice because it achieves high throughput with very shallow queues. We find that 12-KB queues work well for Opera (each port has an additional equal-sized header queue). NDP also has other beneficial characteristics for Opera, such as zero-RTT convergence and no packet metadata loss to eliminate RTOs. Despite being designed for fully-provisioned folded Clos networks, we find in simulation that NDP works well with minimal modification in

Opera, despite Opera’s continuously-varying topology. Other transports, like the recently proposed Homa protocol [36], may also be a good fit for low-latency traffic in Opera, but we leave this to future work.

4.2.2 Bulk transport

Opera’s bulk transport protocol is relatively simple. We draw heavily from the RotorLB protocol proposed in RotorNet [34], which buffers traffic at end hosts until direct connections to the destination are available. When bulk traffic is heavily skewed, and there is necessarily spare capacity elsewhere in the network, RotorLB automatically transitions to using two-hop routing (i.e. Valiant load balancing) to improve throughput. Unlike low-latency traffic, which can be sent at any time, bulk traffic admission is coordinated with the state of the circuit switches, as described in Section 3.5. In addition to extending RotorLB to work with offset reconfigurations, we also implemented a NACK mechanism to handle cases where large bursts of priority-queued low-latency traffic can cause bulk traffic queued at the ToR to be delayed beyond the transmission window and dropped at the ToR. Retransmitting a small number of packets does not significantly affect the FCT of bulk traffic. Unlike TCP, RotorLB does not rely on retransmission timeouts, which could otherwise cause bandwidth throttling for bulk traffic.

4.3 Packet forwarding

Opera relies on ToR switches to route packets along direct or multi-hop paths depending on the requested network service model. We implement this routing functionality using the P4 programming language. Each ToR switch has a built-in register that stores the current network configuration, updated either in-band or via PTP. When a packet arrives at the first ToR switch, the packet’s metadata is updated with the value of the configuration register. What happens next, and at subsequent ToR switches, depends on the value of the DSCP field. If that field indicates a low-latency packet, the switch consults a low-latency table to determine the next hop along the expander path, and then forwards the packet out that port. If the field indicates bulk traffic, the switch consults a bulk traffic table which indicates which circuit switch—if any—provides a direct connection, and the packet is forwarded to that port. We measure the amount of in-switch memory required to implement this P4 program for various datacenter sizes in Section 6.2.

5 Evaluation

We evaluate Opera in simulation. Initially, we focus on a concrete 648-host network, comparing to cost-equivalent folded-Clos, static expander, non-hybrid RotorNet, and (non-cost-equivalent) hybrid RotorNet networks. We then validate against a range of network sizes, skewed workloads, and underlying cost assumptions. We use the `htsim` packet simulator [26], which was previously used to evaluate the NDP protocol [24], and extend it to model static expander networks and

dynamic networks. We ported our RotorNet simulator [34] to `htsim`, first validating its performance against prior results. We also modify NDP to handle <1500 byte packets, which is necessary for some workloads considered. Both the folded-Clos and static expander use NDP as the transport protocol. Opera and RotorNet use NDP to transport low-latency traffic and RotorLB for bulk traffic. Because Opera explicitly uses priority queuing, we simulate the static networks with idealized priority queuing where appropriate to maintain a fair comparison. Following prior work [20, 29], we set the link bandwidth to 10 Gb/s. We use a 1500-byte MTU and set the propagation delay to 500 ns between ToRs (equivalent to 100 meters of fiber).

5.1 Real-world traffic

We start by considering Opera’s target scenario, a workload with an inherent mix of bulk and low-latency traffic. Here we consider the Datamining workload from Microsoft [21], and use a Poisson flow-arrival process to generate flows. We vary the Poisson rate to adjust the load on the network, defining load relative to the aggregate bandwidth of all host links (i.e., 100% load means all hosts are driving their edge links at full capacity, an inadmissible load for any over-subscribed network). As shown in the top portion of Figure 1, flows in this workload range in size from 100 bytes to 1 GB. We use Opera’s default configuration to decide how to route traffic: flows <15 MB are treated as low-latency and are routed over indirect paths, while flows ≥ 15 MB are treated as bulk and are routed over direct paths.

Figure 7 shows the performance of Opera as well as cost-comparable 3:1 folded-Clos and $u = 7$ static expander networks for various offered loads. We also compared to a hybrid RotorNet which faces one of the six ToR uplinks to a multi-stage packet switched network to accommodate low-latency traffic (for $1.33\times$ the cost), and a cost-equivalent non-hybrid RotorNet with no packet switching above the ToR. Appendix B discusses the tradeoffs for a hybrid RotorNet in more detail. We report the 99th percentile FCT except in the case of 1% load, where the variance in the tail obscures the trend and so report the average instead. Note that Opera priority queues all low-latency flows, while by default the static networks do not. For fairness, we also present the expander and folded Clos with “ideal” priority queuing—that is, removing all flows ≥ 15 MB. For reference, we also plot the minimum achievable latency in each network, derived from the end-to-end delay and link capacity.

