

Fig. 8: Relative MPTCP performance as a function of load when running Permutation or Random traffic matrices for differing topologies. Mean performance and the performance of the slowest quarter of flows are shown.

minimum load level to fill a 4:1 oversubscribed topology. The average throughput improvement depends on the topology used; the maximum for oversubscribed Fat-Tree is 65%, while VL2-40 and VL2 improve by 15% and 11% respectively.

It is also instructive to look at the speeds of the slower flows in these experiments, as these dictate when jobs finish. The average improvement again depends on topology and load, but the gains are bigger: MPTCP improves throughput for the slowest flows by 1.5x to 3x for medium to moderately high load levels.

There is one exception for a highly loaded VL2 where the slower flows have lower throughput with MPTCP. On closer inspection, it turns out that the slow flows have very small windows on each of their subflows, which leads to repeated timeouts and reduced throughput for those flows; this is despite total network throughput being higher for MPTCP compared to TCP. For VL2-40 and Fat Tree the same effect does not apply, as there is more heterogeneity in the speeds of the individual subflows; at least one or a few of these have a big enough window to avoid timeouts. A very simple heuristic can be applied to avoid VL2 throughput degradation for small flows: if the stack has many subflows with small windows, it will close some of them to reduce until the remaining windows are big enough to avoid timeouts.

Irrespective of whether MPTCP is used, we believe data center designers will be likely to attempt to engineer their networks so that the core is neither underloaded nor overloaded. An overloaded core is a performance bottleneck; an underloaded core costs money that would have been better spent elsewhere. So it appears likely that the sweet-spot for MPTCP is close to the load level for which the data center designer would provision.

4.3.4 Influence of the Traffic Matrix

The permutation traffic matrix is useful as a baseline for comparison because it is easy to reason about how much throughput should be available from the network. With a topology that provides full bisectional bandwidth, the load is just sufficient to fully load the network. It is however, not terribly realistic.

A random traffic matrix chooses randomly the sources and destinations, allowing traffic concentrations on access links. Because of this, traffic flowing through the core is much less than in a permutation TM for the same number of flows.

Fig. 8(c) shows average throughput improvement with MPTCP vs. TCP in the Fat Tree, VL2 and VL2-40 4:1 oversubscribed topologies. The results are very similar to the permutation TM, but the relative improvements are slightly smaller; this is the effect of access link collisions. Fig. 8(d) shows the throughput improvement for the slowest 25% of flows; MPTCP increases their throughput on average by 1.3 to 1.8 times, for a wide range of loads.

We ran the same experiments with full-bisection topologies. Fat-Tree improved by maximum of 30%, while BCube improved by 150% to 300%, depending on the load level. The BCube improve-

ments come from MPTCP’s ability to simultaneously use multiple interfaces for the same flow.

Full-bisection VL2 and VL2-40 showed no improvement, which was puzzling. To understand this effect, say we randomly allocate n flows to n hosts. The probability that a host sends no flow is:

$$p[\text{no flow}] = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \rightarrow \frac{1}{e}$$

The number of hosts that do not send are then $\frac{n}{e}$; this bounds the total throughput. In fact the throughput is lower. For example, of the hosts that send only one flow, many of these will be received by a host receiving more than one flow, so the sender will be unable to send at its full speed. Numerical analysis shows that when this is taken into account, the maximum achievable throughput by *any* load-balancing algorithm with random traffic is limited by colliding flows on the sending and receiving hosts to less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the bisectional bandwidth.

With such a workload, none of VL2’s 10Gb/s core links is ever saturated, so it makes no difference if TCP or MPTCP is used.

Locality of Traffic The random and permutation traffic matrices provide no locality of traffic. With a full bisection topology, it should in principle not be necessary for applications to localize traffic, although as we have seen, this is only really true under very light or heavy loads, or when multipath transport uses sufficiently many paths. However, with oversubscribed topologies, applications can always get better performance if they can localize traffic to the rack, because that part of the topology is not oversubscribed. MPTCP provides no performance improvement within the rack, because such flows are limited by their link to the top-of-rack switch. Just how good does application-based traffic localization have to be for the advantages of MPTCP to be nullified?

