Homa: A Receiver-Driven Low-Latency
Transport Protocol Using Network Priorities

Behnam Montazeri, Yilong Li, Mohammad Alizadeh[†], and John Ousterhout

Stanford University, [†]MIT

ABSTRACT

Homa is a new transport protocol for datacenter networks. It provides exceptionally low latency, especially for workloads with a high volume of very short messages, and it also supports large messages and high network utilization. Homa uses in-network priority queues to ensure low latency for short messages; priority allocation is managed dynamically by each receiver and integrated with a receiver-driven flow control mechanism. Homa also uses controlled overcommitment of receiver downlinks to ensure efficient bandwidth utilization at high load. Our implementation of Homa delivers 99th percentile round-trip times less than 15 μs for short messages on a 10 Gbps network running at 80% load. These latencies are almost 100x lower than the best published measurements of an implementation. In simulations, Homa's latency is roughly equal to pFabric and significantly better than pHost, PIAS, and NDP for almost all message sizes and workloads. Homa can also sustain higher network loads than pFabric, pHost, or PIAS.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Networks** → **Network protocols**; **Data center networks**;

KEYWORDS

Data centers; low latency; network stacks; transport protocols

1 INTRODUCTION

The rise of datacenter computing over the last decade has created new operating conditions for network transport protocols. Modern datacenter networking hardware offers the potential for very low latency communication. Round-trip times of 5 μs or less are now possible for short messages, and a variety of applications have arisen that can take advantage of this latency [20, 24, 26]. In addition, many datacenter applications use request-response protocols that are dominated by very short messages (a few hundred bytes or less). Existing transport protocols are ill-suited to

these conditions, so the latency they provide for short messages is far higher than the hardware potential, particularly under high network loads.

Recent years have seen numerous proposals for better transport protocols, including improvements to TCP [2, 3, 31] and a variety of new protocols [4, 6, 14, 15, 17, 25, 32]. However, none of these designs considers today's small message sizes; they are based on heavy-tailed workloads where 100 Kbyte messages are considered "small," and latencies are often measured in milliseconds, not microseconds. As a result, there is still no practical solution that provides near-hardware latencies for short messages under high network loads. For example, we know of no existing implementation with tail latencies of 100 μs or less at high network load (within 20x of the hardware potential).

Homa is a new transport protocol designed for small messages in low-latency datacenter environments. Our implementation of Homa achieves 99th percentile round trip latencies less than 15 μs for small messages at 80% network load with 10 Gbps link speeds, and it does this even in the presence of competing large messages. Across a wide range of message sizes and workloads, Homa achieves 99th percentile latencies at 80% network load that are within a factor of 2–3.5x of the minimum possible latency on an unloaded network. Although Homa favors small messages, it also improves the performance of large messages in comparison to TCP-like approaches based on fair sharing.

Homa uses two innovations to achieve its high performance. The first is its aggressive use of the priority queues provided by modern network switches. In order to make the most of the limited number of priority queues, Homa assigns priorities dynamically on receivers, and it integrates the priorities with a receiver-driven flow control mechanism like that of pHost [13] and NDP [15]. Homa's priority mechanism improves tail latency by 2–16x compared to previous receiver-driven approaches. In comparison to sender-driven priority mechanisms such as PIAS [6], Homa provides a better approximation to SRPT (shortest remaining processing time first); this reduces tail latency by 0–3x over PIAS.

Homa's second contribution is its use of *controlled over-commitment*, where a receiver allows a few senders to transmit simultaneously. Slightly overcommitting receiver downlinks in this way allows Homa to use network bandwidth efficiently: Homa can sustain network loads 2–33% higher than pFabric [4], PIAS, pHost, and NDP. Homa limits the overcommitment and integrates it with the priority mechanism to prevent queuing of short messages.

Homa has several other unusual features that contribute to its high performance. It uses a message-based architecture rather than a streaming approach; this eliminates head-of-line blocking at senders and reduces tail latency by 100x over streaming transports such as TCP. Homa is connectionless, which reduces

connection state in large-scale applications. It has no explicit ac-knowledgments, which reduces overheads for small messages, and it implements at-least-once semantics rather than at-most-once.

2 MOTIVATION AND KEY IDEAS

The primary goal of Homa is to provide the lowest possible latency for short messages at high network load using current networking hardware. We focus on tail message latency (99th percentile), as it is the most important metric for datacenter applications [2, 33]. A large body of work has focused on low latency datacenter transport in recent years. However, as our re-sults will show, existing designs are sub-optimal for tail latency at high network load, particularly in networks with raw hard-ware latency in the single-digit microseconds [9, 21, 28, 34]. In this section, we discuss the challenges that arise in such networks and we derive Homa's key design features.

2.1 Motivation: Tiny latency for tiny messages

State-of-the-art cut-through switches have latencies of at most a few hundred nanoseconds [30]. Low latency network interface cards and software stacks (e.g., DPDK [9]) have also become common in the last few years. These advances have made it possible to achieve one-way latencies of a few microseconds in the absence of queuing, even across a large network with thousands of servers (e.g., a 3-level fat-tree network).

Meanwhile, many datacenter applications rely on request-response protocols with tiny messages of *a few hundred bytes or less*. In typical remote procedure call (RPC) use cases, it is almost always the case that either the request or the response is tiny, since data usually flows in only one direction. The data itself is often very short as well. Figure 1 shows a collection of workloads that we used to design and evaluate Homa, most of which were measured from datacenter applications at Google and Facebook. In three of these workloads, more than 85% of messages were less than 1000 bytes. In the most extreme case (W1), more than 70% of all network traffic, measured in bytes, was in messages less than 1000 bytes.

To our knowledge, almost all prior work has focused on work-loads with very large messages. For example, in the Web Search workload used to evaluate DCTCP [2] and pFabric [4] (W5 in Figure 1), messages longer than 1 Mbyte account for 95% of transmitted bytes, and any message shorter than 100 Kbytes was considered "short." Most subsequent work has used the same workloads. To obtain these workloads, message sizes were estimated from packet captures based on inactivity of TCP con-nections beyond a threshold (e.g., 50 ms). Unfortunately, this ap-proach overestimates message sizes, since a TCP connection can contain many closely-spaced messages. In Figure 1, workloads W1–W3 were measured explicitly in terms of application-level messages, and they show much smaller sizes than workloads W4 and W5, which were extracted from packet captures.

Unfortunately, existing datacenter transport designs cannot achieve the lowest possible latency for tiny messages at high network load. We explore the design space in the next section,

| W1 | Accesses to a collection of memcached servers at Facebook, as approximated by the statistical model of the ETC workload in Section 5 and Table 5 of [5]. |
W2	Search application at Google [29].
W3	Aggregated workload from all applications running in a Google datacenter [29].
W4	Hadoop cluster at Facebook [27].
W5	Web search workload used for DCTCP [2].

Figure 1: The workloads used to design and evaluate Homa. Workloads W1–W3 were measured from application-level logs of message sizes; message sizes for W4 and W5 were estimated from packet traces. The upper graph shows the cumulative distribution of message sizes weighted by number of messages, and the lower graph is weighted by bytes. The workloads are ordered by average message size: W1 is the smallest, and W5 is most heavy-tailed.

but consider, for example, designs that do not take advantage of in-network priorities (e.g., HULL [3], PDQ [17], NDP [15]). These designs attempt to limit queue buildup, but none of them can eliminate queuing altogether. The state-of-the-art approach, NDP [15], strictly limits queues to 8 packets, equivalent to roughly 10 μs of latency at 10 Gbps. While this queuing latency has negligible impact in a network with moderate latency (e.g., RTTs greater than 50 μs) or for moderately-sized messages (e.g., 100 KBytes), it increases by 5x the completion time of a 200-byte message in a network with 5 μs RTT.

2.2 The Design Space

We now present a walk through the design space of low latency datacenter transport protocols. We derive Homa's four key de-sign principles: (i) transmitting short messages blindly, (ii) using in-network priorities, (iii) allocating priorities dynamically at receivers in conjunction with receiver-driven rate control, and (iv) controlled overcommitment of receiver downlinks. While some past designs use the first two of these techniques, we show that combining all four techniques is crucial to deliver the lowest levels of latency at high network load.

We focus on *message* latency (not packet latency) since it reflects application performance. A message is a block of bytes of any length transmitted from a single sender to a single re-ceiver. The sender must specify the size of a message when

presenting its first byte to the transport, and the receiver cannot act on a message until it has been received in its entirety. Knowledge of message sizes is particularly valuable because it allows transports to prioritize shorter messages.