The static networks start to saturate past 25% load: folded Clos have limited network capacity, and expanders have high bandwidth tax. Opera, on the other hand, is able to service 40% load despite having lower innate capacity than the cost-comparable expander. Opera offloads bulk traffic onto bandwidth-efficient paths, and only pays bandwidth tax on the small fraction (4%) of low-latency traffic that transits indirect paths, yielding an effective aggregate bandwidth tax of 8.4%




Figure 7: FCTs for the Datamining workload. All networks are cost comparable except hybrid RotorNet, which is $1.33\times$ more expensive. In (a) and (b), dashed lines are without priority queuing, and solid lines are with ideal priority queuing.




Figure 8: Network throughput over time for a 100-KB all-to-all Shuffle workload. Opera carries all traffic over direct paths, greatly increasing throughput. (The small “step” down in Opera’s throughput around 50 ms is due to some flows taking one additional cycle to finish.)

for this workload. Hybrid RotorNet, even with $1/6^{th}$ of its core capacity packet-switched (for 33% higher cost than the other networks), delivers longer FCTs than Opera for short flows at loads $>10\%$. A non-hybrid (i.e. all-optical-core) RotorNet is cost-equivalent to the other networks, but its latency for short flows is three orders of magnitude higher than the other networks, as shown in Figure 7c.

5.2 Bulk traffic

Opera’s superiority in the mixed case stems entirely from its ability to avoid paying bandwidth tax on the bulk traffic. We highlight this ability by focusing on a workload in which all flows are routed over direct paths. We consider an all-to-all shuffle operation (common to MapReduce style applications), and choose the flow size to be 100 KB based on the median inter-rack flow size reported in a Facebook Hadoop cluster [39] (c.f. Figure 1). Here we presume the application tags its flows as bulk, so we do not employ flow-length based classification; i.e., Opera does not indirect any flows in this scenario. We let all flows start simultaneously in Opera, as RotorLB accommodates such cases gracefully, and stagger flow arrivals over 10 ms for the static networks, which otherwise suffer from severe startup effects. Because the shuffle operation correlates the start times of all flows, this workload can drive the network to 100% utilization.

Figure 8 shows the delivered bandwidth over time for the different networks. The limited capacity of the 3:1 Clos and high bandwidth tax rates of the expander significantly extend

the FCT of the shuffle operation, yielding 99th-percentile FCTs of 227 ms and 223 ms, respectively. Opera’s direct paths are bandwidth-tax-free, allowing higher throughput and reducing the 99th-percentile FCT to 60 ms.

5.3 Only low-latency flows

Conversely, workloads in which all flows are routed over indirect low-latency paths represents the worst case for Opera, i.e., it always pays a bandwidth tax. Given our 15 MB threshold for bulk traffic, it is clear from the bottom portion of Figure 1 that the Websearch workload [4] represents such a case. A lower threshold would avoid the bandwidth tax, but would require a shorter cycle time to prevent a significant increase in FCT for these short “bulk” flows.

Figure 9 shows the results for the Websearch workload, again under a Poisson flow arrival process. As before, the cost-equivalent all-optical RotorNet suffers from long FCTs. Hybrid RotorNet (with $1/6^{th}$ of its capacity packet switched for 33% higher cost) can only admit just over 10% load, at which point the throughput saturates. At more than 5% load, its FCTs are significantly higher than the other networks. All other networks provide equivalent FCTs across all flow sizes for loads at or below 10%, at which point Opera is not able to admit additional load. Both the 3:1 folded Clos and expander saturate (slightly) above 25% load, but at that point both deliver FCTs nearly $100\times$ worse than at 1% load. While Opera forwards traffic analogous to the expander in this scenario, it has only 60% the capacity and pays an additional 41% bandwidth tax due to its longer expected path length.

5.4 Mixed traffic

To drive home Opera’s ability to trade off low-latency capacity against lower effective bandwidth taxes, we explicitly combine the Websearch (low-latency) and Shuffle (bulk) workloads from above in varying proportions. Figure 10 shows the aggregate network throughput as a function of Websearch (low-latency) traffic load, defined as before as a fraction of the aggregate host link capacity. We see that for low Websearch load, Opera delivers up to $4\times$ more throughput than the static topologies. Even at 10% Websearch load (near its maximum admissible load), Opera still delivers almost $2\times$ more throughput. In essence, Opera “gives up” a factor of 2 in low-latency capacity (due to its relatively under-




Figure 9: FCTs for the Websearch workload. All networks are cost comparable except hybrid RotorNet, which is $1.33\times$ more expensive. Opera carries all traffic over indirect paths, and supports up to 10% low-latency traffic load with near-equivalent FCTs to the 3:1 folded Clos and $u = 7$ expander.




Figure 10: Network throughput vs. Websearch traffic load for a combined Websearch/Shuffle workload.

provisioned ToRs) to gain a factor of 2–4 in bulk capacity from its vastly lower effective bandwidth tax.

Facebook has reported that only 25% of traffic is attributed to bulk-dominated Hadoop jobs, but also that the total average network load is less than 1% [39]. Even if the other 75% of traffic was solely low-latency flows, Opera can accommodate this light overall load with little-to-no degradation in FCT while significantly improving throughput for Hadoop traffic, which has a high momentary peak load due to the correlated start times of constituent flows.

