

FASTFLOW: Flexible Adaptive Congestion Control for High-Performance Datacenters

Tommaso Bonato
ETH Zürich
Microsoft

Abdul Kabbani
Microsoft

Daniele De Sensi
Sapienza University of Rome

Rong Pan
AMD

Yanfang Le
AMD

Costin Raiciu
Broadcom Inc.

Mark Handley
Broadcom Inc.

Timo Schneider
ETH Zürich

Nils Blach
ETH Zürich

Ahmad Ghalayini
Microsoft

Daniel Alves
Microsoft

Michael Papamichael
Microsoft

Adrian Caulfield
Microsoft

Torsten Hoefler
ETH Zürich
Microsoft

ABSTRACT

The increasing demand of machine learning (ML) workloads in datacenters places significant stress on current congestion control (CC) algorithms, many of which struggle to maintain performance at scale. These workloads generate bursty, synchronized traffic that requires both rapid response and fairness across flows. Unfortunately, existing CC algorithms that rely heavily on delay as a primary congestion signal often fail to react quickly enough and do not consistently ensure fairness. In this paper, we propose FASTFLOW, a streamlined sender-based CC algorithm that integrates delay, ECN signals, and optional packet trimming to achieve precise, real-time adjustments to congestion windows. Central to FASTFLOW is the QuickAdapt mechanism, which provides accurate bandwidth estimation at the receiver, enabling faster reactions to network conditions. We also show that FASTFLOW can effectively enhance receiver-based algorithms such as EQDS by improving their ability to manage in-network congestion. Our evaluation reveals that FASTFLOW outperforms cutting-edge solutions, including EQDS, Swift, BBR, and MPRDMA, delivering up to 50% performance improvements in modern datacenter networks.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the quickly-evolving landscape of AI-centric datacenters, the demand for large-scale and high-performance computing (HPC) capabilities has risen to unprecedented heights. This paradigm shift is demonstrated by the exponential growth of large-scale AI training [16, 52] and the proliferation of HPC offerings in the cloud [17]. The demand for high throughput

at an affordable cost and low latency has become extremely important, and a crucial component to achieving those targets lies in network infrastructure and protocols.

A notable manifestation of this demand is found in the statistics - a staggering 70% of Azure’s traffic is carried by Remote Direct Memory Access (RDMA) technology [7], and all major cloud providers are relying on similar technologies [17, 24, 48]. Yet, as we witness this transformation, it is worth acknowledging that existing protocols may not suit the demands of large-scale high-bandwidth networking. For example, *RDMA over Converged Ethernet* (RoCE) is affected by issues like excessive switch buffer requirements for *Priority Flow Control* (PFC), PFC storms, and in-order delivery requirements [29, 38].

1.1 Motivation

Similar limitations can be found in CC algorithms and to drive our design choices, we identified the following requirements for a modern high-performance CC algorithm.

1.1.1 Fairness. In this paper, we refer with the term *fairness* to the ability of a CC algorithm to allocate the available bandwidth evenly between competing flows. Minimizing jitter and keeping a low and consistent flow completion time (FCT) is particularly important in the context of AI and HPC workloads that exhibit tightly coordinated and synchronized communication patterns. In such systems, performance is often dictated by the slowest node in the system [19, 30, 47], as “*straggler*” flows and growing variability in FCT can have a disproportionately high impact on overall job progress.




Figure 1: Comparison of FASTFLOW with recent CC algorithms on an 8:1 oversubscribed fat tree running a permutation. The first number under each algorithm indicates the overall completion time, while the second the time difference between the fastest and slowest flow. The vertical gray line represents the ideal case where all flows terminate as fast as possible.

This is exacerbated by the presence of bursty traffic, which is often common in datacenters. For example, 80% of RPCs in Google datacenters fit in 1 *bandwidth-delay product* (BDP), and 89% fit in 4 BDP [6]. This behavior is also common in some AI workloads where nodes need to frequently exchange few KiB of data [28]. Algorithms relying on delay to detect congestion often react too late to such transient bursts [6, 57], leading to unfair treatment of concurrently running flows and increasing the completion time.

We show this effect in Fig. 1a, where we report the *Cumulative Distribution Function* (CDF) of the *Flow Completion Time* (FCT) of 2MiB flows in a permutation scenario with 1,024 nodes, for a 8:1 oversubscribed network (more details on the setup in Sec. 4). We can notice how, with Swift [33], a delay-based algorithm, the FCT of the slowest flow is 18% longer than the fastest flow. An even more pronounced effect can be observed with BBR [12] (which we observed needs up to seven *round trip times* (RTTs) to adjust its sending rate). MPRDMA [36], a per-packet ECN based mechanism suffers from its inherit unfairness which is more visible for small messages. Last, as we discuss further in Sec. 1.1.2, vanilla EQDS [42], although more fair, does not manage fabric congestion as effectively as sender-based CC algorithms. On the other hand, the algorithm we propose (FASTFLOW) quickly and precisely reacts to congestion by relying on different congestion signals (delay, ECN markings, and packet trimming), improving fairness and overall performance.

1.1.2 Fabric Congestion Management. Many CC algorithms have been optimized for managing congestion at the final hop caused by incast [27, 42] due to its relevance for traditional TCP-based workloads [14]. However, with the emergence of new workloads, those algorithms provide

sub-optimal performance, since they might have limited visibility of congestion happening in the network fabric. This type of congestion is often the result of oversubscription (i.e., traffic exceeding the capacity of the network), common at upper tiers of datacenter networks [6, 24], but can also occur in a non-oversubscribed setting as a result of ECMP collisions [2, 11, 23]. This is shown in Fig. 1b, where we report the CDF of the FCT of 32MiB flows in a permutation scenario with 1,024 nodes, for an 8:1 oversubscribed network. In this scenario, flows are big enough to allow Swift and MPRDMA to react effectively to congestion. However, FCT with EQDS is higher due to its inability to adapt to fabric congestion, hence underutilizing network bandwidth due to trimmed packets and re-transmissions. As we show in Sec. 5.1, this can be improved by complementing EQDS with FASTFLOW.

1.1.3 Ease of Deployment. Last, the constant increase in the number of nodes used by workloads and the number of network flows per node [45] limits the amount of memory that can be used to track the flow state. This is even more critical when we consider that network bandwidth is rapidly reaching the Tbit/s range and that, for performance reasons, (part of) the CC algorithm would be implemented in *Network Interface Cards* (NICs). This limits the amount of memory the algorithm can use and the complexity of the algorithms that can be executed (at 800Gbit/s, with 4KiB packets, the NIC needs to process one packet every 40 nanoseconds).

The escalating bandwidth requirements for network switches, currently at 51.2 Tbit/s and beyond, impose constraints on the complexity of features these switches can support. Additionally, gradually deploying new switch generations or incorporating switches from diverse vendors with varying features is common in datacenters [50]. Consequently, CC algorithms relying on specific new features demanding switch hardware support [25, 35, 51] might have difficulties getting adopted by datacenter providers.