The key challenge in delivering short messages with low latency is to eliminate queuing delays. Similar to prior work, we assume that bandwidth in the network core is sufficient to accommodate the offered load, and that the network supports efficient load-balancing [1, 10, 16], so that packets are distributed evenly across the available paths (we assume simple randomized per-packet spraying in our design). As a result, queueing will occur primarily in the downlinks from top-of-rack switches (TORs) to machines. This happens when multiple senders transmit simultaneously to the same receiver. The worst-case scenario is *incast*, where an application initiates RPCs to many servers concurrently and the responses all arrive at the same time.

There is no time to schedule every packet. An ideal scheme might attempt to schedule every packet at a central arbiter, as in Fastpass [25]. Such an arbiter could take into account all the messages and make a global scheduling decision about which packet to transmit from each sender and when to transmit it. The arbiter could in theory avoid queues in the network altogether. However, this approach triples the latency for short messages: a tiny, single-packet message takes at least 1.5 RTTs if it needs to wait for a scheduling decision, whereas it could finish within 0.5 RTT if transmitted immediately. Receiver-based scheduling mechanisms such as ExpressPass [8] suffer the same penalty.

In order to achieve the lowest possible latency, short messages must be transmitted *blindly*, without considering potential congestion. In general, a sender must transmit enough bytes blindly to cover the round-trip time to the receiver (including software overheads on both ends); during this time the receiver can return explicit scheduling information to control future transmissions, without introducing additional delays. We refer to this amount of data as *RTTbytes*; it is about 10 KB in our implementation of Homa for 10 Gbps networks.

Buffering is a necessary evil. Blind transmissions mean that buffering can occur when multiple senders transmit to the same receiver. No protocol can achieve minimum latency without incurring some buffering. But, ironically, when buffering occurs, it will increase latency. Many previous designs have attempted to reduce buffering, e.g., with carefully-engineered rate control schemes [2, 21, 34], reserving bandwidth headroom [3], or even strictly limiting the buffer size to a small value [15]. However, none of these approaches can completely eliminate the latency penalty of buffering.

In-network priorities are a must. Given the inevitability of buffering, the only way to achieve the lowest possible latency is to use in-network priorities. Each output port in a modern switch supports a small number of priority levels (typically 8), with one queue for each priority. Each incoming packet indicates which queue to use for that packet, and output ports service higher priority queues before lower priority ones. The key to

low latency is assigning packet priorities so that short messages bypass queued packets for longer messages.

This observation is not new; starting with pFabric [4], several schemes have shown that switch-based priorities can be used to improve message latency [6, 7, 13, 14]. These schemes use priorities to implement various message-size-based scheduling policies. The most common of these policies is SRPT (shortest remaining processing time first), which prioritizes packets from messages with the fewest bytes remaining to transmit. SRPT provides near-optimal average message latency, and as shown in prior work [4, 17], it also provides very good tail latency for short messages. Homa implements an approximation of SRPT (though the design can support other policies as well).

Unfortunately, in practice, no existing scheme can deliver the near-optimal latency of SRPT at high network load. pFabric approximates SRPT accurately, but it requires too many priority levels to implement with today's switches. PIAS [6] works with a limited number of priorities, but it assigns priorities on senders, which limits its ability to approximate SRPT (see below). In addition, it works without message sizes, so it uses a "multi-level queue" scheduling policy. As a result, PIAS has high tail latency both for short messages and long ones. QJUMP [14] requires priorities to be allocated manually on a per-application basis, which is too inflexible to produce optimal latencies.

Making best use of limited priorities requires receiver control. To produce the best approximation of SRPT with only a small number of priority levels, the priorities should be determined by the receiver. Except for blind transmissions, the receiver knows the exact set of messages vying for bandwidth on its downlink from the TOR switch. As a result, the receiver can best decide which priority to use for each incoming packet. In addition, the receiver can amplify the effectiveness of the priorities by integrating them with a packet scheduling mechanism.

pHost [13], the closest prior scheme to Homa, is an example of using a receiver-driven approach to approximate SRPT. Its primary mechanism is packet scheduling: senders transmit the first RTTbytes of each message blindly, but packets after that are transmitted only in response to explicit *grants* from the receiver. Receivers schedule the grants to implement SRPT while controlling the influx of packets to match the downlink speed.

However, pHost makes only limited use of priorities: it statically assigns one high priority for all blind transmissions and one lower priority for all scheduled packets. This impacts its ability to approximate SRPT in two ways. First, it bundles all blind transmissions into a single priority. While this is reasonable for workloads where most bytes are from large messages (W4-W5 in Figure 1), it is problematic for workloads where a large fraction of bytes are transmitted blindly (W1-W3). Second, for messages longer than RTTbytes, pHost cannot preempt a larger message immediately for a shorter one. Once again, the root of the problem is that pHost bundles all such messages into a single priority, which results in queueing delays. We will show in §3.4 that this creates *preemption lag*, which hurts latency, particularly for medium-sized messages that last a few RTTs.

Receivers must allocate priorities dynamically. Homa addresses pHost's limitations by dynamically allocating multiple priorities at the receivers. Each receiver allocates priorities for its own downlink using two mechanisms. For messages larger than RTTbytes, the receiver communicates a priority for each packet to its sender dynamically based on the exact set of inbound messages. This eliminates almost all preemption lag. For short messages sent blindly, the sender cannot know about other messages inbound for the receiver. Even so, the receiver can provide guidance in advance to senders based on its recent workload. Our experiments show that dynamic priority management reduces tail latency considerably in comparison to static priority allocation schemes such as those in pHost or PIAS.

Receivers must overcommit their downlink in a controlled manner. Scheduling packet transmissions with grants from receivers reduces buffer occupancy, but it introduces a new challenge: a receiver may send grants to a sender that does not transmit to it in a timely manner. This problem occurs, for instance, when a sender has messages for multiple receivers; if more than one receiver decides to send it grants, the sender cannot transmit packets to all such receivers at full speed. This wastes bandwidth at the receiver downlinks and can significantly hurt performance at high network load. For example, we find that the maximum load that pHost can support ranges between 58% and 73% depending on the workload, despite using a timeout mechanism to mitigate the impact of unresponsive senders (§5.2). NDP [15] also schedules incoming packets to avoid buffer buildup, and it suffers from a similar problem.

To address this challenge, Homa's receivers intentionally *overcommit* their downlinks by granting simultaneously to a small number of senders; this results in controlled packet queuing at the receiver's TOR but is crucial to achieve high network utilization and the best message latency at high load (§3.5).

Senders need SRPT also. Queues can build up at senders as well as receivers, and this can result in long delays for short messages. For example, most existing protocols implement byte streams, and an application will typically use a single stream for each destination. However, this can result in head-of-line-blocking, where a short message for a given destination is queued in the byte stream behind a long message for the same destination. §5.1 will show that this increases tail latency by 100x for short messages. FIFO packet queues in the NIC can also result in high tail latency for short messages, even if messages are transmitted on different streams. For low tail latency, senders must ensure that short outgoing messages are not delayed by long ones.

Putting it all together. Figure 2 shows an overview of the Homa protocol. Homa divides messages into two parts: an initial *unscheduled* portion followed by a *scheduled* portion. The sender transmits the unscheduled packets (RTTbytes of data) immediately, but it does not transmit any scheduled packets until instructed by the receiver. The arrival of an unscheduled packet makes the receiver aware of the message; the receiver then requests the transmission of scheduled packets by sending one


Figure 2: Overview of the Homa protocol. Sender1 is transmitting scheduled packets of message *m1*, while Sender2 is transmitting unscheduled packets of *m2*.

grant packet for each scheduled packet. Homa's receivers dynamically set priorities for scheduled packets and periodically notify senders of a set of thresholds for setting priorities for unscheduled packets. Finally, the receivers implement controlled overcommitment to sustain high utilization in the presence of unresponsive senders. The net effect is an accurate approximation of the SRPT scheduling policy using a small number of priority queues. We will show that this yields excellent performance across a broad range of workloads and traffic conditions.

3 HOMA DESIGN

This section describes the Homa protocol in detail. In addition to describing how Homa implements the key ideas from the previous section, this section also discusses several other aspects of the protocol that are less essential for performance but result in a complete and practical substrate for datacenter RPC. Homa contains several unusual features: it is receiver-driven; it is message-oriented, rather than stream-oriented; it is connectionless; it uses no explicit acknowledgments; and it implements at-least-once semantics, rather than the more traditional at-most-once semantics. Homa uses four packet types, which are summarized in Figure 3.