We simulated a 4:1 oversubscribed FatTree and generated a random traffic matrix, with the constraint that a fraction of the flows were destined for a random host with the sender’s rack, while the rest were destined for an unconstrained random host. Every host sends one flow, so without locality this corresponds to the 1 flow-per-host data point from Fig. 8(a) - a rather heavily loaded network. Fig. 7 shows the aggregate throughput as locality is increased. Unsurprisingly, as traffic moves from the oversubscribed core to the non-oversubscribed local hosts, aggregate performance increases. However, MPTCP continues to provide approximately the same performance benefits until around 75% of the flows are rack-local. Above this point the network core is lightly loaded, and all flows are limited by the sending or receiving hosts, so MPTCP provides no improvement. We see similar benefit with a localized permutation traffic matrix, though the absolute throughput values are higher.

Finally, we examined many-to-one traffic patterns; there the access links are heavily congested, no alternative paths are available, and so MPTCP and TCP behave similarly.




Fig. 9: Individual flow throughputs with different algorithms




Fig. 10: Individual link loss rates from Figure 9




Fig. 11: Effects of a hot spot on the different algorithms

4.3.5 Influence of Congestion Control

Do we need all of MPTCP’s mechanisms to get the performance and fairness benefits above? MPTCP establishes multiple subflows per connection, and links the congestion control behavior of these subflows to achieve two goals:

- It is fair to single-path TCP flows, even when multiple subflows of a connection traverse the same bottleneck.
- It explicitly moves traffic from the more congested subflows to the less congested subflows.

To understand what is going on, we must tease apart the mechanisms. We compare MPTCP with these algorithms:

Uncoupled TCP. Each subflow behaves independently, exactly as if an application had opened multiple TCP connections and striped data across them. An UNCOUPLED flow will be unfair to regular TCP; if it has n subflows through a bottleneck, it will achieve approximately n times the throughput of a competing TCP.

Equally-Weighted TCP (EWTCP). Each subflow runs TCP’s additive increase, multiplicative decrease algorithm, but the increase constant is decreased depending on the number of active subflows. An EWTCP flow will be fair to regular TCP at a bottleneck, even if all the EWTCP subflows traverse that bottleneck. However, it will not actively move traffic away from congested paths.

A rather different multipath solution would be to deploy per-packet ECMP multipath routing, spreading the packets of a single flow across multiple paths, as opposed to per-flow ECMP which hashes the five-tuple to maintain a consistent path for each flow. For this to work, a single-path TCP endpoint must be modified to avoid unintentionally treating reordering as an indicator of packet loss. Thus we also tested:

PACKETSCATTER. The switches perform per-packet load balancing across all the available alternative paths. The TCP sender runs a more robust fast-retransmit algorithm, but retains a single congestion window as it is unaware of the multiple paths.

Fig. 9 shows the throughputs of individual connections for each algorithm. This is a packet-level simulation with 128 nodes in a FatTree topology, running a permutation traffic matrix of long flows. The result suggests that it does not matter whether multipath transport is performed within TCP, or at the application level, and that the load balancing aspects of MPTCP’s linked congestion control do not greatly affect throughput. In fact the best performance is




Fig. 12: The effect of short flows competing with different multipath congestion controllers

given by PACKETSCATTER, which spreads over all possible paths, but as we shall see, this result is fragile and only applies to over-provisioned networks with no hot spots.

It is clear that many of the performance benefits seen so far are the results of spreading load over many paths. Given this result, is there any reason to deploy MPTCP, as opposed to multipath-capable applications running over regular TCP?

To understand the differences between these algorithms, we have to look more closely. Fig. 10 shows the loss rates for all the links of the FatTree topology used in Fig. 9. We show core links separately from access links because congesting the core is qualitatively different from self-congestion at the host’s own NIC.

UNCOUPLED TCP is clearly much more aggressive than single-path TCP, resulting in much higher packet loss rates, both in the core and access links. Although this does not directly impact performance for long-running UNCOUPLED flows, it does affect competing traffic.

MPTCP, EWTCP and Single-path TCP are equally aggressive overall, and so congest the access links equally. In the core, MPTCP performs as expected, and moves traffic from the more congested to the less congested paths, relieving congestion at hot spots. EWTCP lacks this active load redistribution, so although it does not increase loss at hot spots, it doesn’t effectively relieve it either. EWTCP is also not as aggressive as MPTCP on the less loaded paths, so it misses sending opportunities and gets slightly lower throughput.

With per-packet round-robin ECMP, PACKETSCATTER cannot congest the core links; consequently the losses required to constrain its transmit rate are concentrated on access links.