1.2 Contributions

To fulfill these requirements, we introduce a new CC algorithm which we call FASTFLOW (*Sender-based Marked Rapidly-adapting Trimmed & Timed Transport*). FASTFLOW is a sender-based CC algorithm running over lossy Ethernet. To be easily deployable, FASTFLOW does not rely on any advanced in-band network telemetry (INT). It instead leverages a combination of ECN-marking and round-trip-time (RTT) measurements, two signals that have been commonly used in a mutually exclusive manner despite each of them possessing distinctive valuable benefits that complement one another (as we show in Sec. 3.1). Last, FASTFLOW efficiently uses memory and compute resources, since it only needs to store a few bytes per flow and does not require any *pull queue* or specific control packets, as common in many receiver-driven

algorithms. Specifically, FASTFLOW makes the following key contributions:

Quick Adapt A novel mechanism that can quickly converge to the achievable bandwidth capacity at any bottleneck, typically within one RTT of receiving a severe congestion signal (Sec. 3.3). QuickAdapt relies on packet trimming or, in the case where it is not supported, on timeouts (with minimal performance impact, Sec. 4.1). Using QuickAdapt, FASTFLOW can react to severe congestion as quickly as a receiver-based protocol but without requiring any special support on the receiver side (e.g., pull queues). We also argue that this feature can be retrofitted to any transport mechanism operating within tight RTT bounds, thus significantly reducing tail latencies. In particular, QuickAdapt can reduce queue occupancy much earlier than other sender-based mechanisms.

Fair Increase/Decrease A new congestion window management technique to improve bandwidth fairness (Sec. 3.2.1 and Sec. 3.2.3). In a nutshell, the congestion window is increased or decreased more conservatively (and proportionally to the currently acknowledged packet size) when the ECN and delay congestion signal disagree on the presence of congestion. To reduce any small degree of unfairness that might be present, FASTFLOW rapidly increases the congestion window of flows (Sec. 3.4) if no congestion is detected for a period of time.

2 BACKGROUND

The behavior of CC algorithms is mostly determined by how they detect (Sec. 2.1) and react (Sec. 2.2) to congestion.

2.1 Congestion Signals

Delay End-to-end delay accurately approximates congestion. Delay can be computed either by the sender, measuring the RTT (e.g., in Swift [33] and TCP [13]), or by the receiver, annotating acknowledgment packets (ACK) packets with one-way delay information (e.g., in TIMELY [37] or DX [34]). We assume in the following that accurate delay measurements are computed through NIC timestamping [7, 33].

ECN-marking With *explicit congestion notification* (ECN), switches set a bit in the traffic class field of the IP header when a packet experiences congestion. The receiver sends the marked packet back to the sender, which adjusts its rate accordingly [3, 56, 60]. Because ECN notifies congestion using a single bit, it provides less information than time-based signals, which instead account for the exact queuing delay along the path. Switches can use different policies to decide if a packet must be marked. For example, in *random early detection* (RED) [20], switches randomly mark packets with

a probability linear in the switch queue size, if that size is within two thresholds (K_{min} and K_{max}). Although ECN was designed to mark packets when they are enqueued [21], it has been shown that doing that when dequeued allows CC algorithms to react faster. Dequeue marking can be easily implemented on most existing switches [55], and in the rest of the paper, we assume that switches use RED and mark ECN packets when dequeued. Although ECN-based CC algorithms can react quicker than delay-based ones, they perform poorly when dealing with incast and can be challenging to tune [33].

Packet Losses Packet losses have extensively been used to detect severe congestion [20, 40]. However, by relying on losses only, the algorithm would react too late to congestion. Also, losses are often detected through timeouts, which are hard to tune and can cause unnecessary retransmissions.

Packet Trimming With packet trimming, a switch can remove parts of the packet (e.g., payload) rather than dropping it. Packet trimming retains essential information (e.g., headers), allowing the host to quickly detect and react to congestion [15, 27, 42]. Researchers demonstrated that packet trimming can be implemented on switches such as Intel Tofino, the Broadcom Trident 4 and NVidia Spectrum 2 by leveraging their ability to reroute packets to an alternative port when the initial egress queue becomes saturated [1].

In-Network Telemetry Whereas ECN and packet trimming can be seen as a simple form of in-network telemetry, other protocols report more detailed information, like maximum queue occupancy [35, 46] or links load [54] along the path.

FASTFLOW uses both ECN and delay as congestion signals to react quickly and accurately to congestion. To efficiently manage severe congestion scenarios, FASTFLOW relies on trimming or, if it is not supported, on timeouts. To enable FASTFLOW to be deployed easily on existing networks, FASTFLOW does not rely on complex in-network telemetry.

2.2 Rate Control

The decision on how to react to congestion can be made either by the receiver [22, 27, 31, 39, 42, 59], the sender [3, 33, 58, 60] or the switch [25, 51]. Whereas receiver-based algorithms can precisely regulate the transmission of the different senders (e.g., in incast scenarios), they require extra control packets and data structures (e.g., pull queues) on the receiver side. Also, some of these algorithms can fall short when dealing with fabric congestion [33]. On the other hand, sender-based schemes do not require such extra complexity

but cannot precisely regulate the transmission rate during incast traffic due to lack of interaction with the other senders.

FASTFLOW is a sender-based mechanism that, thanks to our novel QuickAdapt algorithm (Sec. 3.3), can precisely regulate the transmission rate in incast scenarios. At the same time, FASTFLOW is resource-efficient since it does not require pull queues. As already discussed, to improve deployability, FASTFLOW does not rely on any complex or new feature to be implemented in switches.

3 FASTFLOW DESIGN

Overview FASTFLOW is a high-performance, easy-to-deploy, and lightweight CC algorithm that can quickly react to congestion happening both at the last hop (incast) and in any other part of the network. FASTFLOW keeps a number of in-flight bytes equal to the size of a *congestion window* ($cwnd$). FASTFLOW updates the window depending on the estimated network congestion, striving to keep packets RTT lower than a pre-determined and constant target RTT. This can be expressed relatively to the *base RTT* (i.e., the RTT on an empty network). The base RTT be computed when the datacenter network is set up (once for each possible hop count) or recomputed dynamically like what is done by Swift [33]. In the rest of the paper, we assume a target RTT equal to 1.5x the base RTT. Consequently, we can also easily compute a specific target RTT for each hop count by setting it to 50% more than the base RTT (details in Sec. 3.5).

Required Features FASTFLOW relies on widely available features like ECMP, ECN marking, and packet trimming. ECMP and ECN marking are available on most datacenter switches [9, 29, 41], whereas packet trimming can be implemented on existing switches [1]. If ECMP is not supported, we can still run the CC algorithm. If packet trimming is not supported, FASTFLOW falls back to timeouts, with limited performance impact (Sec. 4.1). Similarly to EQDS [42], we assume that each switch port has a high-priority queue to forward control packets such as trims and ACKs, and a lower-priority queue to forward data packets. By doing so, packets carrying potential congestion information are prioritized so that FASTFLOW can react quickly.

Assumptions This work mainly focuses on widely used fat tree networks [17, 43]. However, FASTFLOW could be easily adapted to work with other topologies such as torus, Dragonfly [18, 24, 32], BCube [26], SlimFly [8], HammingMesh [28] and others. Moreover, we intentionally limit buffering to a worst-case scenario, assuming that each per-port queue is one *bandwidth-delay product* (BDP) in size.

Presentation In the following, we motivate the choice of using both delay and ECN as congestion signal (Sec. 3.1),

and then describe the main control loop (Sec. 3.2). We then present *QuickAdapt* (Sec. 3.3) and *FastIncrease* (Sec. 3.4), two techniques we introduce to further improve FASTFLOW reactivity. Eventually, we discuss how to select FASTFLOW parameters (Sec. 3.5).