3.1 RPCs, not connections

Homa is connectionless. It implements the basic data transport for RPCs, each of which consists of a *request message* from a *client* to a *server* and its corresponding *response message*. Each RPC is identified by a globally unique *RPCid* generated by the client. The RPCid is included in all packets associated with the RPC. A client may have any number of outstanding RPCs at a time, to any number of servers; concurrent RPCs to the same server may complete in any order.

Independent delivery of messages is essential for low tail latency. The streaming approach used by TCP results in head-of-line-blocking, where a short message is queued behind a long message for the same destination. §5.1 will show that this

DATA	Sent from sender to receiver. Contains a range of bytes within a message, defined by an offset and a length. Also indicates total message length.
GRANT	Sent from receiver to sender. Indicates that the sender may now transmit all bytes in the message up to a given offset, and specifies the priority level to use.
RESEND	Sent from receiver to sender. Indicates that sender should re-transmit a given range of bytes within a message.
BUSY	Sent from sender to receiver. Indicates that a response to RESEND will be delayed (the sender is busy transmitting higher priority messages, or an RPC operation is still being executed); used to prevent timeouts.

Figure 3: The packet types used by Homa. All packet types except DATA are sent at highest priority; the priorities for DATA packets are specified by the receiver as discussed in §3.4.

increases tail latency by 100x for short messages. Many recent proposals, such as DCTCP, pFabric, and PIAS, assume dozens of connections between each source-target pair, so that each messsage has a dedicated connection. However, this approach results in an explosion of connection state. Even a single connection for each application-server pair is problematic for large-scale applications ([23] §3.1, [11] §3.1), so it is probably not realistic to use multiple connections.

No setup phase or connection is required before a client initiates an RPC to a server, and neither the client nor the server retains any state about an RPC once the client has received the result. In datacenter applications, servers can have large numbers of clients; for example, servers in Google datacenters commonly have several hundred thousand open connections [12]. Homa's connectionless approach means that the state kept on a server is determined by the number of active RPCs, not the total number of clients.

Homa requires a response for each RPC request because this is the common case in datacenter applications and it allows the response to serve as an acknowledgment for the request. This reduces the number of packets required (in the simplest case, there is only a single request packet and a single response packet). One-way messages can be simulated by having the server application return an empty response immediately upon receipt of the request.

Homa handles request and response messages in nearly identical fashion, so we don't distinguish between requests and responses in most of the discussion below.

Although we designed Homa for newer datacenter applications where RPC is a natural fit, we believe that traditional applications could be supported by implementing a socket-like byte stream interface above Homa. We leave this for future work.

3.2   Basic sender behavior

When a message arrives at the sender's transport module, Homa divides the message into two parts: an initial *unscheduled* portion (the first RTTbytes bytes), followed by a *scheduled* portion. The sender transmits the unscheduled bytes immediately, using one or more DATA packets. The scheduled bytes are not transmitted until requested explicitly by the receiver using GRANT

packets. Each DATA packet has a priority, which is determined by the receiver as described in §3.4.

The sender implements SRPT for its outgoing packets: if DATA packets from several messages are ready for transmission at the same time, packets for the message with the fewest remaining bytes are sent first. The sender does not consider the priorities in the DATA packets when scheduling its packet transmissions (the priorities in the DATA packets are intended for the final downlinks to the receivers). Control packets such as GRANTs and RESENDs are always given priority over DATA packets.

3.3   Flow control

Flow control in Homa is implemented on the receiver side by scheduling incoming packets on a packet-by-packet basis, like pHost and NDP. Under most conditions, whenever a DATA packet arrives at the receiver, the receiver sends a GRANT packet back to the sender. The grant invites the sender to transmit all bytes in the message up to a given offset, and the offset is chosen so that there are always RTTbytes of data in the message that have been granted but not yet received. Assuming timely delivery of grants back to the sender and no competition from other messages, messages can be transmitted from start to finish at line rate with no delays.

If multiple messages arrive at a receiver simultaneously, their DATA packets will interleave as determined by their priorities. If the DATA packets of a message are delayed, then GRANTs for that message will also be delayed, so there will never be more than RTTbytes of granted-but-not-received data for a message. This means that each incoming message can occupy at most RTTbytes of buffer space in the receiver's TOR.

If there are multiple incoming messages, the receiver may stop sending grants to some of them, as part of the overcommitment limits described in §3.5. Once a grant has been sent for the last bytes of a message, data packets for that message may result in grants to other messages for which grants had previously been stopped.

The DATA packets for a message can arrive in any order; the receiver collates them using the offsets in each packet. This allows Homa to use per-packet multi-path routing in order to minimize congestion in the network core.

3.4   Packet priorities

The most novel feature in Homa, and the key to its performance, is its use of priorities. Each receiver determines the priorities for all of its incoming DATA packets in order to approximate the SRPT policy. It uses different mechanisms for unscheduled and scheduled packets. For unscheduled packets, the receiver allocates priorities in advance. It uses recent traffic patterns to choose priority allocations, and it disseminates that information to senders by piggybacking it on other packets. Each sender retains the most recent allocations for each receiver (a few dozen bytes per receiver) and uses that information when transmitting unscheduled packets. If the receiver's incoming traffic changes, it disseminates new priority allocations the next time it communicates with each sender.

Figure 4: Homa receivers allocate unscheduled priorities based on traffic patterns. This figure shows the CDF of unscheduled bytes across messages of different sizes for workload W2; 100% on the y-axis corresponds to *all* network traffic, both scheduled and unscheduled. About 80% of all bytes are unscheduled; Homa allocates a corresponding fraction of priority levels (6 out of 8) for unscheduled packets. The CDF is then used to determine the range of message sizes for each priority level so that traffic is evenly distributed among them. For example, P7 (the highest priority level) will be used for unscheduled bytes for messages of length 1–280 bytes.


Figure 5: Preemption lag occurs if a higher priority message uses the same priority level as an existing lower priority message. Packets arrive at the top from the aggregation switch, pass through the TOR priority queues, and are transmitted to the receiver at the bottom. The notation "m1-S3" refers to a scheduled packet for message *m1* with priority 3; "m2-U4" refers to an unscheduled packet for message *m2* with priority 4. RTTbytes corresponds to 4 packets. In (a) the first unscheduled packet for *m2* arrives at the TOR during an ongoing transmission of scheduled packets for *m1*. Unscheduled packets have higher priority than scheduled packets, so *m1*'s scheduled packets will be buffered; (b) shows the state as the last unscheduled packet for *m2* is being sent to the receiver. If scheduled packets for *m2* also use priority level 3, they will be queued behind the buffered packets for *m1* as shown in (c). If the receiver assigns a higher priority level for *m2*'s scheduled packets, it avoids preemption lag.

Homa allocates priorities for unscheduled packets so that each priority level is used for about the same number of bytes. Each receiver records statistics about the sizes of its incoming messages and uses the message size distribution to compute priority levels as illustrated in Figure 4. The receiver first computes the fraction of all incoming bytes that are unscheduled (about 80% in Figure 4). It allocates this fraction of the available priorities (the highest ones) for unscheduled packets, and reserves the remaining (lower) priority levels for scheduled packets. The receiver then chooses cutoffs between the unscheduled priorities so that each priority level is used for an equal number of unscheduled bytes and shorter messages use higher priorities.


Figure 6: Bandwidth can be wasted if a receiver grants to only a single sender at a time. In this example, S1 has messages ready to send to R1 and R2 while S2 also has a message for R1. If R1 grants to only one message at a time, it will choose *m1*, which is shorter than *m3*. However, S1 will choose to transmit *m2*, since it is shorter than *m1*. As a result, R1's downlink will be idle even though it could be used for *m3*.

For scheduled packets, the receiver specifies a priority in each GRANT packet, and the sender uses that priority for the granted bytes. This allows the receiver to dynamically adjust the priority allocation based on the precise set of messages being received; this produces a better approximation to SRPT than approaches such as PIAS, where priorities are set by senders based on historical trends. The receiver uses a different priority level for each message, with higher priorities used for messages with fewer ungranted bytes. If there are more incoming messages than priority levels, only the highest priority messages are granted, as described in §3.5. If there are fewer messages than scheduled priority levels, then Homa uses the lowest of the available priorities; this leaves higher priority levels free for new higher priority messages. If Homa always used the highest scheduled priorities, it would result in *preemption lag*: when a new higher priority message arrived, its scheduled packets would be delayed by 1 RTT because of buffered packets from the previous high priority message (see Figure 5). Using the lowest scheduled priorities eliminates preemption lag except when all scheduled priorities are in use.