5.5 Fault tolerance

Next, we demonstrate Opera’s ability to maintain and re-establish connectivity in the face of component failures by injecting random link, ToR, and circuit switch failures into the network. We then step through the topology slices and record (1) the number of ToR pairs that were disconnected in the worst-case topology slice and (2) the number of unique disconnected ToR pairs integrated across all slices. Figure 11 shows that Opera can withstand about 4% of links failing, 7% of ToRs failing, or 33% (2 out of 6) of circuit switches failing without suffering any loss in connectivity. Opera’s robustness to failure stems from the good fault tolerance properties of expander graphs. As discussed in Appendix F, Opera has better fault tolerance than a 3:1 folded Clos, and is less tolerant than the $u = 7$ expander (which has higher fanout). Maintaining connectivity under failure does require some degree of path stretch in Opera; Appendix F discusses this in more detail.

5.6 Network scale and cost sensitivity

Finally, we examine Opera’s relative performance across a range of network sizes and cost assumptions. We introduce a parameter α , which is defined following [29] to be the cost of an Opera “port” (consisting of a ToR port, optical transceiver, fiber, and circuit switch port) divided by the cost of a static network “port” (consisting of a ToR port, optical transceiver, and fiber). A full description of this cost-normalization method is presented in Appendix A. If $\alpha > 1$ (i.e. circuit switch ports are not free) then a cost-equivalent static network can use the extra capital to purchase more packet switches and increase its aggregate capacity.

We evaluated workloads previously analyzed in [29] using `htsim`: (1) hot rack, which is a highly skewed workload where one rack communicates with one other rack; (2) skew[0.1,1], (10% of racks are hot [29]), (3) skew[0.2,1] (20% hot); and (4) host permutation, where each host sends to one other non-rack-local host. For each workload, we considered a range of relative Opera port costs (reallocating any resulting cost savings in the static networks to increase their capacity). We considered both $k = 12$ and $k = 24$ ToR radices, corresponding to 648-host and 5,184-host networks. Figure 12 shows the results for $k = 24$; the $k = 12$ case has nearly identical cost-performance scaling and is presented in Appendix D, along with path length scaling analysis.

The throughput of the folded Clos topology is independent of traffic pattern, whereas the throughput of the expander topology decreases as workloads become less skewed. Opera’s throughput initially decreases with a decrease in skew, then increases as the traffic becomes more uniform. As long as $\alpha < 1.8$ (Opera’s circuit switch ports cost less than a packet switch port populated with an optical transceiver), Opera delivers higher throughputs than either an expander or folded Clos for permutation traffic and moderately skewed traffic (e.g. 20% of racks communicating). In the case of a single hot rack, Opera offers comparable performance to a static expander. In the case of shuffle (all-to-all) traffic, Opera delivers $2\times$ higher throughput than either the expander or folded Clos even for $\alpha = 2$. As discussed further in Appendix A, we believe $\alpha = 1.3$ is achievable today with certain optical switching technologies.




Figure 11: Fault tolerance in a 648-host, 108-rack Opera network with 6 circuit switches and $k = 12$ port ToRs. Connectivity loss is the fraction of disconnected ToR pairs. In cases involving ToR failures, connectivity loss refers to non-failed ToRs.




Figure 12: Throughput for (left to right) hottrack, skew[0.1,1], skew[0.2,1], and permutation workloads for $k = 24$ ports.

Opera does not offer an advantage for skewed and permutation workloads when the relative cost of its ports is significantly higher than packet switches ($\alpha > 2$), or in deployments where more than 10% of the link rate is devoted to urgent, delay-intolerant traffic, as described in Section 5.3.

6 Prototype

Priority queuing plays an important role in Opera’s design, ensuring that low-latency packets do not get buffered behind bulk packets in the end hosts and switches, and our simulation study reflects this design. In a real system, low-latency packets that arrive at a switch might temporarily buffer behind lower-priority bulk packets that are being transmitted out an egress port. To better understand the impact of this effect on the end-to-end latency of Opera, we built a small-scale hardware prototype.

The prototype consists of eight ToR switches, each with four uplinks connected to one of four emulated circuit switches (the same topology shown in Figure 5). All eight ToR and four circuit switches are implemented as virtual switches within a single physical 6.5-Tb/s Barefoot Tofino switch. We wrote a P4 program to emulate the circuit switches, which forward bulk packets arriving at an ingress port based on a state register, regardless of the destination address of the packet. We connect the virtual ToR switches to the four virtual circuit switches using eight physical 100-Gb/s cables in loopback mode (logically partitioned into 32 10-Gb/s links). Each virtual ToR switch is connected via a cable to one attached end host, which hosts a Mellanox ConnectX-5 NIC. There are eight such end hosts (one per ToR switch) each configured to run at 10 Gb/s.