3.1 FASTFLOW Congestion Signals

Choosing the congestion signal is critical for the whole design of the protocol, and FASTFLOW uses both ECN and delay (RTT). FASTFLOW can also leverage packet trimming to react to severe congestion, which we discuss in Sec. 3.3. In Fig. 2, we compare the full version of FASTFLOW with a simple CC using ECN and delay, by simulating 8:1 incast traffic on 1,024 nodes fat tree with 800Gbps links. In all the simulation results, we use the *htsim* packet-level network simulator [27]. We use the same congestion control logic for both *ECN only* and *RTT only* (we decrease the congestion window by half an MTU per packet at most in response to high delay or ECN marking). We observe that the congestion windows decrease faster when using ECN since, when using delay, the receiver gets the congestion signal only after the packet crosses the entire queue. On the other hand, *RTT only* is more fair. Finally we show FASTFLOW as reference. With it, we take advantage of both signals and also use QuickAdapt (Sec /3.3) to immediately adjust its windows to the right value.




Figure 2: Comparing FASTFLOW, ECN and delay-based congestion signals during an incast. The windows start at 1.42MiB (not shown in the figure).

On the other hand, delay is a more precise and fine-grained congestion signal due to its multi-bit nature and can thus estimate congestion more accurately. Moreover, it improves the algorithm’s fairness since it is not affected by the randomness inherently present with ECN. We show this in Fig. 3a, where we report the distribution of FCTs of the previous experiment. We can see how delay is more fair but ECN is slightly faster to react. Combining the two allows us to get




Figure 3: Impact of congestion signals and reaction granularity on FASTFLOW performance. Running a 8:1 Incast of 8MiB on 1024 nodes at 800Gbps with 4KiB MTU.

some benefits from both, reducing the overall completion time. This is important as the last finishing flow would delay tightly coupled applications such as ML training workloads.

Last, it is important to determine how often to react to congestion signals. Many algorithms like MPRDMA react once per ACK to improve responsiveness. However, it might be hard to keep up when increasing network bandwidth. For this reason, other algorithms like Swift or DCQCN react once per period of time (e.g., once per RTT). As shown in Fig. 3b, reacting on a per-packet basis can result in slightly better performance. Indeed, the congestion window size is adapted more smoothly, improving reaction times and reducing unfairness. We also observe how, even reacting only once every 50 packets does not significantly impact FASTFLOW performance, which is within the 5% of the per-packet reaction scenario.

3.2 Main Control Loop

In FASTFLOW, the sender recomputes the congestion window size every time it receives an ACK. When an ACK is received, four different scenarios can occur depending on the severity of congestion (or lack thereof), as reported by the two congestion signals: *Fair Decrease* (Sec. 3.2.1), *Multiplicative Decrease* (Sec. 3.2.2), *Fair Increase* (Sec. 3.2.3), *Multiplicative Increase* (Sec. 3.2.4).

3.2.1 Fair Decrease (FD). The ACK is **ECN-marked**, but the reported **RTT is smaller than the target one**. In this case, queues are building up, but congestion has not yet affected the acknowledged packet. FASTFLOW proactively reacts by gently decreasing the window regardless of the packet’s RTT. To improve fairness (see Sec. 4.2), the congestion window is decreased more aggressively for flows with larger windows (and thus, likely, more in-flight bytes) as follows:

$$cwnd -= \frac{cwnd}{bdp} \cdot fd \cdot p.size \quad (1)$$

where bdp is the *bandwidth-delay product* (computed considering the base RTT), fd is *fair decrease constant*, and $p.size$ is the size of the acknowledged packet. Intuitively, the higher fd , the more aggressively the congestion window is reduced. We discuss how to choose fd in Sec. 3.5.

3.2.2 Multiplicative Decrease (MD). The ACK is **ECN-marked** and reports an **RTT higher than the target**. This indicates a worst-case scenario and, as a consequence, FASTFLOW rapidly reduces the congestion window proportionally to the difference between the target and measured RTT, as follows:

$$cwnd -= \min \left(size, \frac{p.rtt - trtt}{p.rtt} \cdot md \cdot p.size \right) \quad (2)$$

where $trtt$ and $p.rtt$ are the target and measured RTT, respectively. FASTFLOW additionally applies *Fair Decrease* to improve fairness (Sec. 3.2.1, not shown explicitly in Eq. 2). In any case, the multiplicative decrease reduces $cwnd$ at most by the acknowledged packet’s size. md is a *multiplicative decrease constant* selected so that when the RTT is twice the target RTT, the congestion window is decreased aggressively by a packet for each ACK. Thus, we want to have $\frac{p.rtt - trtt}{p.rtt} \cdot md \cdot p.size = p.size$, which implies $md = 2$.

3.2.3 Fair Increase (FI). The ACK is **not ECN-marked** but reports an **RTT higher than the target one**. This might indicate that the delay signal is outdated and the queues are not growing significantly. Consequently, FASTFLOW gently increases the congestion window, ignoring the delay signal. To improve fairness (see Sec. 4.2), the window is increased more aggressively for flows with smaller windows as follows:

$$cwnd += \frac{p.size}{cwnd} \cdot mtu \cdot fi \quad (3)$$

where fi is a *fair increase constant* and mtu is the *Maximum Transmission Unit*. The higher fi , the more aggressively the congestion window is increased. fi impacts small flows more than large ones, and we discuss how to choose fi in Sec. 3.5.

3.2.4 Multiplicative Increase (MI). The received ACK is **not ECN-marked** and reports an **RTT smaller than the target one**. In this case, FASTFLOW increases the congestion window proportionally to the difference between the target and measured RTTs, as follows:

$$cwnd += \min \left(size, \frac{trtt - p.rtt}{p.rtt} \cdot \frac{p.size}{cwnd} \cdot mtu \cdot mi \right) \quad (4)$$

mi is a *multiplicative increase constant* selected to increase the congestion window by at most one MTU per RTT. If we assume $cwnd/p.size$ ACKs are received in an RTT, FASTFLOW would increase the window size by $\frac{trtt - p.rtt}{p.rtt} \cdot mtu \cdot mi$ per RTT. Because we want this quantity to be smaller than

an MTU, $mi \leq \frac{rtt}{trtt-p.rtt}$. Since $p.rtt \geq brtt$, where $brtt$ is the base RTT, we set $mi = \frac{brtt}{trtt-brtt}$. This multiplicative increase is followed by a fair increase to improve fairness (Sec. 3.2.3, not shown explicitly in Eq. 4).

3.2.5 Overall Picture. Algorithm 1 summarizes the main FASTFLOW logic. So far, we discussed lines 19-27, while we discuss the remaining parts in the next sections. It is worth remarking that FASTFLOW has a low memory footprint (19 bytes per flow, and 28 bytes globally) to ensure scalability and ease of hardware implementation on NICs.