3.5 Overcommitment

One of the important design decisions for Homa is how many incoming messages a receiver should allow at any given time. A receiver can stop transmission of a message by withholding grants; once all of the previously-granted data arrives, the sender will not transmit any more data for that message until the receiver starts sending grants again. We use the term *active* to describe the messages for which the receiver is willing to send grants; the others are *inactive*.

One possible approach is to keep all incoming messages active at all times. This is the approach used by TCP and most other existing protocols. However, this approach results in high buffer occupancy and round-robin scheduling between messages, both of which contribute to high tail latency.

In our initial design for Homa, each receiver allowed only one active message at a time, like pHost. If a receiver had multiple partially-received incoming messages, it sent grants only to the highest priority of these; once it had granted all of the bytes of the highest priority message, it began granting to the next highest priority message, and so on. The reasoning for this approach was to minimize buffer occupancy and to implement run-to-completion rather than round-robin scheduling.

Our simulations showed that allowing only one active message resulted in poor network utilization under high load. For example, with workload W4 from Figure 1, Homa could not use more than about 63% of the network bandwidth, regardless of offered load. The network was underutilized because senders did not always respond immediately to grants; this caused downlink bandwidth to be wasted. Figure 6 illustrates how this can happen.

There is no way for a receiver to know whether a particular sender will respond to grants, so the only way to keep the downlink fully utilized is to *overcommit*: a receiver must grant to more than one sender at a time, even though its downlink can only support one of the transmissions at a time. With this approach, if one sender does not respond, then the downlink can be used for some other sender. If many senders respond at once, the priority mechanism ensures that the shortest message is delivered first; packets from the other messages will be buffered in the TOR.

We use the term *degree of overcommitment* to refer to the maximum number of messages that may be active at once on a given receiver. If there are more than this many messages available, only the highest priority ones are active. A higher degree of overcommitment reduces the likelihood of wasted bandwidth, but it consumes more buffer space in the TOR (up to RTTbytes for each active message) and it can result in more round-robin scheduling between messages, which increases average completion time.

Homa currently sets the degree of overcommitment to the number of scheduled priority levels: a receiver will grant to at most one message for each available priority level. This approach resulted in high network utilization in our simulations, but there are other plausible approaches. For example, a receiver might use a fixed degree of overcommitment, independent of available priority levels (if necessary, several messages could share the lowest priority level); or, it might adjust the degree of overcommitment dynamically based on sender response rates. We leave an exploration of these alternatives to future work.

The need for overcommitment provides another illustration why it isn't practical to completely eliminate buffering in a transport protocol. Homa introduces just enough buffering to ensure good link utilization; it then uses priorities to make sure that the buffering doesn't impact latency.

3.6 Incast

Homa solves the incast problem by taking advantage of the fact that incast is usually self-inflicted: it occurs when a node issues many concurrent RPCs to other nodes, all of which return their results at the same time. Homa detects impending incasts by counting each node's outstanding RPCs. Once this number exceeds a threshold, new RPCs are marked with a special flag that causes the server to use a lower limit for unscheduled bytes in the response message (a few hundred bytes). Small responses will still get through quickly, but larger responses will be scheduled by the receiver; the overcommitment mechanism will limit buffer usage. With this approach, a 1000-fold incast will consume at most a few hundred thousand bytes of buffer space in the TOR.

Incast can also occur in ways that are not predictable; for example, several machines might simultaneously decide to issue requests to a single server. However, it is unlikely that many such requests will synchronize tightly enough to cause incast problems. If this should occur, Homa's efficient use of buffer space still allows it to support hundreds of simultaneous arrivals without packet loss (see Section 5.1).

Incast is largely a consequence of the high latency in current datacenters. If each request results in a disk I/O that takes 10 ms, a client can issue 1000 or more requests before the first response arrives, resulting in massive incast. In future low-latency environments, incast will be less of an issue because requests will complete before very many have been issued. For example, in the RAMCloud main-memory storage system [24], the end-to-end round-trip time for a read request is about 5μs. In a multiread request, it takes the client 1–2μs to issue each request for a different server; by the time it has issued 3–4 RPCs, responses from the first requests have begun to arrive. Thus there are rarely more than a few outstanding requests.

3.7 Lost packets

We expect lost packets to be rare in Homa. There are two reasons for packet loss: corruption in the network, and buffer overflow. Corruption is extremely rare in modern datacenter networks, and Homa reduces buffer usage enough to make buffer overflows extremely uncommon as well. Since packets are almost never lost, Homa optimizes lost-packet handling for efficiency in the common case where packets are not lost, and for simplicity when packets are lost.

In TCP, senders are responsible for detecting lost packets. This approach requires acknowledgment packets, which add overhead to the protocol (the simplest RPC requires two data packets and two acknowledgments). In Homa, lost packets are detected by receivers; as a result, Homa does not use any explicit acknowledgments. This eliminates half of the packets for simple RPCs. Receivers use a simple timeout-based mechanism to detect lost packets. If a long time period (a few milliseconds) elapses without additional packets arriving for a message, the receiver sends a RESEND packet that identifies the first range of missing bytes; the sender will then retransmit those bytes.

If all of the initial packets of an RPC request are lost, the server will not know about the message, so it won't issue RESENDs. However, the client will timeout on the response message, and it will send a RESEND for the response (it does this even if the request has not been fully transmitted). When the server receives a RESEND for a response with an unknown RPCid, it assumes that the request message must have been lost and it sends a RESEND for the first RTTbytes of the request.

If a client receives no response to a RESEND (because of server or network failures), it retries the RESEND several times and eventually aborts the RPC, returning an error to higher level software.

3.8 At-least-once semantics

RPC protocols have traditionally implemented *at most once* semantics, where each RPC is executed exactly once in the

normal case; in the event of an error, an RPC may be executed either once or not at all. Homa allows RPCs to be executed more than once: in the normal case, an RPC is executed one or more times; after an error, it could have been executed any number of times (including zero). There are two situations where Homa re-executes RPCs. First, Homa doesn't keep connection state, so if a duplicate request packet arrives after the server has already processed the original request and discarded its state, Homa will re-execute the operation. Second, servers get no acknowledgment that a response was received, so there is no obvious time at which it is safe to discard the response. Since lost packets are rare, servers take the simplest approach and discard all state for an RPC as soon as they have transmitted the last response packet. If a response packet is lost, the server may receive the RESEND after it has deleted the RPC state. In this case, it will behave as if it never received the request and issue a RESEND for the request; this will result in re-execution of the RPC.

Homa allows re-executions because it simplifies the implementation and allows servers to discard all state for inactive clients (at-most-once semantics requires servers to retain enough state for each client to detect duplicate requests). Moreover, duplicate suppression at the transport level is insufficient for most datacenter applications. For example, consider a replicated storage system: if a particular replica crashes while executing a client's request, the client will retry that request with a different replica. However, it is possible that the original replica completed the operation before it crashed. As a result, the crash recovery mechanism may result in re-execution of a request, even if the transport implements at-most-once semantics. Duplicates must be filtered at a level above the transport layer.

Homa assumes that higher level software will either tolerate redundant executions of RPCs or filter them out. The filtering can be done either with application-specific mechanisms, or with general-purpose mechanisms such as RIFL [19]. For example, a TCP-like streaming mechanism can be implemented as a very thin layer on top of Homa that discards duplicate data and preserves order.

4 IMPLEMENTATION

We implemented Homa as a new transport in the RAMCloud main-memory storage system [24]. RAMCloud supports a variety of transports that use different networking technologies, and it has a highly tuned software stack: the total software overhead to send or receive an RPC is 1–2 μs in most transports. The Homa transport is based on DPDK [9], which allows it to bypass the kernel and communicate directly with the NIC; Homa detects incoming packets with polling rather than interrupts. The Homa implementation contains a total of 3660 lines of C++ code, of which about half are comments.

The RAMCloud implementation of Homa includes all of the features described in this paper except that it does not yet measure incoming message lengths on the fly (the priorities were precomputed based on knowledge of the benchmark workload).