An attached control server periodically sends a packet to the Tofino’s ASIC that updates its state register. After configuring this register, the controller sends RDMA messages to each of the attached hosts, signaling that one of the emulated circuit switches has reconfigured. The end hosts run two




Figure 13: RTT values for low-latency traffic with and without bulk background traffic in the prototype.

processes: an MPI-based shuffle program patterned on the Hadoop workload, and a simple “ping-pong” application that sends low-latency RDMA messages to a randomly selected receiver, which simply returns a response back to the sender. The relatively low sending rate of the ping-pong application did not require us to implement NDP for this traffic.

6.1 End-to-end latency

Figure 13 shows the observed application-level latency of sending a ping message from a random source to a random destination (and back). We plot this distribution both with and without bulk background traffic. The latency observed without bulk traffic is due to a combination of the path length and the time to forward a packet through Tofino’s P4 program, which we observe to be about 3 μ s per hop, resulting in latency of up to 9 μ s depending on path length. The observed tail is due to RoCE/MPI variance at the end hosts. In the presence of bulk traffic, low-latency packets potentially need to queue behind bulk packets currently being sent from the egress port. Because we emulate circuit switches within the Barefoot switch, each transit of a circuit-switch introduces additional latency that would not be present in a deployment, adding additional latency. For our testbed there are as many as eight serialization points from source to destination, or 16 for each ping-pong exchange. Each serialization point can introduce

#Racks	#Entries	% Utilization
108	12,096	0.7
252	65,268	3.8
520	276,120	16.2
768	600,576	35.3
1008	1,032,192	60.7
1200	1,461,600	85.9

Table 1: Number of entries and resulting resource utilization for Opera rulesets for datacenters of varying sizes.

as much as $1.2 \mu\text{s}$ (one MTU at 10 Gb/s), or $19.2 \mu\text{s}$ in total, as shown in Figure 13. The distribution is smooth because when low-latency packets buffer behind bulk packets currently exiting the switch, the amount of remaining time is effectively a random variable.

6.2 Routing state scalability

Opera requires more routing state than a static topology. A straightforward implementation would require the tables in each switch to contain $O(N_{rack})^2$ entries as there are N_{rack} topology slices and $N_{rack} - 1$ possible destinations within each slice. We use Barefoot’s Capilano compiler tool to measure the size of the ruleset for various datacenter sizes, and compare that size to the capacity of the Tofino 65x100GE switch. The ruleset consists of both bulk and low-latency non-rack-local rules. The resulting number of rules and the percent utilization of the switch’s memory are shown in Table 1. Because the practical rulesize limit may be lower than the compiler-predicted size due to hash collisions within the switch, we loaded the generated rules into a physical switch to validate that the rules would fit into the resource constraints. These results show that today’s hardware is capable of holding the rules needed to implement Opera, while also leaving spare capacity for additional non-Opera rules.

7 Related work

Opera builds upon previous network designs focused on cluster and low-latency environments. In addition to the folded-Clos and expander graph topologies described thus far, a number of additional static and dynamic network topologies have been proposed for clusters and datacenters.

Static topologies: Dragonfly [30] and SlimFly [8] topologies connect localized pools of high cross-section bandwidth with a sparse inter-cluster set of links, and have been adopted in HPC environments. Diamond [12] and WaveCube [9] statically interconnect switches with optical wavelength MUXes, resulting in a connected topology without reconfiguration. Quartz [32] interconnects switches into rings, and relies on multi-hop forwarding for low-latency traffic.

Dynamic topologies: Several dynamic network topologies have been proposed, which we can group into two categories: those that cannot support low-latency traffic and those that

can. In the former case, Helios [16], Mordia [38], and C-Through [44] aim to reactively establish high-bandwidth connections in response to observed traffic patterns; they all rely on a separate packet-switched network to support low-latency traffic. RotorNet [34] relies on deterministic reconfiguration to deliver constant bandwidth between all endpoints, and requires endpoints inject traffic using Valiant load balancing to support skewed traffic. RotorNet requires a separate packet-switched network for low latency traffic.

ProjecToR [20], on the other hand, always maintains a “base mesh” of connected links that can handle low-latency traffic while it opportunistically reconfigures free-space links in response to changes in traffic patterns. The authors initially evaluated the use of a random base network, ruling it out due to poor support of skew. Instead, they proposed a weighted matching of sources and sinks, though it is not clear what the expected diameter of that network would be in general. Similar to ProjecToR, Opera maintains an “always on” base network which consists of a repeating sequence of time-varying expander graphs, which has a well-known structure and performance characteristics.

There are also reconfigurable network proposals that rely on multi-hop indirection to support low-latency traffic. In OSA [10], during reconfiguration some end-to-end paths may not be available, and so some circuit-switch ports can be reserved specifically to ensure connectivity for low-latency traffic. Megaswitch [11] could potentially support low-latency traffic in a similar manner.