Algorithm 1 FASTFLOW Pseudocode

```

1: acked, bytes_ignored = 0 ▷ Sec. 3.3
2:
3: procedure CONGESTION_LOOP_LOGIC(p)
4:   acked += p.size
5:   bytes_ignored += p.size
6:
7:   if p.is_ack then
8:     if bytes_ignored < bytes_to_ignore then
9:       return ▷ Ignore ACKs after QuickAdapt (Sec. 3.3)
10:    end if
11:
12:    can_decrease = wait_to_decrease(p) ▷ Sec. 3.5.1
13:    adp = quick_adapt(p) ▷ Sec. 3.3
14:    finc = fast_increase(p) ▷ Sec. 3.4
15:    if adp or finc then
16:      return ▷ Exit if QuickAdapt or FastIncrease triggered
17:    end if
18:
19:    if p.ecn and p.rtt ≤ trtt and can_decrease then
20:      fair_decrease(p) ▷ Sec. 3.2.1
21:    else if p.ecn and p.rtt > trtt and can_decrease then
22:      multiplicative_decrease(p) ▷ Sec. 3.2.2
23:    else if !p.ecn and p.rtt > trtt then
24:      fair_increase(p) ▷ Sec. 3.2.3
25:    else if !p.ecn and p.rtt ≤ trtt then
26:      multiplicative_increase(p) ▷ Sec. 3.2.4
27:    end if
28:    else if p.is_trimmed or p.timeout_triggered then ▷ Sec. 3.3
29:      cwnd -= p.size
30:      trigger_qa = true
31:      retransmit_packet(p)
32:      if bytes_ignored ≥ bytes_to_ignore then
33:        quick_adapt(p) ▷ Sec. 3.3
34:      end if
35:    end if
36:    cwnd = max(min(cwnd, bdp), mtu) ▷ Sec. 3.5
37: end procedure

```

3.3 QuickAdapt

The four cases presented in Sec. 3.2 describe how FASTFLOW reacts when receiving an ACK. However, if packets are dropped, FASTFLOW reacts to such heavy congestion by quickly adjusting the congestion window using a novel technique, which we call *QuickAdapt*. QuickAdapt behaves

similarly to receiver-based CC algorithms without needing special support on the receiver side (e.g., pull queues) or per-packet states like in BBR [12].

By default, FASTFLOW relies on packet trimming to detect packet drops. Traditionally, when using packet trimming, the switch removes the payload and forwards the header if the queue size exceeds a threshold [27]. This allows congestion information to be communicated to the receiver even on congested networks. With FASTFLOW, we trim packets only if they would otherwise be dropped because of a full buffer.

QuickAdapt counts how many bytes have been received over the last *trtt* and, if a loss is detected, it sets the congestion window to that value. It is possible to scale that value by a constant (*qa_scaling*) depending on the desired queue occupancy (see Sec. 3.5). Because the sudden change caused by QuickAdapt already factors in the subsequent feedback, the receiver ignores the congestion information carried by all the unacked packets received from when QuickAdapt is triggered. By doing so, QuickAdapt does not overreact to congestion and, for the same reason, it is applied at most once per target RTT. The QuickAdapt pseudocode is presented in Algorithm 2, while the interaction with the rest of the FASTFLOW logic is visible in the previously presented Algorithm 1. Figure 4 shows a simplified example of QuickAdapt in action with a 2:1 incast.

Algorithm 2 QuickAdapt Pseudocode

```

1: procedure QUICK_ADAPT(p)
2:   adapted = false
3:   if now ≥ end then ▷ QuickAdapt at most once per target RTT
4:     if trigger_qa and end ≠ 0 then
5:       trigger_qa = false
6:       adapted = true
7:       cwnd = max(acked, mtu) · qa_scaling
8:       bytes_to_ignore = unacked ▷ Ignore next congestion signals
9:       bytes_ignored = 0
10:    end if
11:    end = now + trtt
12:    acked = 0
13:  end if
14:  return adapted
15: end procedure

```

QuickAdapt without trimming. Although packet trimming can be implemented on many existing switches [1], we also want FASTFLOW to be compatible with switches lacking such support. If trimming is not supported, FASTFLOW falls back to a simple timeout-based approach, requiring minimal changes to the overall logic (it reacts to timeouts like it does on the reception of a trimmed packet). We compare FASTFLOW performance with and without trimming in Sec. 4.1. Because FASTFLOW strives to keep the RTT below the target one, it uses aggressive timeouts to detect packet losses. When using timeouts instead of trimming, we also double

the value of the md constant. By doing so, FASTFLOW reacts more aggressively to congestion and reduces the probability of packet drops, which can decrease performance and reduce link efficiency.




Figure 4: QuickAdapt behavior for a 2:1 incast. Senders have a starting window of 4 packets. When a sender gets a trimmed packet it sets $trigger_qa$ to true. After $trtt$, it changes its window size to the number of Bytes acknowledged during this time window (2 packets in this case).

3.4 FastIncrease

FastIncrease quickly reclaims available bandwidth after the termination of some flows (e.g., in case of incast with uneven sizes). *FastIncrease* is triggered when at least $cwnd$ subsequent bytes did not experience any congestion (i.e., the RTT is close to the base RTT, and the ACKs are not ECN marked). In that case, as long as *FastIncrease* stays active, the congestion window is increased by k MTUs for each ACK. k is a constant that we set equal to 2 (after proper tuning) (see Sec. 3.5). We show the *FastIncrease* pseudocode in Algorithm 3 and how it interacts with the rest of the FASTFLOW logic in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 3 FastIncrease Pseudocode

```

1: procedure FAST_INCREASE(p)
2:   if  $r_{tt} \approx br_{tt}$  and not p.ecn then
3:      $count \ += \ p.size$ 
4:     if  $count > cwnd$  or  $increase$  then
5:        $cwnd \ += \ k \cdot mtu$ 
6:        $increase = true$ 
7:       return  $increase$ 
8:     end if
9:   else
10:     $count = 0$ 
11:     $increase = false$ 
12:   end if
13:   return  $increase$ 
14: end procedure

```

3.5 Parameter Selection

Window Size Bounds FASTFLOW enforces the congestion window size within a predefined range. We assume a maximum window size of 1.25 BDP (higher than 1 to manage transient bursts) and a minimum window size of 1 MTU. Modern link speeds and delays (with a BDP around 900KiB [29] and 4KiB MTUs) allow incast with hundreds (200 in this example) of senders targeting a single receiver to be easily supported. Higher incast degrees can be gracefully handled by FASTFLOW at reduced link efficiency due to the potentially higher number of trimmed or dropped packets. Alternatively, FASTFLOW can integrate a pacer-based solution similar to the one introduced by Swift for cases when the window would drop below one MTU [33]. However, it is worth remarking that such high-degree incast are unlikely to appear in modern AI workloads where traffic is dominated by highly optimized collective operations that limit or avoid incast [28].

ECN Marking We test FASTFLOW using RED queueing discipline, with K_{min} and K_{max} set to 20% and 80% of the switch queue size respectively [20].

Target RTT $trtt$ is selected to be equal to 1.5x the base RTT. Because we assume a queue size equal to 1 BDP, this corresponds to having half-full switch queues, thus halfway between K_{min} and K_{max} . By doing so, FASTFLOW allows the load balancer to react by forwarding packets on different paths, before taking more drastic actions involving a reduction of the congestion window.

QuickAdapt Scaling Selecting $qa_scaling = 1$ would let the RTT stabilize around the target RTT, corresponding to a switch queue size to roughly in-between K_{min} and K_{max} . We set it instead to 0.8, so that the RTT drops to 0.8 the target RTT (i.e., $0.8 \cdot 1.5brtt = 1.2brtt$), corresponding to a switch queue size around K_{min} , thus reducing the probability of triggering ECN marking.

FastIncrease/Decrease We set the fi and fd parameters (see Sec. 3.2) to 0.25 and 0.8 respectively for 100Gbps links 4096B MTU. This selection comes from tuning over hundreds of combinations in all test scenarios of Sec. 4.

Scaling Last, some values need to be scaled depending on the network bandwidth and latency since changing these would affect the BDP and, thus, the maximum for congestion windows. Consequently, the congestion window can be increased more aggressively on networks with higher bdp . Namely, the fi and mi parameters need to be multiplied by $\gamma = \frac{bdp}{reference_bdp}$, where $reference_bdp$ is the network bdp for a 100Gbps network with 12us RTT. On the other hand,

to be more conservative, both fd and md are fixed regardless of link speed, as we always want to react strongly in case of congestion.