The Homa transport contains one additional mechanism not previously described, which limits buffer buildup in the NIC

	CloudLab	Infiniband
CPU	Xeon D1548 (8 cores @ 2.0 GHz)	Xeon X3470 (4 cores @ 2.93 GHz)
NICs	Mellanox ConnectX-3 (10 Gbps Ethernet)	Mellanox ConnectX-2 (24 Gbps)
Switches	HP Moonshot-45XGc (10 Gbps Ethernet)	Mellanox MSX6036 (4X FDR) and Infiniscale IV (4X QDR)

Figure 7: Hardware configurations. The Infiniband cluster was used for measuring Infiniband performance; CloudLab was used for all other measurements.

transmit queue. In order for a sender to implement SRPT precisely, it must keep the transmit queue in the NIC short, so that high priority packets don't have to wait for lower priority packets queued previously (as described in §3.2, the sender's priority for an outgoing packet does not necessarily correspond to the priority stored in the packet). To do this, Homa keeps a running estimate of the total number of untransmitted bytes in the NIC, and it only hands off a packet to the NIC if the number of untransmitted bytes (including the new packet) will be two full-size packets or less. This allows the sender to reorder outgoing packets when new messages arrive.

5 EVALUATION

We evaluated Homa by measuring the RAMCloud implementation and also by running simulations. Our goal was to answer the following questions:

- Does Homa provide low latency for short messages even at high network load and in the presence of long messages?
- How efficiently does Homa use network bandwidth?
- How does Homa compare to existing state-of-the-art approaches?
- How important are Homa's novel features to its performance?

5.1 Implementation Measurements

We used the CloudLab cluster described in Figure 7 to measure the performance of the Homa implementation in RAMCloud. The cluster contained 16 nodes connected to a single switch using 10 Gbps Ethernet; 8 nodes were used as clients and 8 as servers. Each client generated a series of echo RPCs; each RPC sent a block of a given size to a server, and the server returned the block back to the client. Clients chose RPC sizes pseudo-randomly to match one of the workloads from Figure 1, with Poisson arrivals configured to generate a particular network load. The server for each RPC was chosen at random.

Figure 8 graphs the performance of Homa and several other RAMCloud transports for workloads W3-W5 at 80% network load (W1 and W2 are not shown because RAMCloud's software overheads are too high to handle the large numbers of small messages generated by these workloads at 80% network utilization). Our primary metric for evaluating Homa, shown in Figure 8, is 99th percentile tail *slowdown*, where slowdown is the ratio of the actual time required to complete an echo RPC divided by the best possible time for an RPC of that size on an unloaded

Figure 8: Tail latency of Homa and other RAMCloud transports for workloads W3, W4, and W5 at 80% network load. X-axes are linear in total number of messages (each tick is 10% of all messages). "HomaP*x***" measures Homa restricted to use only *x* priorities. "Basic" measures the preexisting Basic transport in RAMCloud, which corresponds roughly to HomaP1 with no limit on overcommitment. "InfRC" measures RAMCloud's Infrc transport, which uses Infiniband reliable connected queue pairs. "InfRC-MC" uses Infiniband with multiple connections per client-server pair. "TCP-MC" uses kernel TCP with multiple connections per client-server pair. Homa, Basic, and TCP were measured on the CloudLab cluster. InfRC was measured on the Infiniband cluster using the same absolute workload, so its network utilization was only about 33%. Best-case RPC times (slowdown of 1.0) for 100 byte RPCs are 3.9 µs for InfRC, 4.7 µs for Homa and Basic, and 15.5 µs for TCP.**

network. A slowdown of 1 is ideal. The x-axis for each graph is scaled to match the CDF of message sizes: the axis is linear in total number of messages, with ticks corresponding to 10% of all messages in that workload. This results in a different x-axis scale for each workload, which makes it easier to see results for the message sizes that are most common.

Homa provides a 99th percentile tail slowdown in the range of 2–3.5 across a broad range of RPC sizes and workloads. For example, a 100-byte echo RPC takes 4.7 µs in an unloaded network; at 80% network load, the 99th-percentile latency was about 14 µs in all three loads.

To quantify the benefits provided by the priority and overcommitment mechanisms in Homa, we also measured RAMCloud's Basic transport. Basic is similar to Homa in that it is receiver-driven, with grants and unscheduled packets. However, Basic does not use priorities and it has no limit on overcommitment: receivers grant independently to all incoming messages. Figure 8 shows that tail latency is 5–15x higher in Basic than in Homa. By analyzing detailed packet traces we determined that Basic's high latency is caused by queuing delays at the receiver's downlink; Homa's use of priorities eliminates almost all of these delays.

Although Homa prioritizes small messages, it also outperforms Basic for large ones. This is because Homa's SRPT policy tends to produce run-to-completion behavior: it finishes the highest priority message before giving service to any other messages. In contrast, Basic, like TCP, tends to produce round-robin behavior; when there are competing large messages, they all complete slowly.

For the very largest messages, Homa produces 99th-percentile slowdowns of 100x or more. This is because of the SRPT policy. We speculate that the performance of these outliers could be improved by dedicating a small fraction of downlink bandwidth to the oldest message; we leave a full analysis of this alternative to future work.

To answer the question "How many priority levels does Homa need?" we modified the Homa transport to reduce the number of

priority levels by collapsing adjacent priorities. Figure 8 shows the results. 99th-percentile tail latency is almost as good with 4 priority levels as with 8, but tail latency increases noticeably when there are only 2 priority levels. Homa with only one priority level is still significantly better than Basic; this is because Homa's limit on overcommitment results in less buffering than Basic, which reduces preemption lag.

Homa vs. Infiniband. Figure 8 also measures RAMCloud's InfRC transport, which uses kernel bypass with Infiniband reliable connected queue pairs. The Infiniband measurements show the advantage of Homa's message-oriented protocol over streaming protocols. We first measured InfRC in its normal mode, which uses a single connection for each client-server pair. This resulted in tail latencies about 1000x higher than Homa for small messages. Detailed traces showed that the long delays were caused by head-of-line blocking at the sender, where a small message got stuck behind a very large message to the same destination. Any streaming protocol, such as TCP, will suffer similar problems. We then modified the benchmark to use multiple connections per client-server pair ("InfRC-MC" in the figures). This eliminated the head-of-line blocking and improved tail latency by 100x, to about the same level as Basic. As discussed in §3.1, this approach is probably not practical in large-scale applications because it causes an explosion of connection state. InfRC-MC still doesn't approach Homa's performance, because it doesn't use priorities.

Note: the Infiniband measurements were taken on a different cluster with faster CPUs, and the Infiniband network offers 24 Gpbs applicaiton level bandwidth, vs. 10 Gbps for Homa and Basic. The software overheads for InfRC were too high to run at 80% load on the Infiniband network, so we used the same absolute load as for the Homa and Basic measurements, which resulted in only 33% network load for Infiniband. As a result, Figure 8 overstates the performance of Infiniband relative to Homa. In particular, Infiniband appears to perform better than Homa for large messages sizes. This is an artifact of measuring

Figure 9: Overall throughput when a single Homa client receives responses for RPCs issued concurrently to 15 servers. Each response was 10 KB. Each data point shows min, mean, and max values over 10 runs.

Infiniband at 33% network load and Homa at 80%; at equal load factors, we expect Homa to provide significantly lower latency than Infiniband at all message sizes.

Homa vs. TCP. The "TCP-MC" curves in Figure 8 shows the performance of RAMCloud's TCP transport, which uses the Linux kernel implementation of TCP. Only workloads W4 and W5 are shown (system overheads were too high to run W3 at 80% load), and only with multiple connections per client-server pair (with a single connection, tail slowdown was off the scale of the graphs). Even in multi-connection mode, TCP's tail latencies are 10–100x higher than for Homa. We also created a new RAMCloud transport using mTCP [18], a user-level implementation of TCP that uses DPDK for kernel bypass. However, we were unable to achieve latencies for mTCP less than 1 ms; the mTCP developers confirmed that this behavior is expected (mTCP batches heavily, which improves throughput at the expense of latency). We did not graph mTCP results.

Homa vs. other implementations. It is difficult to compare Homa with other published implementations because most prior systems do not break out small message performance and some measurements were taken with slower networks. Nonetheless, Homa's absolute performance (14 µs round-trip for small messages at 80% network load and 99th percentile tail latency) is nearly two orders of magnitude faster than the best available comparison systems. For example, HULL [3] reported 782 µs one-way latency for 1 Kbyte messages at 99th percentile and 60% network load, and PIAS [6] reported 2 ms one-way latency for messages shorter than 100 Kbytes at 99th percentile and 80% network load; both of these systems used 1 Gbps networks. NDP [15] reported more than 600 µs one-way latency for 100 Kbyte messages at 99th percentile in a loaded 10 Gbps network, of which more than 400 µs was queueing delay.