8 Conclusions

Static topologies such as oversubscribed folded-Clos and expander graphs support low-latency traffic but have limited overall network bandwidth. Recently proposed dynamic topologies provide high bandwidth, but cannot support low-latency traffic. In this paper, we propose Opera, which is a topology that implements a series of time-varying expander graphs that support low-latency traffic, and when integrated over time, provide direct connections between all endpoints to deliver high throughput to bulk traffic. Opera can deliver a $4\times$ increase in throughput for shuffle workloads and a 60% increase in supported load for skewed datacenter workloads compared to cost-equivalent static networks, all without adversely impacting the flow completion times of short flows.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the Department of Energy through grant ARPA-E DE-AR000084, and by the National Science Foundation through grants CNS-1564185, CNS-1553490, CSR-1629973, and CNS-1911104. We would like to thank our shepherd, Manya Ghobadi, as well as the anonymous NSDI reviewers for their useful feedback.

References

- [1] IEEE standard for a precision clock synchronization protocol for networked measurement and control systems. *IEEE Std 1588-2008 (Revision of IEEE Std 1588-2002)*, pages 1–300, July 2008.
- [2] Mohammad Al-Fares, Alex Loukissas, and Amin Vahdat. A scalable, commodity, data center network architecture. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, Seattle, WA, August 2008.
- [3] Mohammad Al-Fares, Sivasankar Radhakrishnan, Barath Raghavan, Nelson Huang, and Amin Vahdat. Hedera: Dynamic Flow Scheduling for Data Center Networks. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM/USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, San Jose, CA, April 2010.
- [4] Mohammad Alizadeh, Albert Greenberg, David A. Maltz, Jitendra Padhye, Parveen Patel, Balaji Prabhakar, Sudipta Sengupta, and Murari Sridharan. Data center TCP (DCTCP). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, pages 63–74, New Delhi, India, 2010.
- [5] Mohammad Alizadeh, Abdul Kabbani, Tom Edsall, Balaji Prabhakar, Amin Vahdat, and Masato Yasuda. Less is more: Trading a little bandwidth for ultra-low latency in the data center. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 19–19, San Jose, CA, 2012.
- [6] N Alon. Eigen values and expanders. *Combinatorica*, 6(2):83–96, January 1986.
- [7] Wei Bai, Li Chen, Kai Chen, Dongsu Han, Chen Tian, and Hao Wang. Information-agnostic flow scheduling for commodity data centers. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 455–468, Oakland, CA, 2015.
- [8] Maciej Besta and Torsten Hoefler. Slim fly: A cost effective low-diameter network topology. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 348–359, New Orleans, Louisiana, 2014.
- [9] K. Chen, X. Wen, X. Ma, Y. Chen, Y. Xia, C. Hu, and Q. Dong. Wavecube: A scalable, fault-tolerant, high-performance optical data center architecture. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, pages 1903–1911, April 2015.
- [10] Kai Chen, Ankit Singlay, Atul Singhz, Kishore Ramchandran, Lei Xuz, Yueping Zhangz, Xitao Wen, and Yan Chen. OSA: An optical switching architecture for data center networks with unprecedented flexibility. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 18–18, San Jose, CA, 2012.
- [11] Li Chen, Kai Chen, Zhonghua Zhu, Minlan Yu, George Porter, Chunming Qiao, and Shan Zhong. Enabling wide-spread communications on optical fabric with MegaSwitch. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 577–593, Boston, MA, 2017.
- [12] Yong Cui, Shihan Xiao, Xin Wang, Zhenjie Yang, Chao Zhu, Xiangyang Li, Liu Yang, and Ning Ge. Diamond: Nesting the data center network with wireless rings in 3D space. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 657–669, Santa Clara, CA, 2016.
- [13] Jeffrey Dean and Sanjay Ghemawat. MapReduce: Simplified data processing on large clusters. In *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Symposium on Operating Systems Design & Implementation*, pages 10–10, San Francisco, CA, 2004.
- [14] Nandita Dukkupati and Nick McKeown. Why flow-completion time is the right metric for congestion control. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 36(1):59–62, January 2006.
- [15] Facebook. Introducing data center fabric. <https://engineering.fb.com/production-engineering/introducing-data-center-fabric-the-next-generation-facebook-data-center-network/>, 2019.
- [16] Nathan Farrington, George Porter, Sivasankar Radhakrishnan, Hamid Bazzaz, Vikram Subramanya, Yeshaiahu Fainman, George Papen, and Amin Vahdat. Helios: A hybrid electrical/optical switch architecture for modular data centers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, New Delhi, India, August 2010.
- [17] Joseph E. Ford, Yeshayahu Fainman, and Sing H. Lee. Reconfigurable array interconnection by photorefractive correlation. *Appl. Opt.*, 33(23):5363–5377, Aug 1994.
- [18] The Apache Software Foundation. Apache Hadoop. <https://hadoop.apache.org/>, 2018.
- [19] Peter X. Gao, Akshay Narayan, Gautam Kumar, Rachit Agarwal, Sylvia Ratnasamy, and Scott Shenker. pHost: Distributed near-optimal datacenter transport over commodity network fabric. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, pages 1:1–1:12, Heidelberg, Germany, 2015.
- [20] Monia Ghobadi, Ratul Mahajan, Amar Phanishayee, Nikhil Devanur, Janardhan Kulkarni, Gireeja Ranade, Pierre-Alexandre Blanche, Houman Rastegarfar,