3.5.1 Interaction between CC and load balancing. An adaptive load balancer can reduce the impact of fabric congestion (e.g., caused by ECMP hashing collisions) without reducing the congestion window size. This is especially relevant in permutation workloads running on non-oversubscribed networks where, in principle, the congestion can be avoided by properly balancing the traffic. To allow adaptive load balancer algorithms to react to such congestion, FASTFLOW does not react to ECN-marked packets unless several marked packets are received. In a nutshell, FASTFLOW keeps an exponential moving average tracking ECN-marked packets by updating, for each packet, a variable $avg_wtd = \alpha \cdot p.ecn + (1 - \alpha) \cdot avg_wtd$. FASTFLOW does not decrease the congestion window as long as $avg_wtd < 0.25$ (i.e. 25 percent or more of the acks indicate congestion, which is a sufficiently large threshold to rule out congestion caused by transient load imbalance). We call this feature *Wait to Decrease (WTD)*.

4 EVALUATION

Simulation Setup. We ran simulations using and extending the *htsim* packet-level network simulator [27]. Our simulations consider four different fat-tree topologies, two non-blocking (one with 1,024 and the other with 128 nodes), and three with 1,024 nodes and 2:1, 4:1, and 8:1 oversubscription ratios, due to the relevance of such topologies in production datacenters [49]. We set a 4KiB MTU size, a 800 Gbps network bandwidth, and a 400ns switch traversal latency, consistent with the latest generation of switches [10, 18]. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that all links have the same length and, hence, the same latency, equal to 600ns.

State-of-the-art Comparison. We evaluate FASTFLOW against EQDS, Swift, MPRDMA, and BBR. To have a fair comparison and focus on congestion control, we enable trimming and multi-pathing for all the algorithms. Indeed, running Swift or BBR in their vanilla version using a single path would result in bad performance, mostly due to routing rather than congestion control.

Analyzed Workloads. We consider the following three traffic patterns: (i) **incast**: relevant for traditional datacenter workloads, that often send requests to a large number of workers, and must then handle their near-simultaneous responses; (ii) **permutation**: simulates point to point connections between pairs of nodes, selected so that each packet crosses the core switches, to emulate a worst case scenario and stress the load balancer; (iii) **alltoall**: relevant for many AI workloads such as Mixture of Experts models.

4.1 Trimming vs. Timeouts

As discussed in Sec. 3.3, FASTFLOW relies on timeouts to detect packet drops when the switches do not support trimming. We now evaluate the impact of the lack of trimming. In Fig. 6, we report an incast scenario on small (512 KiB) messages, showing that the lack of trimming increases the FCT by slightly more than one base RTT (equal to 8.6 μ s in our setup).

We investigate this further in Fig. 7, reporting the increase in FCT due to the lack of trimming support, showing that the additional delay is often smaller than one base RTT, and always within two base RTTs on all the scenarios we evaluated. We also observed that less than 0.2% packets were unnecessarily re-transmitted (not shown in the plot).

4.2 Incast

Fig. 5 shows the relative performance of FASTFLOW in incast scenarios ranging from an 8:1 incast to a 100:1 incast for varying message sizes. We note that EQDS, being a receiver-based mechanism, can easily achieve good performance. Indeed, it can precisely communicate the window size to each sender and schedule them to be perfectly fair.

On the other hand, sender-based mechanisms like MPRDMA, FASTFLOW, and Swift perform slightly worse, particularly true for medium sized messages. Small messages do not overrun switch buffers, whereas for large enough messages all the algorithms have enough time to converge to the correct rate. The zone in between, usually for messages slightly smaller than BDP, is subject to random drop events that affect sender-based mechanisms more. Moreover, MPRDMA seems to have slightly worse performance due to its lack of fairness features. Finally, BBR struggles for medium-sized messages since it needs more time to converge to the correct rate.

4.3 Permutation

In Fig. 1, we show the results for a 2 MiB and 32 MiB permutation traffic pattern on an 8:1 oversubscribed fat tree with 1,024 nodes. It is worth noting that, when using a relatively small message of 2 MiB, just slightly bigger than the BDP, FASTFLOW outperforms all other algorithms while being fair (it can quickly react thanks to ECN). In Fig. 8a and Fig. 8b, we show what happens on 2:1 and 4:1 oversubscribed fat trees respectively. In these cases, FASTFLOW still outperforms the other algorithms, but not as much as in other cases, a smaller oversubscription ratio is easier to manage even for simpler CC algorithm.

In Fig. 8c we report instead the results for a scenario where multiple permutations run in parallel (which can be the case with a Butterfly AllReduce or a windowed AllToAll). In this




Figure 5: Relative incast performance for different message sizes and incast degrees.




Figure 6: Flow completion time in a 16:1 512KiB incast with and without trimming.




Figure 7: Increase in runtime due to the lack of packet trimming support for different workloads on a 1,024-node fat tree. *Perm.* stands for permutation with an oversubscribed network. Incasts are run without over-subscription.

case, the performance gap between FASTFLOW and EQDS increases up to 50%, while all the other sender based-algorithms

perform better but are still about 10% slower than FASTFLOW. Finally, we show in Fig. 8d a scenario with 2MiB flows, except for one that is bigger and sends 4MiB. This scenario shows how FASTFLOW outperforms other sender-based mechanisms by almost 30% thanks to its capacity to reclaim bandwidth quickly (see Sec. 3.4). This is also the case for EQDS, which outperforms MPRDMA, BBR, and Swift since it can also reclaim unused bandwidth quickly.

Generally, we can notice that for high oversubscription ratios, the performance of EQDS degrades even more due to the high number of trimmed packets. To further emphasize this point, we measure the number of trimmed packets for EQDS and report that, in the worst case scenario just mentioned, it can generate up to 155x more trimmed packets than FASTFLOW, resulting in wasted bandwidth and resources. The EQDS authors state that in such cases a CC algorithm on the sender side would benefit its performance, and we explore that in Sec. 5.1.

4.4 Alltoall

We also evaluate performance for alltoall communication, a collective operation commonly used in AI workloads [28]. Due to the large number of messages generated, we use the smaller topology to reduce simulation times. We use a windowed algorithm for the alltoall to have at least k active flows per node at any time. We show the results in an oversubscribed fat tree, as a non blocking tree topology can theoretically handle alltoall traffic without problems for congestion control. We report the results of our evaluation in Fig. 9. We observe that EQDS performance drops as the number of parallel connection increases, consistent with the multiple permutation results in Fig. 8c. On the other hand, sender-based mechanisms handle that case better, with FASTFLOW taking the lead being only 6% behind the ideal time.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Augmenting EQDS with FASTFLOW

One of the main drawbacks of using a receiver-based mechanism like EQDS, as shown in the previous results, is its bad




Figure 8: Flow completion time with for different permutations on fat trees with different oversubscription ratios.




Figure 9: The number on top of each bar indicates the time distance to the ideal completion time (grey dotted line). k indicates the number of active flows at any given time for a sender.

management of fabric congestion. As suggested in the EQDS paper, it should be possible to improve EQDS’ performance by complementing it with a sender-based CC algorithm. To do so, we explore using EQDS with FASTFLOW, as well as with a DCTCP-style CC algorithm (MPRDMA). While running in combination with EQDS, the role of the sender-based congestion control is to limit its sending rate by capping the congestion window and adapting as needed.