Short Flows Fig. 12 examines how the algorithms affect competing short flows. The topology is the 4:1 oversubscribed FatTree; each host sends to one other host; 33% send a continuous flow using either TCP or one of the multipath algorithms, provid-

ing enough traffic to congest the core. The remaining hosts send one 70 Kbyte file on average every 200ms (poisson arrivals) using single-path TCP (ECMP sends each via a new path), and we measure how long these flows take to complete. The averages in these experiments are:

Algorithm	Short Flow Finish Time (mean/stddev)	Network Core Utilization
SINGLE-PATH TCP	78 ± 108 ms	25%
PACKETSCATTER	42 ± 63 ms	30%
EWTCP	80 ± 89 ms	57%
MPTCP	97 ± 106 ms	62%
UNCOUPLED	152 ± 158 ms	65%


It is clear that UNCOUPLED significantly hurts the short flows. Single-path TCP fails to spread load within the core, so while many short flows complete faster, some encounter more congestion and finish slower. MPTCP fills the core, but isn't overly aggressive, having much less impact than UNCOUPLED. Compared to TCP, MPTCP increases mean completion time by 25% but decreases the finish time of the slowest short flows by 10%. EWTCP has less impact on short flows than MPTCP, which should not be surprising - while it does use multiple paths, it does not load-balance as effectively as MPTCP, failing to use capacity quickly where it is available.

PACKETSCATTER lets short flows finish quickest, but gets very low network utilization, close to what TCP provides. This is because long flows back off on all paths as soon as one path looks congested, despite congestion being transient due to short flows. MPTCP achieves almost all of the performance that UNCOUPLED can manage, but its lower aggressiveness and better load balancing greatly reduce impact on competing traffic.

Robustness What happens when there is a hot spot in the network? We drop a single link in the core network from 1Gb/s to 100Mb/s. Such a failure is quite common: Gigabit ethernet requires two copper pairs in a Cat-5e cable; if one RJ45 conductor fails to seat properly, it can fall back to 100Mb/s which only requires a single pair. Similar results would be seen if a single unresponsive flow saturated one link (e.g. a FCoE or UDP flow).

Results, shown in Fig. 11, show that MPTCP does what it designed to do, moving traffic off the hot link onto alternative paths; other flows then move some of their traffic off these alternative paths, and so on, so the effect of the failure is negligible. EWTCP and UNCOUPLED do not shift traffic away from congestion, giving less throughput to the flows that pass through the bottleneck. PACKETSCATTER behaves worst: it has no way to separate the bad link from the good ones. It just observes a high loss rate, and backs off. Every single connection that has any available path through the bad link achieves about 10% of the throughput it should achieve.

Network Efficiency The example below shows another difference between EWTCP and MPTCP, and is taken from [14]. If there are multiple different length paths to a destination, pathological traffic matrices are possible where the network resources are wasted. MPTCP will explicitly move traffic off the paths that traverse multiple congested links, avoiding such pathologies. Such examples do not occur in FatTree-style topologies, but they can occur with BCube.



To illustrate the issue, consider a many-to-one traffic matrix, as in a distributed file system read from many servers. Typically the




Fig. 13: First-fit scheduling compared to flow ECMP and MPTCP

distributed file systems store the data on hosts close in the network, to allow higher throughput writes. In our experiment each host reads from 12 other hosts, chosen to be the host's neighbors in the three levels in BCube(4,3). The per-host total read throughputs are:

SINGLE-PATH	297 Mb/s
EWTCP	229 Mb/s
MPTCP	272 Mb/s
PACKETSCATTER	115 Mb/s

Due to the locality, single-path TCP can saturate all three of the host's 100 Mb/s NICs, and achieves maximum throughput. EWTCP uses multiple paths and long paths congest short ones. MPTCP's linked congestion control mechanism moves almost all of the traffic onto the shortest path, avoiding paths that traverse multiple congested links, and so greatly reduces the self-congestion.

PACKETSCATTER suffers particularly badly in this case. It spreads traffic across both short and longer paths, and with this regular traffic matrix it actually succeeds in equalizing the loss rate across all paths. However, most of the traffic takes multi-hop paths using the network very inefficiently. If we wish to take advantage of multi-path in the cases where it benefits flows and also avoid this scenario and that of Fig. 11, it seems inevitable that each subflow must have its own sequence space and congestion window[11]. These choices dictate the core design of MPTCP.

4.4 Scheduling and Dynamic Flow Arrivals

With single-path TCP it is clear that ECMP's randomized load balancing does not perform sufficiently well unless the topology has been specifically tailored for it, as with VL2. Even with VL2, MPTCP can increase fairness and performance significantly.