Incast. To measure the effectiveness of Homa's incast control mechanism, we ran an experiment where a single client initiated a large number of RPCs in parallel to a collection of servers. Each RPC had a tiny request and a response of approximately RTTbytes (10 KB). Figure 9 shows the results. With the incast control mechanism enabled, Homa successfully handled several thousand simultaneous RPCs without degradation. We also measured performance with incast control disabled; this shows the performance that can be expected when incast occurs for unpredictable reasons. Even under these conditions Homa

supported about 300 concurrent RPCs before performance degraded because of packet drops. Homa is less sensitive to incast than protocols such as TCP because its packet scheduling mechanism limits buffer buildup to at most RTTbytes per incoming message. In contrast, a single TCP connection can consume all of the buffer space available in a switch.

5.2 Simulations

The rest of our evaluation is based on packet-level simulations. The simulations allowed us to explore more workloads, measure behavior at a deeper level, and compare with simulations of pFabric [4], pHost [13], NDP [15], and PIAS [6]. We chose pFabric for comparison because it is widely used as a benchmark and its performance is believed to be near-optimal. We chose pHost and NDP because they use receiver-driven packet scheduling, like Homa, but they make limited use of priorities and don't use overcommitment. We chose PIAS because it uses priorities in a more static fashion than Homa and does not use receiver-driven scheduling.

The simulations used the same network topology as prior evaluations of pFabric, pHost, and PIAS, consisting of 144 hosts divided among 9 racks with a 2-level switching fabric. Host links operate at 10 Gbps and TOR-aggregation links operate at 40 Gbps. For additional details about the simulators, see the complete version of this paper [22].

Our simulations used an all-to-all communication pattern similar to that of §5.1, except that each host was both a sender and a receiver, and the workload consisted of one-way messages instead of RPCs. New messages are created at senders according to a Poisson process; the size of each message is chosen from one of the workloads in Figure 1, and the destination for the message is chosen uniformly at random. For each simulation we selected a message arrival rate to produce a desired network load, which we define as the percentage of available network bandwidth consumed by goodput packets; this includes application-level data plus the minimum overhead (packet headers, inter-packet gaps, and control packets) required by the protocol; it does not include retransmitted packets.

Tail latency vs. pFabric, pHost, and PIAS. Figure 10 displays 99th percentile slowdown as a function of message size at a network load of 80% for the five workloads in Figure 1. It uses the same axes as Figure 8 except that slowdown is measured in terms of one-way message delivery, not RPC round-trips. The Homa curves in Figure 10 are similar to those in Figure 8, but slowdowns are somewhat less in Figure 10 (the simulations do not model queueing delays that occur in software, such as when an incoming packet cannot be processed immediately because the receiver is still processing an earlier packet).

Homa delivers consistent low latency for small messages across all workloads, and its performance is similar to pFabric: 99th-percentile slowdown for the shortest 50% of messages is never worse than 2.2 at 80% network load. pHost and PIAS have considerably higher slowdown than Homa and pFabric in Figure 10. This surprised us, because both pHost and PIAS claimed performance comparable to pFabric. On further review,

Figure 10: 99th-percentile slowdown as a function of message size, for different protocols and workloads. Distance on the x-axis is linear in total number of messages (each tick corresponds to 10% of all messages). All measurements except NDP and pHost used a network load of 80%. NDP and pHost cannot support 80% network load for these workloads, so we used the highest load that each protocol could support (70% for NDP, 58–73% for pHost, depending on workload). The minimum one-way time for a small message (slowdown is 1.0) is 2.3 μs. NDP was measured only for W5 because its simulator cannot handle partial packets.

we found that those claims were based on *mean* slowdown. Our evaluation follows the original pFabric publication and focuses on 99th percentile slowdown.

A comparison between the pHost and Homa curves in Figure 10 shows that a receiver-driven approach is not enough by itself to guarantee low latency; using priorities and overcommitment reduces tail latency by an additional 30–50%.

The performance of PIAS in Figure 10 is somewhat erratic. Under most conditions, its tail latency is considerably worse than Homa, but for larger messages in W1 and W2 PIAS provides better latency than Homa. PIAS is nearly identical to Homa for small messages in workload W3. PIAS always uses the highest priority level for messages that fit in a single packet, and this happens to match Homa's priority allocation for W3.

PIAS uses a multi-level feedback queue policy, where each message starts at high priority; the priority drops as the message is transmitted and PIAS learns more about its length. This policy is inferior to Homa's receiver-driven SRPT not only for small messages but also for most long ones. Small messages suffer because they get queued behind the high-priority prefixes of longer messages. Long messages suffer because their priority drops as they get closer to completion; this makes it hard to finish them. As a result, PIAS' slowdown jumps significantly for messages greater than one packet in length. In addition, without receiver-based scheduling, congestion led to ECN-induced backoff in workload W4, resulting in slowdowns of 20 or more for multi-packet messages. Homa uses the opposite approach from PIAS: the priority of a long message starts off low, but rises as the message gets closer to finishing; eventually the message runs to completion. In addition, Homa's rate-limiting and priority mechanisms work well together; for example, the rate limiter eliminates buffer overflow as a major consideration.

NDP. The NDP simulator [15] could not simulate partial packets, so we measured NDP only with W5, in which all packets are full-size; Figure 10 shows the results. NDP's performance is considerably worse than any of the other protocols, for two reasons. First, it uses a rate control mechanism with no overcommitment, which wastes bandwidth: at 70% network load, 27% of receiver bandwidth was wasted (the receiver had incomplete incoming messages yet its downlink was idle). We could not run simulations above 73% network load. The wasted downlink bandwidth results in additional queuing delays at high network load. Second, NDP does not use SRPT; its receivers use a fair-share scheduling policy, which results in a uniformly high slowdown for all messages longer than RTTbytes. In addition, NDP senders do not prioritize their transmit queues; this results in severe head-of-line blocking for small messages when the transmit queue builds up during bursts. The NDP comparison demonstrates the importance of overcommitment and SRPT.

Causes of remaining delay. We instrumented the Homa simulator to identify the causes of tail latency ("why is the slowdown at the 99th percentile greater than 1.0?") Figure 11 shows that tail latency is almost entirely due to link-level preemption lag, where a packet from a short message arrives at a link while it is

Figure 11: Sources of tail delay for short messages. "Preemption Lag" occurs when a higher priority packet must wait for a lower priority packet to finish transmission on a link. "Queuing Delay" occurs when a packet waits for one or more packets of equal or higher priority. Each bar represents an average across short messages with delay near the 99th percentile. For workloads W1-W4 the bar considers the smallest 20% of all messages; for W5 it considers all single packet messages.


Figure 12: Network utilization limits. The top of each bar indicates the highest percent of available network bandwidth that the given protocol can support for the given workload. It counts all bytes in goodput packets, including application data, packet headers, and control packets; it excludes retransmitted packets. The bottom part of each bar indicates the percent of network bandwidth used for application data at that load.

busy transmitting a packet from a longer message. This shows that Homa is nearly optimal: the only way to improve tail latency significantly is with changes to the networking hardware, such as implementing link-level packet preemption.

Bandwidth utilization. To measure each protocol's ability to use network bandwidth efficiently, we simulated each workload-protocol combination at higher and higher network loads to identify the highest load the protocol can support (the load generator runs open-loop, so if the offered load exceeds the protocol's capacity, queues grow without bound). Figure 12 shows that Homa can operate at higher network loads than either pFabric, pHost, NDP, or PIAS, and its capacity is more stable across workloads.

None of the protocols can achieve 100% bandwidth because each of them wastes network bandwidth under some conditions. Homa wastes bandwidth because it has a limited number of scheduled priority levels: there can be times when (a) all of the scheduled priority levels are allocated, (b) none of those senders is responding, so the receiver's downlink is idle and (c) there are additional messages for which the receiver could send grants if it had more priority levels. Figure 13 shows that this wasted bandwidth increases with the overall network load; eventually it consumes all of the surplus network bandwidth. Figure 13 also shows the importance of overcommitment: if


Figure 13: Wasted bandwidth as a function of network load for the W4 workload. Each curve uses a different number of scheduled priorities, which corresponds to the level of overcommitment. Each y-value is the average fraction of time across all receivers that a receiver's link is idle, yet the receiver withheld grants (because of overcommitment limits) that might have caused the bandwidth to be used. The diagonal line represents surplus network bandwidth (100% - network load). Wasted bandwidth cannot ever exceed surplus bandwidth, so the point where each curve intersects the diagonal line indicates the maximum sustainable network load.