In theory, this combination should give us the benefits of both world: perfect incast management thanks to the receiver-based CC and the ability to deal with the other forms of congestion thanks to a solid sender-based CC. In this work, we only show a simple scenario where such combinations seem beneficial for EQDS. A more in-depth analysis of such a combination is necessary but outside the scope of this paper.

In Fig. 10 we report a permutation scenario on an 8:1 oversubscribed fat tree, with 2 MiB and 32 MiB flows. We can see that FASTFLOW improves EQDS performance. For 2MiB flows, the improvement introduced by FASTFLOW is higher than that of MPRDMA, thanks to its better fairness. When running with 32 MiB flows except for one being 64




Figure 10: Augmenting EQDS with sender-based mechanisms.

MiB, we can also see how we do very well on our own but also help EQDS. In this case having FastIncrease is key to recover quickly the bandwidth for the larger flow.

6 RELATED WORK

Researchers proposed several datacenter CC algorithms, and we discuss in the following how FASTFLOW differs from some of the most recently proposed ones. Receiver-based algorithms such as NDP [27], EQDS [42], pHost [22], ExpressPass [59], SMSRP [31], and Homa [39] maintain end-to-end credits that are used to adjust sender flow rates. They can effectively manage incast scenarios by precisely regulating the transmission rates of the different senders. We have shown, however, that they can struggle when dealing with fabric congestion unless they are complemented with a sender-based mechanism. FASTFLOW can instead deal with fabric congestion and incast but without requiring pull queues.

On the other hand, sender-based CC algorithms can deal better with fabric congestion, but might not be as responsive when confronted with sudden workload shift (e.g. incast or dynamic job arrivals or departures). Some of those algorithms like DCTCP [4], Hull [5], and D²TCP [53] rely on ECN marking. For example, DCQCN [60] combines ECN and *Priority-based Flow Control* (PFC) to avoid packet losses and react to congestion quickly. However, PFC is hard to tune and can cause PFC storms [29, 38]. Differently from

DCQCN, FASTFLOW is designed for lossy networks and relies on packet trimming to avoid switches dropping packets, thus avoiding all the issues related to the use of PFC. Other sender-based algorithms Swift [33] and TIMELY [37] detect congestion using delay but, as we show in this paper, they cannot react as fast as ECN-based algorithms.

Last, some works recently demonstrated that having an unfair congestion control can improve performance of jobs running ML training workloads [44]. These works are orthogonal to FASTFLOW, since they target fairness between different jobs, whereas FASTFLOW improves fairness between flows belonging to the same job.

7 CONCLUSION

This paper proposes FASTFLOW, a sender- and window-based CC algorithm using ECN and delay as congestion signals and packet trimming to detect packet losses. When trimming is not supported FASTFLOW falls back to a timeout-based mechanism, which we show adds at most two base RTT of delay. We evaluate FASTFLOW on several workloads, showing that it constantly either outperforms or matches the performance of EQDS, Swift, BBR, and MPRDMA by up to 50%. Eventually, we show how FASTFLOW could complement receiver-based CC algorithms such as EQDS.

REFERENCES

- [1] Popa Adrian, Dumitrescu Dragos, Handley Mark, Nikolaidis Georgios, Lee Jeongkeun, and Raiciu Costin. 2022. Implementing packet trimming support in hardware. (2022). arXiv:cs.NI/2207.04967
- [2] Mohammad Alizadeh, Tom Edsall, Sarang Dharmapurikar, Ramanan Vaidyanathan, Kevin Chu, Andy Fingerhut, Vinh The Lam, Francis Matus, Rong Pan, Navindra Yadav, and George Varghese. 2014. CONGA: Distributed Congestion-Aware Load Balancing for Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM Conference on SIGCOMM (SIGCOMM '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 503–514. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2619239.2626316>
- [3] Mohammad Alizadeh, Albert Greenberg, David A. Maltz, Jitendra Padhye, Parveen Patel, Balaji Prabhakar, Sudipta Sengupta, and Murari Sridharan. 2010. Data Center TCP (DCTCP). *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 40, 4 (aug 2010), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1851275.1851192>
- [4] Mohammad Alizadeh, Albert Greenberg, David A. Maltz, Jitendra Padhye, Parveen Patel, Balaji Prabhakar, Sudipta Sengupta, and Murari Sridharan. 2010. Data Center TCP (DCTCP). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2010 Conference (SIGCOMM '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1851182.1851192>
- [5] Mohammad Alizadeh, Abdul Kabbani, Tom Edsall, Balaji Prabhakar, Amin Vahdat, and Masato Yasuda. 2012. Less Is More: Trading a Little Bandwidth for Ultra-Low Latency in the Data Center. In *9th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 12)*. USENIX Association, San Jose, CA, 253–266. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi12/technical-sessions/presentation/alizadeh>
- [6] Serhat Arslan, Yuliang Li, Gautam Kumar, and Nandita Dukkkipati. 2023. Bolt: Sub-RTT Congestion Control for Ultra-Low Latency. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 219–236. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/arslan>
- [7] Wei Bai, Shanin Sainul Abdeen, Ankit Agrawal, Krishan Kumar Attre, Paramvir Bahl, Ameya Bhagat, Gowri Bhaskara, Tanya Brokman, Lei Cao, Ahmad Cheema, Rebecca Chow, Jeff Cohen, Mahmoud Elhaddad, Vivek Ette, Igal Figlin, Daniel Firestone, Mathew George, Ilya German, Lakhmeet Ghai, Eric Green, Albert Greenberg, Manish Gupta, Randy Haagens, Matthew Hendel, Ridwan Howlader, Neetha John, Julia Johnstone, Tom Jolly, Greg Kramer, David Kruse, Ankit Kumar, Erica Lan, Ivan Lee, Avi Levy, Marina Lipshteyn, Xin Liu, Chen Liu, Guohan Lu, Yuemin Lu, Xiakun Lu, Vadim Makhervaks, Ulad Malashanka, David A. Maltz, Ilias Marinos, Rohan Mehta, Sharda Murthi, Anup Namdhari, Aaron Ogus, Jitendra Padhye, Madhav Pandya, Douglas Phillips, Adrian Power, Suraj Puri, Shachar Raindel, Jordan Rhee, Anthony Russo, Maneesh Sah, Ali Sheriff, Chris Sparacino, Ashutosh Srivastava, Weixiang Sun, Nick Swanson, Fuhou Tian, Lukasz Tomczyk, Vamsi Vadlamuri, Alec Wolman, Ying Xie, Joyce Yom, Lihua Yuan, Yanzhao Zhang, and Brian Zill. 2023. Empowering Azure Storage with RDMA. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 49–67. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/bai>
- [8] Maciej Besta and Torsten Hoefer. 2014. Slim Fly: A Cost Effective Low-Diameter Network Topology. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC '14)*. IEEE Press, 348–359. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SC.2014.34>
- [9] Broadcom. 2024. Deploying AI/ML training clusters with IP/Ethernet. (2024). <https://www.broadcom.com/blog/deploying-ai-ml-training-clusters-with-ip-ethernet> (accessed 01/24).
- [10] Broadcom. 2024. Tomahawk 5 Switch. (2024). <https://www.broadcom.com/products/ethernet-connectivity/switching/strataxgs/bcm78900-series> (accessed 01/24).
- [11] Jiaxin Cao, Rui Xia, Pengkun Yang, Chuanxiong Guo, Guohan Lu, Lihua Yuan, Yixin Zheng, Haitao Wu, Yongqiang Xiong, and Dave Maltz. 2013. Per-Packet Load-Balanced, Low-Latency Routing for Clos-Based Data Center Networks. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies (CoNEXT '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2535372.2535375>
- [12] Neal Cardwell, Yuchung Cheng, C. Stephen Gunn, Soheil Hassas Yeganeh, and Van Jacobson. 2017. BBR: Congestion-Based Congestion Control. *Commun. ACM* 60 (2017), 58–66. <http://cacm.acm.org/magazines/2017/2/212428-bbr-congestion-based-congestion-control/fulltext>
- [13] V. Cerf and R. Kahn. 1974. A Protocol for Packet Network Intercommunication. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* 22, 5 (1974), 637–648. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCOM.1974.1092259>
- [14] Yanpei Chen, Rean Griffith, Junda Liu, Randy H. Katz, and Anthony D. Joseph. 2009. Understanding TCP Incast Throughput Collapse in Datacenter Networks. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Workshop on Research on Enterprise Networking (WREN '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1592681.1592693>
- [15] Peng Cheng, Fengyuan Ren, Ran Shu, and Chuang Lin. 2014. Catch the Whole Lot in an Action: Rapid Precise Packet Loss Notification in Data Center. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 14)*. USENIX Association, Seattle, WA, 17–28. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi14/technical-sessions/presentation/cheng>