ECMP however is not the only single path selection algorithm; Hedera proposes using a centralized scheduler to supplement random load balancing, with the goal of explicitly allocating large flows to paths. Specifically, Hedera flows start off using ECMP, but are measured by the centralized scheduler. If, during a scheduling period, a flow's average throughput is greater than 10% of the interface speed, it is explicitly scheduled. How well does MPTCP compare with centralized scheduling?

This evaluation is more difficult; the performance of a scheduler can depend on lag in flow measurement, path configuration, and TCP's response to path reconfiguration. Similarly the performance of MPTCP can depend on how quickly new subflows can slowstart.

We use a 128-host FatTree running a permutation traffic matrix with closed loop flow arrivals (one flow finishes, another one starts). Flow sizes come from the VL2 dataset. We measure throughputs for single-path TCP with ECMP, MPTCP (8 subflows), and a centralized scheduler using the First Fit heuristic Hedera [2].²

The total throughput is shown in Fig. 13. Again, MPTCP outperforms TCP over ECMP. Centralized scheduler performance depends on how frequently it is run. In [2] it is run every 5 sec-

²First Fit is much faster than Simulated Annealing; execution speed is essential to get benefits with centralized scheduling.

onds. Our results show it needs to run every 100ms to approach the performance of MPTCP; even if it runs every 500ms there is little benefit because in high bandwidth data center even large flows complete in around a second.

Host-limited Flows Hedera’s flow scheduling algorithm is based on the assumption that it only needs to schedule long-lived flows because they contribute most of the bytes. Other flows are treated as background noise. It also assumes that a flow it schedules onto an unused link is capable of increasing to fill that link.

Both assumptions can be violated by flows which are end-host limited and so cannot increase their rate. For example, network bandwidth can exceed disk performance for many workloads. Host-limited flows can be long lived and transfer a great deal of data, but never exceed the scheduling threshold. These flows are ignored by the scheduler and can collide with scheduled flows. Perhaps worse, a host-limited flow might just exceed the threshold for scheduling, be assigned to an empty path, and be unable to fill it, wasting capacity. We ran simulations using a permutation matrix where each host sends two flows; one is host-limited and the other is not. When the host-limited flows have throughput just below the 10% scheduling threshold, Hedera’s throughput drops 20%. When the same flows are just above the threshold for scheduling it costs Hedera 17%.

Scheduling Threshold	App Limited Flows	
	Over-Threshold	Under-Threshold
5%	-21%	-22%
10%	-17%	-21%
20%	-22%	-23%
50%	-51%	-45%

The table shows the 10% threshold is a sweet spot; changing it either caused too few flows to be scheduled, or wasted capacity when a scheduled flow cannot expand to fill the path. In contrast, MPTCP makes no such assumptions. It responds correctly to competing host-limited flows, consistently obtaining high throughput.

5. EVOLVING TOPOLOGIES WITH MPTCP

Our previous experiments showed that only a few workloads saturate the core of full-bisection topologies; these workloads are somewhat artificial. To justify full-bisection topologies requires:

- There is no locality to the traffic.
- There are times when all hosts wish to send flat-out.
- There is no concentration of traffic on any access link.

In practice, none of these assumptions seem valid, so building a topology that provides full bisectional bandwidth seems to be a waste of money.

In section 4.3.3, we examined an oversubscribed FatTree: one where for the same core network we connected four times as many hosts. This seems a more likely topology, and hits a better balance between being bottlenecked on the core and being bottlenecked on host access links. It also takes advantage of any locality provided by the application. For example, HDFS places two out of three replicas in the same rack, and map jobs in MapReduce are assigned to servers in the same rack as the data. For such topologies, MPTCP cannot help much with the local traffic, but it does ensure the core is used to maximal effect.

If we now take a leap and assume all hosts in the data center support MPTCP, then we should also ask whether different topologies enabled by MPTCP would perform even better. The obvious place to start is to consider cases where the workloads we have examined are bottlenecked on the access links between the hosts




Fig. 14: Dual-homing in the Fat Tree Topology

and the top-of-rack (ToR) switches. These cases can only be improved by adding more capacity, but moving to 10Gb/s ethernet is expensive. With single-path TCP, there is limited benefit from additional 1Gb/s ethernet links to the ToR switches, because a single flow cannot utilize more than one path. MPTCP does not have this limitation. Almost all current servers ship with dual gigabit ethernet onboard, so an obvious solution is to dual-home hosts to ToR switches, as shown in Fig.14. Whether to overprovision the core is then an additional question a data center operator must consider, based on predicted workload.