- Madeleine Glick, and Daniel Kilper. ProjecToR: Agile reconfigurable data center interconnect. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, pages 216–229, Florianopolis, Brazil, 2016.
- [21] Albert Greenberg, James R. Hamilton, Navendu Jain, Srikanth Kandula, Changhoon Kim, Parantap Lahiri, David A. Maltz, Parveen Patel, and Sudipta Sengupta. VL2: A scalable and flexible data center network. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication*, pages 51–62, Barcelona, Spain, 2009.
- [22] Matthew P. Grosvenor, Malte Schwarzkopf, Ionel Gog, Robert N. M. Watson, Andrew W. Moore, Steven Hand, and Jon Crowcroft. Queues don't matter when you can jump them! In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 1–14, Oakland, CA, 2015.
- [23] Navid Hamedazimi, Zafar Qazi, Himanshu Gupta, Vyas Sekar, Samir R. Das, Jon P. Longtin, Himanshu Shah, and Ashish Tanwer. Firefly: A reconfigurable wireless data center fabric using free-space optics. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on SIGCOMM*, pages 319–330, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 2014.
- [24] Mark Handley, Costin Raiciu, Alexandru Agache, Andrei Voinescu, Andrew W. Moore, Gianni Antichi, and Marcin Wójcik. Re-architecting datacenter networks and stacks for low latency and high performance. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, pages 29–42, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2017.
- [25] Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *BULL. AMER. MATH. SOC.*, 43(4):439–561, 2006.
- [26] Ht-sim. The htsim simulator. <https://github.com/nets-cs-pub-ro/NDP/wiki/NDP-Simulator>, 2018.
- [27] Sangeetha Abdu Jyothi, Ankit Singla, P. Brighten Godfrey, and Alexandra Kolla. Measuring and understanding throughput of network topologies. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 65:1–65:12, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2016.
- [28] Srikanth Kandula, Jitendra Padhye, and Paramvir Bahl. Flyways to de-congest data center networks. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets-VIII)*, New York City, NY, October 2009.
- [29] Simon Kassing, Asaf Valadarsky, Gal Shahaf, Michael Schapira, and Ankit Singla. Beyond fat-trees without antennae, mirrors, and disco-balls. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, pages 281–294, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2017.
- [30] John Kim, William J. Dally, Steve Scott, and Dennis Abts. Technology-driven, highly-scalable dragonfly topology. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, pages 77–88, Beijing, China, 2008.
- [31] He Liu, Feng Lu, Alex Forenich, Rishi Kapoor, Malveeka Tewari, Geoffrey M. Voelker, George Papen, Alex C. Snoeren, and George Porter. Circuit Switching Under the Radar with REACToR. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM/USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, pages 1–15, Seattle, WA, April 2014.
- [32] Yunpeng James Liu, Peter Xiang Gao, Bernard Wong, and Srinivasan Keshav. Quartz: A new design element for low-latency DCNs. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on SIGCOMM*, pages 283–294, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 2014.
- [33] W. M. Mellette, G. M. Schuster, G. Porter, G. Papen, and J. E. Ford. A scalable, partially configurable optical switch for data center networks. *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, 35(2):136–144, Jan 2017.
- [34] William M. Mellette, Rob McGuinness, Arjun Roy, Alex Forenich, George Papen, Alex C. Snoeren, and George Porter. RotorNet: a scalable, low-complexity, optical datacenter network. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, Los Angeles, California, August 2017.
- [35] William M. Mellette, Alex C. Snoeren, and George Porter. P-FatTree: A multi-channel datacenter network topology. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets-XV)*, Atlanta, GA, November 2016.
- [36] Behnam Montazeri, Yilong Li, Mohammad Alizadeh, and John Ousterhout. Homa: A receiver-driven low-latency transport protocol using network priorities. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, pages 221–235, Budapest, Hungary, 2018.
- [37] Radhika Niranjana Mysore, Andreas Pamboris, Nathan Farrington, Nelson Huang, Pardis Miri, Sivasankar Radhakrishnan, Vikram Subramanya, and Amin Vahdat. Portland: A scalable fault-tolerant layer 2 data center network fabric. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication*, pages 39–50, Barcelona, Spain, 2009.

