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## How to build 100G datacenter networks?

## Datacenters Traffic Is Skewed



## 10G Fat-Tree



## 100G Fat-Tree



## [SIGCOMM 2010]

## Helios, c-Through: Hotspot Circuits

Destinations



Use mirrors
Reconfigures in 10ms
[NSDI 2012]
OSA: More Circuits


## [SIGCOMM 2013]

## Mordia: Fast Circuit Switching



## Limitation: Still Circuit Switching



## Limitation: Still Circuit Switching



## Limitation: Inefficient with Small Flows



## Our Approach: REACToR



## Start with a Pre-existing 10G Network



## Connect via REACToR





## Challenge: Two Different Networks



Electrical Packet

- Low bandwidth
- Buffers all the way
- Tx at any time


Optical Circuit

- High bandwidth
- Bufferless TDMA
- Tx only when circuit connects


## Design Requirements

- Hybrid scheduling: classify traffic into circuits or packets
- Buffer packets at source hosts until circuit is available
- Have sources transmit when the circuit is connected
- Rate control to prevent downlink overload


## The Hybrid Scheduling Problem



- Collect traffic demand from all hosts
- TDMA schedule the big flows on the circuit path
- Schedule the rest on the packet path
- An oracle predicts the demand and builds the schedules.


## End Host: Classify and Buffer Packets



- Classify packets and map into different hardware queues
- Based on the schedule
- Packet path: one hardware queue for all destinations
- Can transmit at any time, but at 10G
- Circuit path: one hardware queue for each destination
- Can only transmit when the particular circuit is connected
- Buffer the packets in end-host memory


## Packet Transmission

- Packet path: Rate limit to 10G
- Circuit path: Transmit only when the circuit is connected
- REACToR pulls packets from the circuit queue in real-time
- Use PFC frames to selectively unpause queues



## Rate Control

- Problem: downlink merging 100G + 10G to 100 G



## Rate Control

- Problem: downlink merging 100G + 10G to 100G

- Our approach: Rate limit the circuit path at the source to avoid overloading



## Implementation



## 10G/1G Prototype



## Timing Parameters

- End-to-end reconfiguration time: $30 \mu \mathrm{~s}$
- Schedule reconfigures every 1500 us
- Example: 7 flows TDMA, 86\% duty cycle
$1500 \mu \mathrm{~s}$



## Evaluation

- Experiment 1: Supporting TCP
- The performance on working with stock network stack
- Experiment 2: React to demand changes
- The dynamics on handling changes and mispredictions
- Experiment 3: Demonstrate the benefit of using hybrid
- The performance gain on handling skewed demand


## Experiment 1: Supporting TCP

- Each host receives 7 TCP flows from all other hosts
- Hybrid schedule: data packets via OCS, ACKs via EPS
- 7 flows TDMA, fair sharing the link
- Check if TCP works with high throughput


## TCP Throughput



## Experiment 2: React to Demand Changes

From: Intra-rack Traffic


Use pktgen to impose precise and sudden traffic pattern change. See if REACToR can react in time.

## React to Demand Changes

3-host round robin
demand change
4-host round robin

## React fast and robust to demand changes

Tx with Packet

## Experiment 3: Demonstrating Hybrid

- Simulated 64 hosts with demand of different skewness
- Big benefit from a small electrical packet switch



## Experiment 3: Demonstrating Hybrid

- Simulated 64 hosts with demand of different skewness
- Big benefit from a small electrical packet switch



## Optical Circuit Switching Not Enough
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## Optical Circuit Switching Not Enough



## Hybrid Switching with REACToR
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## Hybrid Switching with REACToR



## Conclusion



100G Optical
Circuit Switching


10G Electrical
Packet Switching

REACToR


100G Electrical
Packet Switching

For datacenter workloads At a lower cost

Thank you!

## DCTCP: Datacenter Workload

[SIGCOMM 2010]


## Cost of Transceivers

- Cost of 10G Transceivers
- Cost: \$500 per pair
- Power: 1Watt per pair
- (100G costs even more)
- 3-Level Fat-tree: 27.6k hosts
- Transceivers per host:

| Link rate | Full fat tree | Helios-like | REACToR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 \mathrm{~Gb} / \mathrm{s}$ | $2-4$ | $1-3$ | N/A |
| $100 \mathrm{~Gb} / \mathrm{s}$ | 4 | 3 | $1^{\dagger}$ |

## Scheduling

- Problem: matrix decomposition
- Similar to BvN, but must consider reconfiguration penalty
- NP-complete problem
- Goal: schedule all the big flows ( $90 \%$ of the demand)
- Greedy approach: e.g. iSLIP
- Suboptimal
- Naïve BvN:
- Fragmented by small elements and residuals
- A good algorithm should:
- Prioritize the big flows
- Perform full matrix decomposition (like BvN)
- Minimize number of reconfigurations at the same time