For our experiments, we wish to keep the cost of the network constant, so we can directly compare new and existing topologies. To do so, we impose the artificial constraint that the number of switch ports remains constant, but that we can move ports from one place in the topology to another³.

Consider the following two topologies:

Perfect Switch . FatTree and VL2 both try to emulate a single huge non-blocking switch. VL2 comes closer to succeeding than FatTree does, but a perfect switch serves as a good control experiment, giving an upper bound on what any network core might provide using single links to the hosts.

Dual-homed FatTree (DHFT) . A full FatTree requires five switch ports per host; one is to the host and four connect the links between the two layers of switches. If we remove one port per host from the core and use it to connect the second interface on each server, the network requires the same number of switch ports.

To produce a regular DHFT topology with this ratio of core-to-access capacity, we start with a k -port FatTree topology. We leave the upper-pod switches and aggregation switches the same, and replace each top-of-rack switch with two $11k/12$ port switches. With FatTree, each ToR switch had $k/2$ uplinks and connected $k/2$ hosts. With DHFT, each pair of DHFT ToR switches still has $k/2$ uplinks, but have $4k/3$ downlinks, supporting $2k/3$ hosts between them. In total, there are still five switch ports per host.

For sensible values of k , we cannot produce fully regular DHFT and FatTree networks with the same number of ports per host. For this reason we compare DHFT with the Perfect Switch, which should underestimate the benefits of DHFT.

5.1 Analysis

Effects of Locality It is not our aim to show that DHFT is in any sense optimal; we cannot define optimality without knowing the workload and which metrics are most important. Rather, we aim to show that MPTCP creates new options for data center topologies; DHFT is a simple example of such a topology.

DHFT presents opportunities single path TCP can’t exploit. If the network is underutilized, any pair of communicating hosts should be able to utilize both their NICs, reaching a throughput of 2Gb/s.

³In a real network, the ports per switch would be fixed, and the number of hosts and switches varied, but this does not allow for a fair comparison, independent of the prices of hosts and switches




Fig. 15: Performance as a function of locality in the DHFT topology




Fig. 16: Relative performance as a function of load in the DHFT




Fig. 17: Time to transfer short files.

We wish to tease apart the effects of the topology from the effects of running MPTCP over the topology. We compare:

- **TCP over the Perfect Switch.** This is the control experiment, and is an upper bound on what TCP can do in any single-homed topology. As there are no parallel paths, MPTCP cannot help on a Perfect Switch. Locality also has no effect on the results.
- **Single-path TCP over DHFT.** Although DHFT is not ideal for TCP, this provides a baseline for comparison.
- **MPTCP over DHFT.** We wish to understand when MPTCP over DHFT outperforms any single-homed topology, and see how much of this is due to MPTCP.

Our first experiment shown in Fig. 15 is a packet-level simulation of the permutation traffic matrix, using long-lived flows with varying degrees of intra-ToR traffic locality. The DHFT network has $k=12$, giving 576 hosts, and 100Mb/s links, giving a maximum throughput of 43 Gb/s if no traffic is local, and 115 Gb/s if all the traffic is local to the rack and both links from each host are used. The dark grey region shows throughputs that are feasible as locality changes. If only one of the two interfaces on each host is used, as is the case with single-path TCP, then the light grey region shows the possible throughputs.

Our baseline for comparison is a perfect switch directly connecting all 576 hosts via 100Mb/s links. This provides an upper bound on what a regular FatTree with the same number of switch ports as the DHFT could achieve with perfect traffic scheduling.

MPTCP using eight subflows achieves close to the theoretical maximum for all degrees of locality. In contrast, due to flow collisions on core links, single-path TCP does not even come close to the theoretical single-path limits until most of the traffic is not using the core. If the traffic resembles a permutation traffic matrix, building a DHFT topology without MPTCP makes little sense.

If no traffic is local, MPTCP on DHFT is outperformed by the Perfect Switch. But to achieve no locality requires effort - even with a random traffic, some flows stay local to the rack. In practice, applications often adaptively arrange for processing to take advantage of locality. MPTCP on DHFT outperforms the Perfect Switch when at least 12% of traffic is local, and costs the same in switch ports as a FatTree that is strictly worse than a Perfect Switch.

Effects of Load With a random traffic matrix, throughput can be limited by access links collisions. For single-path TCP, a DHFT can reduce this bottleneck, improving performance. Collisions in the DHFT core remain an issue though. The benefits are much greater for MPTCP, as it can utilize both access links even when there are no collisions. Fig. 16 shows how performance depends

on load. At light-to-medium load, MPTCP achieves nearly twice the performance of the perfect switch. At high load, the DHFT core is the bottleneck, and the Perfect Switch core has higher bandwidth.