Queue		W1	W2	W3	W4	W5
TOR→Aggr	mean	0.7	1.0	1.6	1.7	1.7
	max	21.1	30.0	50.3	82.7	93.6
Aggr→TOR	mean	0.8	1.1	1.8	1.7	1.6
	max	22.4	34.1	57.1	92.2	78.1
TOR→host	mean	1.7	5.5	12.8	17.3	17.3
	max	58.7	93.0	117.9	146.1	126.4

Table 1: Average and maximum queue lengths (in Kbytes) at switch egress ports for each of the three levels of the network, measured at 80% network load. Queue lengths do not include partially-transmitted or partially-received packets.

receivers grant to only one message at a time, Homa can only support a network load of about 63% for workload W4, versus 89% with an overcommitment level of 7.

The other protocols also waste bandwidth. pFabric wastes bandwidth because it drops packets to signal congestion; those packets must be retransmitted later. NDP and pHost both waste bandwidth because they do not overcommit their downlinks. For example, in pHost, if a sender becomes nonresponsive, bandwidth on the receiver's downlink is wasted until the receiver times out and switches to a different sender. Figure 12 suggests that Homa's overcommitment mechanism uses network bandwidth more efficiently than any of the other protocols.

Queue lengths. Some queuing of packets in switches is inevitable in Homa because of its use of unscheduled packets and overcommitment. Even so, Table 1 shows that Homa is successful at limiting packet buffering: average queue lengths at 80% load are only 1–17 Kbytes, and the maximum observed queue length was 146 Kbytes (in a TOR→host downlink). Of the maximum, overcommitment accounts for as much as 56 Kbytes (RTTbytes in each of 6 scheduled priority levels); the remainder is from collisions of unscheduled packets. Workloads with shorter messages consume less buffer space than those with longer messages. For example, the W1 workload uses only one scheduled priority level, so it cannot overcommit; in addition,

Figure 14: Usage of priority levels for workload W3 under different loads. Each bar indicates the number of network bytes transmitted at a given priority level, as a fraction of total available network bandwidth. P0-P3 are used for scheduled packets and P4-P7 for unscheduled packets.

its messages are shorter, so more of them must collide simultaneously in order to build up long queues at the TOR. The 146-Kbyte peak occupancy is well within the capacity of typical switches, so the data confirms our assumption that packet drops due to buffer overflows will be rare.

Table 1 also validates our assumption that there will not be significant congestion in the core. The TOR→Aggr and Aggr→TOR queues contain less than 2 Kbytes of data on average, and their maximum length is less than 100 Kbytes.

Priority utilization. Figure 14 shows how network traffic is divided among the priority levels when executing workload W3 at three different network loads. For this workload Homa splits the priorities evenly between scheduled and unscheduled packets. The four unscheduled priorities are used evenly, with the same number of network bytes transmitted under each priority level. As the network load increases, the additional traffic is also split evenly across the unscheduled priority levels.

The four scheduled priorities are used in different ways depending on the network load. At 50% load, a receiver typically has only one schedulable message at a time, in which case the message uses the lowest priority level (P0). Higher priority levels are used for preemption when a shorter message appears part-way through the reception of a longer one. It is rare for preemptions to nest deeply enough to use all four scheduled levels. As the network load increases, the usage of scheduled priorities changes. By the time network load reaches 90%, receivers typically have at least four partially-received messages at any given time, so they use all of the scheduled priority levels. More scheduled packets arrive on the highest scheduled level than any other; the other levels are used if the highest-priority sender is nonresponsive or if the number of incoming messages drops below 4. The figure indicates that senders are frequently nonresponsive at 80% network load (more than half of the scheduled traffic arrives on P0–P2).

Additional information. Page length restrictions forced us to omit several portions of this section. A complete version of the paper is available online [22] and includes the following additional information:

- A more comprehensive description of our simulation environment and the parameters used in simulation.

- Measurements of median slowdown for both the implementation and the simulations (vs. 99th percentile in Figures 8 and 10), and simulation measurements at 50% network load (vs. 80% load in Figure 10). Homa performed well in all these measurements, though its advantages over the other protocols were smaller with lower network loads and at the median.

- Measurements in which we varied the number of unscheduled priority levels, the cutoff points between unscheduled priority levels, the division of priorities between scheduled and unscheduled packets, and the number of unscheduled bytes. In each case, the best hand-chosen value was the same as the value chosen automatically by Homa. Among other things, the measurements showed that workloads with small messages need multiple priority levels for unscheduled packets (tail slowdown in W1 is 2.5x higher with only a single unscheduled priority level).

6 LIMITATIONS

This section summarizes the most important assumptions Homa makes about its operating environment. If these assumptions are not met, then Homa may not achieve the performance levels reported here.

Homa is designed for use in datacenter networks and capitalizes on the properties of those networks; it is unlikely to work well in wide-area networks.

Homa assumes that congestion occurs primarily at host downlinks, not in the core of the network. Homa assumes per-packet spraying to ensure load balancing across core links, combined with sufficient overall capacity. Oversubscription is still possible, as long as there is enough aggregate bandwidth to avoid significant congestion. We hypothesize that congestion in the core of datacenter networks will be uncommon because it will not be cost-effective. If the core is congested, it will result in underutilization of servers, and the cost of this underutilization will likely exceed the cost of provisioning more core bandwidth. If the core does become congested, then Homa latencies will degrade. Homa's mechanisms for limiting buffer occupancy may reduce the impact of congestion in comparison to TCP-like protocols, but we leave a full exploration of this topic to future work.

Homa also assumes a single implementation of the protocol for each host-TOR link, such as in an operating system kernel running on bare hardware, so that Homa is aware of all incoming and outgoing traffic. If multiple independent Homa implementations share a single host-TOR link, they may make conflicting decisions. For example, each Homa implementation will independently overcommit the downlink and assign priorities based on the input traffic passing through that implementation. Multiple implementations can occur when a virtualized NIC is shared between multiple guest operating systems in a virtual machine environment, or between multiple applications that implement the protocol at user level. Obtaining good performance in these environments may require sharing state between the Homa implementations, perhaps by moving part of the protocol to the

NIC or even the TOR. We leave an exploration of this problem and its potential solutions to future work.

Homa assumes that the most severe forms of incast are predictable because they are self-inflicted by outgoing RPCs; Homa handles these situations effectively. Unpredictable incasts can also occur, but Homa assumes that they are unlikely to have high degree. Homa can handle unpredictable incasts of several hundred messages with typical switch buffer capacities; unpredictable incasts larger than this will cause packet loss and degraded performance.

The Homa configuration and measurements in this paper were based on 10 Gbps link speeds. As link speeds increase in the future, RTTbytes will increase proportionally, and this will impact the protocol in several ways. A larger fraction of traffic will be sent unscheduled, so Homa's use of multiple priority levels for unscheduled packets will become more important. With faster networks, workloads will behave more like W1 and W2 in our measurements, rather than W3-W5. As RTTbytes increases, each message can potentially consume more space in switch buffers, and the degree of unpredictable incast that Homa can support will drop.

7 RELATED WORK

In recent years there have been numerous proposals for new transport protocols, driven by new datacenter applications and the well-documented shortcomings of TCP. However, none of these proposals combines the right set of features to produce low latency for short messages under load.

The biggest shortcoming of most recent proposals is that they do not take advantage of in-network priority queues. This includes rate-control techniques such as DCTCP [2] and HULL [3], which reduce queue occupancy, and D^3 [32] and D^2TCP [31], which incorporate deadline-awareness. PDQ [17] adjusts flow rates to implement preemption, but its rate calculation is too slow for scheduling short messages. Without the use of priorities, none of these systems can achieve the rapid preemption needed by short messages.

A few systems have used in-network priorities, but they do not implement SRPT. §5.2 showed that the PIAS priority mechanism [6] performs worse than SRPT for most message sizes and workloads. QJUMP [14] requires priorities to be specified manually on a per-application basis. Karuna [7] uses priorities to separate deadline and non-deadline flows, and requires a global calculation for the non-deadline flows. Without receiver-driven SRPT, none of these systems can achieve low latency for short messages.

pFabric [4] implements SRPT by assuming fine-grained priority queues in network switches. Although this produces near-optimal latencies, it depends on features not available in existing switches.

pHost [13] and NDP [15] are the systems most similar to Homa, in that both use receiver-driven scheduling and priorities. pHost and NDP use only two priority levels with static assignment, which results in poor latency for short messages. Neither system uses overcommitment, which limits their ability to operate at high network load. NDP uses fair-share scheduling rather than SRPT, which results in high tail latencies. NDP includes an incast control mechanism, in which network switches drop all but the first few bytes of incoming packets when there is congestion. Homa's incast control mechanism achieves a similar effect using a software approach: instead of truncating packets in-flight (which wastes network bandwidth), senders are instructed by the protocol to limit how much data they send.