- [38] George Porter, Richard Strong, Nathan Farrington, Alex Forencich, Pang-Chen Sun, Tajana Rosing, Yeshaiah Fainman, George Papen, and Amin Vahdat. Integrating microsecond circuit switching into the data center. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, Hong Kong, China, August 2013.
- [39] Arjun Roy, Hongyi Zeng, Jasmeet Bagga, George Porter, and Alex C. Snoeren. Inside the social network’s (data-center) network. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, London, England, August 2015.
- [40] Vishal Shrivastav, Asaf Valadarsky, Hitesh Ballani, Paolo Costa, Ki Suh Lee, Han Wang, Rachit Agarwal, and Hakim Weatherspoon. Shoal: A lossless network for high-density and disaggregated racks. Technical report, Cornell, <https://hdl.handle.net/1813/49647>, 2017.
- [41] Arjun Singh, Joon Ong, Amit Agarwal, Glen Anderson, Ashby Armistead, Roy Bannon, Seb Boving, Gaurav Desai, Bob Felderman, Paulie Germano, Anand Kana-gala, Jeff Provost, Jason Simmons, Eiichi Tanda, Jim Wanderer, Urs Hölzle, Stephen Stuart, and Amin Vahdat. Jupiter rising: A decade of Clos topologies and centralized control in google’s datacenter network. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, pages 183–197, London, United Kingdom, 2015.
- [42] Ankit Singla, Chi-Yao Hong, Lucian Popa, and P. Brighten Godfrey. Jellyfish: Networking data centers randomly. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 17–17, San Jose, CA, 2012.
- [43] Asaf Valadarsky, Gal Shahaf, Michael Dinitz, and Michael Schapira. Xpander: Towards optimal-performance datacenters. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, pages 205–219, Irvine, California, USA, 2016.
- [44] Guohui Wang, David G. Andersen, Michael Kaminsky, Konstantina Papagiannaki, T.S. Eugene Ng, Michael Kozuch, and Michael Ryan. c-through: Part-time optics in data centers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*, pages 327–338, New Delhi, India, 2010.
- [45] Xia Zhou, Zengbin Zhang, Yibo Zhu, Yubo Li, Saipriya Kumar, Amin Vahdat, Ben Y. Zhao, and Haitao Zheng. Mirror mirror on the ceiling: Flexible wireless links for data centers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication*, pages 443–454, Helsinki, Finland, 2012.

Appendix

A Cost-normalization approach

In this section, we detail the method we used to analyze a range of cost-equivalent network topologies at various network scales and technology cost points. We begin by defining α as the cost of an Opera “port” (consisting of a ToR port, optical transceiver, fiber, and circuit switch port) divided by the cost of a static network “port” (consisting of a ToR port, optical transceiver, and fiber), following [29].

We can also interpret α as the cost of the “core” ports (i.e. upward-facing ToR ports and above) per edge port (i.e. server-facing ToR port). Core ports drive the network cost because they require optical transceivers. Thus, for a folded Clos we can write $\alpha = 2(T - 1)/F$ (where T is the number of tiers and F is the oversubscription factor). For a static expander, we can write $\alpha = u/(k - u)$ (where u is the number of ToR uplinks and k is the ToR radix).

We use a $T = 3$ three tier (i.e. three layer) folded Clos as the normalizing basis and keep the packet switch radix (k) and number of hosts (H) constant for each point of network comparison. To determine the number of hosts as a function of k and α , we first solve for the oversubscription factor as a function of α : $F = 2(T - 1)/\alpha$ (note $T = 3$). Then, we find the number of hosts H in a folded Clos as a function of F , k , and α : $H = (4F/(F + 1))(k/2)^T$ (note $T = 3$, and F is a function of α). This allows us to compare networks for various values of k and α , but we also estimate α given technology assumptions described below.

Opera’s cost hinges largely on the circuit switching technology used. While a wide variety of technologies could be used in principle, using optical rotor switches [34] is likely the most cost-effective because (1) they provide low optical signal attenuation (about 3 dB) [33], and (2) they are compatible with either single mode or multimode signaling by virtue of their imaging-relay-based design [33]. These factors mean that Opera can use the same (cost) multimode or single-mode transceivers used in traditional networks, unlike many other optical network proposals that require expensive and sophisticated telecom grade gear such as wavelength tunable transceivers or optical amplifiers. Based on the cost estimates of commodity components taken from [29] and rotor switch components (summarized in Table 2), we approximate that an Opera port costs about $1.3 \times$ more than a static network port (i.e. $\alpha=1.3$).

B Hybrid cost-performance tradeoff

In Section 5, we evaluated the performance of a hybrid RotorNet which faced one of the six available ToR uplinks to a multi-stage packet switched network (for $1.33 \times$ the cost of the other networks evaluated). Here, we consider the tradeoff between FCT and cost for a broader range of hybrid packet switched bandwidths. To consider small fractions of packet switched bandwidth, we allow the bandwidth of a single ToR uplink to be split arbitrarily between the packet and circuit

Component	Static	Opera
SR transceiver	\$80	\$80
Optical fiber (\$0.3/m)	\$45	\$45
ToR port	\$90	\$90
Optical fiber array	-	\$30 †
Optical lenses	-	\$15 †
Beam-steering element	-	\$5 †
Optical mapping	-	\$10 †
Total	\$215	\$275
α ratio	1	1.3

Table 2: Cost per “port” for a static network vs. Opera. A “port” in a static network consists of a packet switch port, optical transceiver, and fiber. A “port” in Opera consists of a packet switched (ToR) port, optical transceiver, and fiber, as well as the components needed to build a rotor switch. The cost of rotor switch components is amortized across the number of ports on a given rotor switch, which can be 100s or 1,000s; we present values in the table assuming 512 port rotor switches. († per duplex fiber port)




Figure 14: Flow completion times as a function of the cost incurred by adding more packet switched bandwidth to a hybrid RotorNet. The FCTs for Opera are shown for reference. FCTs are shown for 1 kB flows in the Datamining workload running at 25% load. The percent values for hybrid RotorNet indicate the percent of total network bandwidth allocated to the packet switched portion of the network.