Interestingly, if we keep adding connections, we expect that around 20 connections per host MPTCP will again start to get more throughput than the perfect switch as more hosts gain at least one rack-local connection. In the extreme, an all-to-all traffic matrix will achieve twice the throughput of the perfect switch, with most traffic being rack-local flows. Such extreme workloads push the limits of our packet-level simulator, and have no practical relevance.

5.2 Discussion

DHFT costs the same as a Fat Tree (same port count), but has more links in the access. It provides benefits for traffic patterns with hotspots, and those where the network core is underutilized. Compared to an idealized Fat Tree (i.e. perfect switch), DHFT's worst case performance is 75% and best case is around 200%. If all traffic matrices we analyzed are equally likely to appear in practice, DHFT trades a bit of worst-case performance for substantial average-case gains.

Beyond performance, DHFT improves robustness: any lower-pod switch failure does not cut-off an entire rack of servers. As most racks have dual power supplies, switch redundancy eliminates the biggest single cause for correlated node failures. In turn, this will likely increase application locality; for instance HDFS could choose to store all three replicas of each block in the same rack.

DHFT is not optimal by any measure, but it shows that we can create topologies with better performance *if* we assume MPTCP is the transport protocol. DHFT makes little sense with TCP, as most of the benefits vanish either due to collisions in the core or TCP's inability to use multiple interfaces for a single connection.

With MPTCP as transport, a wider range of topologies are cost-effective. Multipath TCP allows us to linearly scale bisection bandwidth for the same increase in cost. For instance, to create a topology with 2Gb/s full bisection bandwidth, we could use a k -port Fat Tree with $k^3/8$ dual-homed hosts. Transport flows would need to be split across different host interfaces to reach 2Gb/s. Single path TCP can't effectively utilize such a topology.

For really large data centers with hundreds of thousands of hosts, Fat Tree may not be feasible to deploy. We expect there will be islands of Fat Trees, connected to a super core with 10Gb/s uplinks.

6. EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION

Simulation is only as good as our ability to predict which properties of the environment we are modeling will turn out to be im-




Fig. 18: Performance as a function of locality in the DHFT testbed




Fig. 19: Robustness to Link Failures in the DHFT testbed




Fig. 20: 12 hours of throughput, all paths between forty EC2 nodes.


portant. Ideally we would cross-validate results against the full implementation. We had two opportunities to do this.

First, we built several small FatTree-like topologies in our lab, with 12 hosts and 7 switches. Although this is too small to see various statistical multiplexing effects, it does provide a controlled environment for experimentation. We primarily use this for microbenchmarks to validate aspects that cannot be accurately modeled in simulation.

Our second opportunity was to rent virtual machines on Amazon’s Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2). This is a real large-scale production data center, but we can only infer topology and we cannot control or even measure competing traffic.

6.1 Microbenchmarks

Our Linux implementation is still research-grade code; it has not been optimized and mature code should perform better. All the same, it is important to verify that the implementation is capable of the performance indicated in the simulations. In particular, if eight subflows per connection are needed, can the implementation cope?



The histogram above shows host CPU load as the client sends to the server saturating a Gigabit link. Both machines are 2006-era, with 2.2GHz single-core Opteron CPUs. Even on old machines, growing beyond two subflows only increases CPU load by 10%.

Should MPTCP be enabled for all TCP connections in a data center? We connected two dual-interface machines to a gigabit switch, and measured the time to setup a connection and transfer a short file. TCP can only use one interface; MPTCP can also use the second, but only after the first subflow has negotiated the use of MPTCP and the second subflow has been established. Figure 17 shows that TCP is quicker for files of less than about 10 packets, but much slower thereafter. To avoid penalizing short flows, the code just needs to wait two RTTs after data transmission starts (or until the window of the first subflow is big enough) and only then start a second subflow.

6.2 DHFT Testbed Experiments

We built a small DHFT network with 12 hosts in two racks. Each host connects to the two ToR switches in its rack, which are dual homed to two aggregation switches, giving four static-routed paths

between hosts in different racks. The switches are soft switches running Linux on PCs. ToR-to-core links are oversubscribed 3:2.