- [16] D. Hernandez D. Amodei. 2018. The Computational Limits of Deep Learning. (2018). <https://openai.com/research/ai-and-compute> (accessed 9/23).
- [17] Daniele De Sensi, Tiziano De Matteis, Konstantin Taranov, Salvatore Di Girolamo, Tobias Rahn, and Torsten Hoefer. 2022. Noise in the Clouds: Influence of Network Performance Variability on Application Scalability. *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.* 6, 3, Article 49 (Dec. 2022), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3570609> arXiv:2210.15315
- [18] Daniele De Sensi, Salvatore Di Girolamo, Kim H. McMahon, Duncan Roweth, and Torsten Hoefer. 2020. An In-Depth Analysis of the Slingshot Interconnect. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SC41405.2020.00039>
- [19] Jeffrey Dean and Luiz André Barroso. 2013. The Tail at Scale. *Commun. ACM* 56, 2 (feb 2013), 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2408776.2408794>
- [20] S. Floyd and V. Jacobson. 1993. Random early detection gateways for congestion avoidance. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 1, 4 (1993), 397–413. <https://doi.org/10.1109/90.251892>
- [21] Sally Floyd, Dr. K. K. Ramakrishnan, and David L. Black. 2001. The Addition of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP. RFC 3168. (Sept. 2001). <https://doi.org/10.17487/RFC3168>
- [22] Peter X. Gao, Akshay Narayan, Gautam Kumar, Rachit Agarwal, Sylvia Ratnasamy, and Scott Shenker. 2015. PHost: Distributed near-Optimal Datacenter Transport over Commodity Network Fabric. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies (CoNEXT '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2716281.2836086>
- [23] Soudeh Ghorbani, Zibin Yang, P. Brighten Godfrey, Yashar Ganjali, and Amin Firoozshahian. 2017. DRILL: Micro Load Balancing for Low-Latency Data Center Networks. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 225–238. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3098822.3098839>
- [24] Dan Gibson, Hema Hariharan, Eric Lance, Moray McLaren, Behnam Montazeri, Arjun Singh, Stephen Wang, Hassan M. G. Wassel, Zhehua Wu, Sunghwan Yoo, Raghuraman Balasubramanian, Prashant Chandra, Michael Cuthforth, Peter Cuy, David Decotigny, Rakesh Gautam, Alex Iriza, Milo M. K. Martin, Rick Roy, Zuowei Shen, Ming Tan, Ye Tang, Monica Wong-Chan, Joe Zbiciak, and Amin Vahdat. 2022. Aquila: A unified, low-latency fabric for datacenter networks. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Renton, WA, 1249–1266. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi22/presentation/gibson>
- [25] Prateesh Goyal, Prey Shah, Kevin Zhao, Georgios Nikolaidis, Mohammad Alizadeh, and Thomas E. Anderson. 2022. Backpressure Flow Control. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Renton, WA, 779–805. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi22/presentation/goyal>
- [26] Chuanxiong Guo, Guohan Lu, Dan Li, Haitao Wu, Xuan Zhang, Yunfeng Shi, Chen Tian, Yongguang Zhang, and Songwu Lu. 2009. BCube: A High Performance, Server-Centric Network Architecture for Modular Data Centers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2009 Conference on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1592568.1592577>
- [27] Mark Handley, Costin Raiciu, Alexandru Agache, Andrei Voinescu, Andrew W. Moore, Gianni Antichi, and Marcin Wójcik. 2017. 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 (SIGCOMM '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3098822.3098825>
- [28] Torsten Hoefer, Tommaso Bonato, Daniele De Sensi, Salvatore Di Girolamo, Shigang Li, Marco Heddes, Jon Belk, Deepak Goel, Miguel Castro, and Steve Scott. 2022. HammingMesh: A Network Topology for Large-Scale Deep Learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC '22)*. IEEE Press, Article 11, 18 pages.
- [29] Torsten Hoefer, Duncan Roweth, Keith Underwood, Robert Alverston, Mark Griswold, Vahid Tabatabaee, Mohan Kalkunte, Surendra Anubolu, Siyuan Shen, Moray McLaren, Abdul Kabbani, and Steve Scott. 2023. Data Center Ethernet and Remote Direct Memory Access: Issues at Hyperscale. *Computer* 56, 7 (2023), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2023.3261184>
- [30] Torsten Hoefer, Timo Schneider, and Andrew Lumsdaine. 2009. The Effect of Network Noise on Large-Scale Collective Communications. *Parallel Processing Letters (PPL)* 19, 4 (Aug. 2009), 573–593.
- [31] Nan Jiang, Larry Dennison, and William J. Dally. 2015. Network Endpoint Congestion Control for Fine-Grained Communication. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 35, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2807591.2807600>
- [32] John Kim, William J. Dally, Steve Scott, and Dennis Abts. 2008. Technology-Driven, Highly-Scalable Dragonfly Topology. In *2008 International Symposium on Computer Architecture*. 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2008.19>
- [33] Gautam Kumar, Nandita Dukkupati, Keon Jang, Hassan Wassel, Xian Wu, Behnam Montazeri, Yaogong Wang, Kevin Springborn, Christopher Alfeld, Mike Ryan, David J. Wetherall, and Amin Vahdat. 2020. Swift: Delay is Simple and Effective for Congestion Control in the Datacenter. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3387514.3406591>
- [34] Changhyun Lee, Chunjong Park, Keon Jang, Sue Moon, and Dongsu Han. 2017. DX: Latency-Based Congestion Control for Datacenters. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 25, 1 (2017), 335–348. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2016.2587286>
- [35] Yuliang Li, Rui Miao, Hongqiang Harry Liu, Yan Zhuang, Fei Feng, Lingbo Tang, Zheng Cao, Ming Zhang, Frank Kelly, Mohammad Alizadeh, and Minlan Yu. 2019. HPCC: High Precision Congestion Control. In *Proceedings of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341302.3342085>
- [36] Yuanwei Lu, Guo Chen, Bojie Li, Kun Tan, Yongqiang Xiong, Peng Cheng, Jiansong Zhang, Enhong Chen, and Thomas Moscibroda. 2018. Multi-path transport for RDMA in datacenters. In *Proceedings of the 15th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'18)*. USENIX Association, USA, 357–371.
- [37] Radhika Mittal, Terry Lam, Nandita Dukkupati, Emily Blem, Hassan Wassel, Monia Ghobadi, Amin Vahdat, Yaogong Wang, David Wetherall, and David Zats. 2015. TIMELY: RTT-based Congestion Control for the Datacenter. In *Sigcomm '15*.
- [38] Radhika Mittal, Alexander Shpiner, Aurojit Panda, Eitan Zahavi, Arvind Krishnamurthy, Sylvia Ratnasamy, and Scott Shenker. 2018. Revisiting Network Support for RDMA. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 313–326. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3230543.3230557>
- [39] Behnam Montazeri, Yilong Li, Mohammad Alizadeh, and John Ousterhout. 2018. Homa: A Receiver-Driven Low-Latency Transport Protocol Using Network Priorities. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3230543.3230564>