Figure 15: Relative cycle time is improved at larger scale by grouping circuit switches and allowing one switch in each group to reconfigure simultaneously.

networks. Figure 14 shows the resulting tradeoff between cost and the FCTs for 1 kB flows in the Datamining workload running at 25% load (similar trends were observed for other loads and flow sizes). As cost is reduced in hybrid RotorNet (by allocating a smaller percent of total network bandwidth to the packet switched network), FCTs begin to rise substantially due to increased network congestion.

C Reducing cycle time at scale

Larger Opera networks are enabled by higher radix ToR switches, which commensurately increase the number of circuit switches. To prevent the cycle time from scaling quadratically with the ToR radix, we allow multiple circuit switches to reconfigure simultaneously (ensuring that the remaining switches deliver a fully-connected network at all times). As an example, doubling the ToR radix doubles the number of circuit switches, but presents the opportunity to cut the cycle time in half by reconfiguring two circuit switches at a time. This approach offers linear scaling in the cycle time with the ToR radix, as shown in Figure 15. Assuming we divide circuit switches into groups of 6, parallelizing the cycle of each group, the cycle time increases by a factor of 6 from a $k = 12$ (648-host network) to a $k = 64$ (98,304-host network), corresponding to a flow length cutoff for “bulk” flows of 90 MB in the latter case.

D Additional scaling analysis

Figure 16 shows the performance-cost scaling trends for various traffic patterns for networks with $k = 12$ port ToRs. Comparing with Figure 12, we observed nearly identical performance between networks with $k = 12$ and $k = 24$, indicating the (cost-normalized) network performance is nearly independent of scale for all networks considered (folded Clos, static expanders, and Opera).

To analyze this result at a more fundamental level, we evaluated the average and worst-case path lengths for ToR radices between $k = 12$ and $k = 48$ for both Opera and static expanders at various cost points (α). Figure 17 shows that the average path lengths converge for large network sizes (the worst-case path length for all networks including Opera was 4 ToR-to-ToR hops for $k = 24$ and above). Given that the network performance properties of static expanders are




Figure 16: Throughput for (left to right) hottrack, skew[0.1,1], skew[0.2,1], and permutation workloads for $k = 24$ ports.




Figure 17: Path lengths for different network sizes (from $k = 12$ with ≈ 650 hosts to $k = 48$ with $\approx 98,000$ hosts) and relative cost assumptions (α).

correlated with their path length properties [6], Figure 17 supports our observation that the cost-performance properties of the networks do not change substantially with network size.

E Spectral efficiency and path lengths

The *spectral gap* of a network is a graph-theoretic metric indicating how close a graph is to an optimal Ramanujan expander [25]. Larger spectral gaps imply better expansion. We evaluated the spectral gap for each the 108 topology slices in the example 648-host 108-rack Opera network analyzed in the text, and compared it to the spectral gaps of a number of randomly-generated static expanders with varying $d:u$ ratios. All networks used $k = 12$ radix ToRs and were constrained to have a nearly-equal number of hosts. The results are shown in Figure 18. Note that expanders with larger u require more ToR switches (i.e., cost more) to support the same number of hosts.

Interestingly, when the number of hosts is held constant, we observe that the average and worst-case path length is not a strong function of the spectral gap. Further, we see that Opera comes very close to the best average path length achievable with a static expander, indicating that it makes good use of the ToR uplinks in each topology slice. Opera achieves this




Figure 18: Average and worst-case path lengths and spectral gap for Opera and static expander networks. All networks use $k = 12$ -port ToR switches and have between 644 and 650 hosts. Each data point for Opera corresponds to one of its 108 topology slices.

good performance despite the fact that we have imposed additional constraints to support bulk traffic with low bandwidth tax: unlike a static expander, Opera must provide a set of $N_{racks} = 108$ expanders across time, and those expanders are constructed from an underlying set of disjoint matchings.

F Additional failure analysis

Opera recomputes paths to route around failed links, ToRs, and circuit switches, and in general these paths will be longer than those under zero failures. Figure 19 shows the correlation between the degree of each type of failure and the average and maximum path length (taken across all topology slices).

For reference, we also analyzed the fault tolerance properties of the 3:1 folded Clos and $u = 7$ expander discussed in the paper. Figure 20 shows the results for the 3:1 Clos and Figure 21 shows results for the $u = 7$ expander. We note that Opera has better fault tolerance properties than the 3:1 folded Clos, but the $u = 7$ expander is better yet. This is not surprising considering the $u = 7$ expander has significantly more links and switches, as well as higher fanout at each ToR.




Figure 19: Average and worst-case path length of a 108-rack Opera network with 6 circuit switches and $k = 12$ port ToRs, for various failure conditions. Path length is reported for all finite-length paths. Figure 11 indicates how many ToR-pairs are disconnected (i.e. have infinite path length).




Figure 20: Connectivity loss and impact on path lengths in the 3:1 folded Clos for link failures (top two) and ToR failures (bottom two).




Figure 21: Connectivity loss and impact on path lengths in the $u = 7$ expander for link failures (top two) and ToR failures (bottom two).