Our aim is to validate some of the simulations, and to see how well our Linux MPTCP implementation behaves with multiple paths. To compare with Fig. 15 we ran the permutation locality traffic matrix, varying the fraction of rack-local connections. A traffic pattern quite similar to this is generated by HDFS writes, where $\frac{2}{3}$ of the traffic is rack-local. The throughput curve, shown in Fig. 18, is close to the theoretical value; if 15% of traffic is local, DHFT equals the throughput of a perfect switch; with more local traffic, the improvements are bigger. Aggregate throughput levels off at 21Gb/s; although MPTCP could send more, the Linux soft-switches are saturated.

To validate MPTCP’s robustness to link failures we ran the experiment from Fig. 11, downgrading a core link’s speed from 1Gb/s to 100Mb/s. Single-path TCP cannot avoid this link as such a failure will not trigger re-routing. We ran a zero-locality permutation matrix to maximally load the core. Fig. 19 shows a time series of flow throughputs. Approximately 4 minutes into the experiment, we downgrade one of the core switches’ links to 100Mb/s. MPTCP copes well: its congestion control fairly distributes the remaining core capacity between the flows. When the link returns to 1Gb/s, MPTCP flows increase to fill the capacity.

6.3 EC2

Amazon’s EC2 compute cloud allows us to run real-world experiments on a production data center. Amazon has several data centers; their older ones do not appear to have redundant topologies, but their latest data centers (us-east-1c and us-east-1d) use a topology that provides many parallel paths between many pairs of virtual machines.

We do not know the precise topology of the US East data center. Compared to our simulations, it is complicated slightly because each instance is a virtual machine, sharing the physical hardware with other users. Background traffic levels are also unknown to us, and may vary between experiments.

To understand the variability of the environment and the potential for MPTCP to improve performance, we ran our MPTCP-capable Linux kernel on forty EC2 instances, and for 12 hours sequentially measured throughput with iperf between each pair of hosts, using MPTCP with 2 and 4 subflows and TCP as transport protocols. The resultant dataset totals 3,000 measurements for each configuration, and samples across both time and topology.⁴

Fig. 20 shows the results ordered by throughput for each configuration. Traceroute shows that a third of paths have no diversity; of

⁴We also ran the same experiment for 24h with ten machines; results are qualitatively similar.

these paths 60% are local to the switch (2 IP hops), while the others have four IP hops. They roughly correspond to the right-hand 35% of the flows in the figure; they achieve high throughput, and their bottleneck is most likely the shared host NIC. MPTCP cannot help these flows; in fact some of these flows show a very slight reduction in throughput; this is likely due to additional system overheads of MPTCP.

The remaining paths are four IP hops, and the number of available paths varies between two (50% of paths), three (25%) up to nine. Traceroute shows all of them implement load balancing across a redundant topology. MPTCP with four subflows achieves three times the throughput of a single-path TCP for almost every path across the entire 12-hour period.

7. RELATED WORK

Multipath TCP spans routing, path selection and congestion control, offering a general solution to flow scheduling in data center networks. Our design of the MPTCP congestion controller was presented in [14]; there we also briefly analyzed the applicability of MPTCP to current data centers, and the effect of different congestion controllers. This paper provides a much more detailed analysis of MPTCP in existing data centers, as well as exploring new topologies enabled by MPTCP.

There has been much work on scheduling for Clos networks [10, 13, 8]. $m = n$ Clos networks are rearrangeably non-blocking: there is an assignment of flows to paths such that any source-destination traffic pattern can be satisfied at maximum speed. However, mapping flows to paths is difficult; random path selection can give less than 50% of the possible throughput. Many heuristic algorithms have been proposed to utilize Clos networks, but most have drawbacks either in convergence time or performance [8]. More recently, Hedera provided such a solution for data center networks using a centralized coordinator and programmable switches to place flows on paths in the Fat Tree topology [1].

VL2[6] sidesteps the scheduling issue by using 10Gb/s links in the core and per-flow Valiant Load Balancing (ECMP). The speed difference between core and access links reduces the effect of collisions. With BCube [7], sources probe congestion on all paths then use source routing. Unfortunately congestion varies rapidly, and the initial choice may quickly become suboptimal.

Spreading each connection over multiple paths makes the scheduling problem tractable. Geoffray [5] proposes striping packets across multiple paths, coupled with layer two back-pressure. The limitations of this solution stem from the limitations of back-pressure: it is unclear how well this scheme works over multi-hop paths with heterogeneous hardware, as found in today's data centers. In addition to changing the switches, the transport protocol must also be changed to cope with frequent reordering.