- [40] Kathleen Nichols and Van Jacobson. 2012. Controlling Queue Delay: A modern AQM is just one piece of the solution to bufferbloat. *Queue* 10, 5 (may 2012), 20–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2208917.2209336>
- [41] Nvidia. 2024. Networking for the Era of AI: The Network Defines the Data Center. (2024). <https://nvdam.widen.net/s/bvpmkbgzt/networking-overall-whitepaper-networking-for-ai-2911204> (accessed 01/24).
- [42] Vladimir Olteanu, Haggai Eran, Dragos Dumitrescu, Adrian Popa, Cristi Baci, Mark Silberstein, Georgios Nikolaidis, Mark Handley, and Costin Raiciu. 2022. An edge-queued datagram service for all datacenter traffic. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Renton, WA, 761–777. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi22/presentation/olteanu>
- [43] Leon Poutievski, Omid Mashayekhi, Joon Ong, Arjun Singh, Mukarram Tariq, Rui Wang, Jianan Zhang, Virginia Beaugregard, Patrick Conner, Steve Gribble, Rishi Kapoor, Stephen Kratzer, Nanfang Li, Hong Liu, Karthik Nagaraj, Jason Ornstein, Samir Sawhney, Ryohei Urata, Lorenzo Vicisano, Kevin Yasumura, Shidong Zhang, Junlan Zhou, and Amin Vahdat. 2022. Jupiter Evolving: Transforming Google’s Datacenter Network via Optical Circuit Switches and Software-Defined Networking. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM 2022*.
- [44] Sudarsanan Rajasekaran, Manya Ghobadi, Gautam Kumar, and Aditya Akella. 2022. Congestion control in machine learning clusters. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 235–242. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3563766.3564115>
- [45] Arjun Roy, Hongyi Zeng, Jasmeet Bagga, George Porter, and Alex C. Snoeren. 2015. Inside the Social Network’s (Datacenter) Network. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 45, 4 (aug 2015), 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2829988.2787472>
- [46] Alessio Sacco, Antonino Angi, Flavio Esposito, and Guido Marchetto. 2023. HINT: Supporting Congestion Control Decisions with P4-driven In-Band Network Telemetry. In *2023 IEEE 24th International Conference on High Performance Switching and Routing (HPSR)*. 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPSR57248.2023.10147977>
- [47] Daniele De Sensi, Salvatore Di Girolamo, and Torsten Hoefler. 2019. Mitigating Network Noise on Dragonfly Networks through Application-Aware Routing. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC19)*.
- [48] Leah Shalev, Hani Ayoub, Nafea Bshara, and Erez Sabbag. 2020. A Cloud-Optimized Transport Protocol for Elastic and Scalable HPC. *IEEE Micro* 40, 6 (2020), 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MM.2020.3016891>
- [49] Arjun Singh, Joon Ong, Amit Agarwal, Glen Anderson, Ashby Armistead, Roy Bannon, Seb Boving, Gaurav Desai, Bob Felderman, Paulie Germano, Anand Kanagala, Jeff Provost, Jason Simmons, Eiichi Tanda, Jim Wanderer, Urs Hölzle, Stephen Stuart, and Amin Vahdat. 2015. Jupiter Rising: A Decade of Clos Topologies and Centralized Control in Google’s Datacenter Network. In *Sigcomm ’15*.
- [50] Rachee Singh, Muqet Mukhtar, Ashay Krishna, Aniruddha Parkhi, Jitendra Padhye, and David Maltz. 2021. Surviving switch failures in cloud datacenters. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 51, 2 (may 2021), 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3464994.3464996>
- [51] Parvin Taheri, Danushka Menikkumbura, Erico Vanini, Sonia Fahmy, Patrick Eugster, and Tom Edsall. 2020. RoCC: Robust Congestion Control for RDMA. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies (CoNEXT ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3386367.3431316>
- [52] Neil C. Thompson, Kristjan Greenewald, Keeheon Lee, and Gabriel F. Manso. 2022. The Computational Limits of Deep Learning. (2022). [arXiv:cs.LG/2007.05558](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.05558)
- [53] Balajee Vamanan, Jahangir Hasan, and T.N. Vijaykumar. 2012. Deadline-Aware Datacenter Tcp (D2TCP). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2012 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication (SIGCOMM ’12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2342356.2342388>
- [54] Jin Wang, Dongzhi Yuan, Wangqing Luo, Shuying Rao, R. Simon Sherratt, and Jinbin Hu. 2023. Congestion Control Using In-Network Telemetry for Lossless Datacenters. *Computers, Materials & Continua* 75, 1 (2023), 1195–1212. <https://doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2023.035932>
- [55] Haitao Wu, Chuanxiong Guo, Yongqiang Xiong, and Yongguang Zhang. 2012. Tuning ECN for Data Center Networks. In *ACM CoNEXT’12*. ACM. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/tuning-ecn-for-data-center-networks/>
- [56] Jin Ye, Renzhang Liu, Ziqi Xie, Luting Feng, and Sen Liu. 2019. EMPTCP: An ECN Based Approach to Detect Shared Bottleneck in MPTCP. In *2019 28th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks (ICCCN)*. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN.2019.8847013>
- [57] Qiao Zhang, Vincent Liu, Hongyi Zeng, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. 2017. High-Resolution Measurement of Data Center Microbursts. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Internet Measurement Conference (IMC ’17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 78–85. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3131365.3131375>
- [58] Xiaolong Zhong, Jiao Zhang, Yali Zhang, Zixuan Guan, and Zirui Wan. 2022. PACC: Proactive and Accurate Congestion Feedback for RDMA Congestion Control. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. 2228–2237. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM48880.2022.9796803>
- [59] Zejia Zhou, Dezun Dong, Shan Huang, and Zihao Wei. 2019. ExpressPass++: Credit-Efficient Congestion Control for Data Centers. In *2019 IEEE Intl Conf on Parallel & Distributed Processing with Applications, Big Data & Cloud Computing, Sustainable Computing & Communications, Social Computing & Networking (ISPA/BDCloud/SocialCom/SustainCom)*. 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISPA-BDCloud-SustainCom-SocialCom48970.2019.00018>
- [60] Yibo Zhu, Yibo Zhu, Haggai Eran, Daniel Firestone, Daniel Firestone, Chuanxiong Guo, Marina Lipshteyn, Yehonatan Liron, Jitendra Padhye, Shachar Raindel, Mohamad Haj Yahia, Ming Zhang, and Jitu Padhye. 2015. Congestion Control for Large-Scale RDMA Deployments. In *SIGCOMM (sigcomm ed.)*. ACM - Association for Computing Machinery. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/congestion-control-for-large-scale-rdma-deployments/>