Multipath TCP takes the next logical step, making the end-host aware of the different paths, but not changing the network. MPTCP is topology agnostic, completely distributed, and can react on the timescale of a few round trip times to changes in load. MPTCP finds free capacity in the network, increases fairness and is robust to congested links or failures. Finally, it can cope with app-limited flows; network-based solutions struggle here because they have insufficient information. MPTCP gets these benefits because it combines path selection, scheduling and congestion control.

8. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we examined how the use of MPTCP could improve data center performance by performing very short timescale distributed load balancing. This makes effective use of parallel paths

in modern data center topologies. Our experiments show that for any traffic pattern that is bottlenecked on the network core rather than on the hosts or their access links, MPTCP provides real performance benefits. Due to cost, we expect network cores to be over-subscribed in real data centers, so these benefits seem likely to be common; certainly we observed them in Amazon's EC2 network.

A surprising result is the need to use as many as eight subflows for FatTree and BCube to achieve both good throughput and fairness. Only then is the variance of load between core links reduced sufficiently. The MPTCP protocol and our implementation handle this without difficulty.

Multipath transport protocols such as MPTCP can change the way we think about data center design. With the right congestion control, they actively relieve hot spots, with no need for any form of network scheduling other than simple random ECMP routing. More importantly, network topologies that make no sense with TCP can be very effective with MPTCP. Even routing protocols might benefit. In recent years switch vendors have put a great deal of effort into reducing failure detection and routing reconvergence times. But as data centers scale to hundreds of thousands of hosts, this becomes increasingly difficult. In topologies with many redundant paths and hosts running MPTCP, perhaps fast routing reconvergence after failures is less critical.

Acknowledgements

We thank Olivier Bonaventure and Christoph Paasch for their help with improving MPTCP and the kernel implementation. We also want to thank the anonymous reviewers and our shepherd Jitendra Padhye for their suggestions that helped improve this paper. This work was partly funded by Trilogy, a research project funded by the European Commission in its Seventh Framework program.

9. REFERENCES

- [1] M. Al-Fares, A. Loukissas, and A. Vahdat. A scalable, commodity data center network architecture. In *Proc. SIGCOMM 2010*.
- [2] M. Al-Fares, S. Radhakrishnan, B. Raghavan, N. Huang, and A. Vahdat. Hedera: Dynamic flow scheduling for data center networks. In *Proc. Usenix NSDI 2010*.
- [3] C. Clos. A study of non-blocking switching networks. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 32(5):406–424, 1952.
- [4] A. Ford, C. Raiciu, M. Handley, and O. Bonaventure. TCP Extensions for Multipath Operation with Multiple Addresses. Internet-draft, IETF, 2011.
- [5] P. Geoffray and T. Hoefler. Adaptive routing strategies for modern high performance networks. In *Proceedings of the 2008 16th IEEE Symposium on High Performance Interconnects*, pages 165–172, Washington, DC, USA, 2008. IEEE Computer Society.
- [6] A. Greenberg et al. VL2: a scalable and flexible data center network. In *Proc. ACM Sigcomm 2009*.
- [7] C. Guo, G. Lu, D. Li, H. Wu, X. Zhang, Y. Shi, C. Tian, Y. Zhang, and S. Lu. Bcube: a high performance, server-centric network architecture for modular data centers. In *Proc. SIGCOMM 2009*.
- [8] K. Holmberg. Optimization models for routing in switching networks of clos type with many stages. *AMO - Advanced Modeling and Optimization*, 10(1), 2008.
- [9] J. Mudigonda, P. Yalagandula, M. Al-Fares, and J. C. Mogul. Spain: Cots data-center ethernet for multipathing over arbitrary topologies. In *Proc. NSDI 2010*.
- [10] E. Oki, Z. Jing, R. Rojas-Cessa, and H. J. Chao. Concurrent round-robin-based dispatching schemes for clos-network switches. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 10:830–844, December 2002.
- [11] C. Raiciu, M. Handley, and A. Ford. Multipath TCP design decisions. Work in progress, www.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/C.Raiciu/files/mtcp-design.pdf, 2009.
- [12] C. Raiciu, M. Handley, and D. Wischik. Coupled Congestion Control for Multipath Transport Protocols. Internet-draft, IETF, 2011.
- [13] A. Smiljanic. Rate and delay guarantees provided by clos packet switches with load balancing. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 16:170–181, February 2008.
- [14] D. Wischik, C. Raiciu, A. Greenhalgh, and M. Handley. Design, implementation and evaluation of congestion control for multipath TCP. In *Proc. Usenix NSDI 2011*.