Almost all of the systems mentioned above, including DCTCP, pFabric, PIAS, and NDP, use a connection-oriented streaming approach. As previously discussed, this results in either high tail latency because of head-of-line blocking at senders, or an explosion of connections, which is impractical for large-scale datacenter applications.

A final alternative is to schedule all messages or packets for a cluster centrally, as in Fastpass [25]. However, communication with the central scheduler adds too much latency to provide good performance for short messages. In addition, scaling a system like Fastpass to a large cluster is challenging, particularly for workloads with many short messages.

8 CONCLUSION

The combination of tiny messages and low-latency networks creates challenges and opportunities that have not been addressed by previous transport protocols. Homa meets this need with a new transport architecture that combines several unusual features:

- It implements discrete messages for remote procedure calls, not byte streams.
- It uses in-network priority queues with a hybrid allocation mechanism that approximates SRPT.
- It manages most of the protocol from the receiver, not the sender.
- It overcommits receiver downlinks in order to maximize throughput at high network loads.
- It is connectionless and has no explicit acknowledgments.

These features combine to produce nearly optimal latency for short messages across a variety of workloads. Even under high loads, tail latencies are within a small factor of the hardware limit. The remaining delays are almost entirely due to the absence of link-level packet preemption in current networks; there is little room for improvement in the protocol itself. Finally, Homa can be implemented with no changes to networking hardware. We believe that Homa provides an attractive platform on which to build low-latency datacenter applications.

9 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] M. Alizadeh, T. Edsall, S. Dharmapurikar, R. Vaidyanathan, K. Chu, A. Fingerhut, V. T. Lam, F. Matus, R. Pan, N. Yadav, and G. Varghese. CONGA: Distributed Congestion-aware Load Balancing for Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2014 Conference*, SIGCOMM '14, pages 503–514, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.

[2] M. Alizadeh, A. Greenberg, D. A. Maltz, J. Padhye, P. Patel, B. Prabhakar, S. Sengupta, and M. Sridharan. Data Center TCP (DCTCP). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2010 Conference*, SIGCOMM '10, pages 63–74, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.

[3] M. Alizadeh, A. Kabbani, T. Edsall, B. Prabhakar, A. Vahdat, and M. Yasuda. Less is More: Trading a Little Bandwidth for Ultra-low Latency in the Data Center. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, NSDI'12, pages 19–19, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2012. USENIX Association.

[4] M. Alizadeh, S. Yang, M. Sharif, S. Katti, N. McKeown, B. Prabhakar, and S. Shenker. pFabric: Minimal Near-optimal Datacenter Transport. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2013 Conference*, SIGCOMM '13, pages 435–446, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM.

[5] B. Atikoglu, Y. Xu, E. Frachtenberg, S. Jiang, and M. Paleczny. Workload Analysis of a Large-scale Key-value Store. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGMETRICS/PERFORMANCE Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*, SIGMETRICS '12, pages 53–64, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.

[6] W. Bai, L. Chen, K. Chen, D. Han, C. Tian, and H. Wang. Information-agnostic Flow Scheduling for Commodity Data Centers. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, NSDI'15, pages 455–468, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2015. USENIX Association.

[7] L. Chen, K. Chen, W. Bai, and M. Alizadeh. Scheduling Mix-flows in Commodity Datacenters with Karuna. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2016 Conference*, SIGCOMM '16, pages 174–187, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM.

[8] I. Cho, K. Jang, and D. Han. Credit-Scheduled Delay-Bounded Congestion Control for Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2017 Conference*, SIGCOMM '17, pages 239–252, New York, NY, USA, 2017. ACM.

[9] Data Plane Development Kit. http://dpdk.org/.

[10] A. Dixit, P. Prakash, Y. C. Hu, and R. R. Kompella. On the Impact of Packet Spraying in Data Center Networks. In *Proceedings of IEEE Infocom*, 2013.

[11] A. Dragojević, D. Narayanan, M. Castro, and O. Hodson. FaRM: Fast Remote Memory. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 14)*, pages 401–414, Seattle, WA, Apr. 2014. USENIX Association.

[12] B. Felderman. Personal communication, February 2018. Google.

[13] P. X. Gao, A. Narayan, G. Kumar, R. Agarwal, S. Ratnasamy, and S. Shenker. 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, pages 1:1–1:12, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.

[14] M. P. Grosvenor, M. Schwarzkopf, I. Gog, R. N. M. Watson, A. W. Moore, S. Hand, and J. Crowcroft. Queues Don't Matter When You Can JUMP Them! In *12th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 15)*, pages 1–14, Oakland, CA, 2015. USENIX Association.

[15] M. Handley, C. Raiciu, A. Agache, A. Voinescu, A. W. Moore, G. Antichik, and M. Mojcik. Re-architecting Datacenter Networks and Stacks for Low Latency and High Performance. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2017 Conference*, SIGCOMM '17, pages 29–42, New York, NY, USA, 2017. ACM.

[16] K. He, E. Rozner, K. Agarwal, W. Felter, J. Carter, and A. Akella. Presto: Edge-based Load Balancing for Fast Datacenter Networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2015 Conference*, SIGCOMM '15, pages 465–478, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.

[17] C.-Y. Hong, M. Caesar, and P. B. Godfrey. Finishing Flows Quickly with Preemptive Scheduling. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2012 Conference*, SIGCOMM '12, pages 127–138, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.

[18] E. Jeong, S. Wood, M. Jamshed, H. Jeong, S. Ihm, D. Han, and K. Park. mTCP: a Highly Scalable User-level TCP Stack for Multicore Systems. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 14)*, pages 489–502, Seattle, WA, 2014. USENIX Association.

[19] C. Lee, S. J. Park, A. Kejriwal, S. Matsushita, and J. Ousterhout. Implementing Linearizability at Large Scale and Low Latency. In *Proceedings of the 25th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '15, pages 71–86, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.

[20] memcached: a Distributed Memory Object Caching System. http://www.memcached.org/, Jan. 2011.

[21] R. Mittal, V. T. Lam, N. Dukkipati, E. Blem, H. Wassel, M. Ghobadi, A. Vahdat, Y. Wang, D. Wetherall, and D. Zats. TIMELY: RTT-based Congestion Control for the Datacenter. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, SIGCOMM '15, pages 537–550, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.

[22] B. Montazeri, Y. Li, M. Alizadeh, and J. K. Ousterhout. Homa: A Receiver-Driven Low-Latency Transport Protocol Using Network Priorities (Complete Version). *CoRR*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1803.09615, 2018.

[23] R. Nishtala, H. Fugal, S. Grimm, M. Kwiatkowski, H. Lee, H. C. Li, R. McElroy, M. Paleczny, D. Peek, P. Saab, D. Stafford, T. Tung, and V. Venkataramani. Scaling Memcache at Facebook. In *10th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 13)*, pages 385–398, Lombard, IL, 2013. USENIX.

[24] J. Ousterhout, A. Gopalan, A. Gupta, A. Kejriwal, C. Lee, B. Montazeri, D. Ongaro, S. J. Park, H. Qin, M. Rosenblum, et al. The RAMCloud Storage System. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, 33(3):7, 2015.

[25] J. Perry, A. Ousterhout, H. Balakrishnan, D. Shah, and H. Fugal. Fastpass: A Centralized "Zero-queue" Datacenter Network. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2014 Conference*, SIGCOMM '14, pages 307–318, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.

[26] Redis, Mar. 2015. http://redis.io.

[27] A. Roy, H. Zeng, J. Bagga, G. Porter, and A. C. Snoeren. Inside the Social Network's (Datacenter) Network. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2015 Conference*, SIGCOMM '15, pages 123–137, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.

[28] T. Shanley. *Infiniband Network Architecture*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2003.

[29] R. Sivaram. Some Measured Google Flow Sizes (2008). Google internal memo, available on request.

[30] BCM56960 Series: High-Density 25/100 Gigabit Ethernet StrataXGS Tomahawk Ethernet Switch Series. https://www.broadcom.com/products/ethernet-connectivity/switching/stratxgs/bcm56960-series.

[31] B. Vamanan, J. Hasan, and T. Vijaykumar. Deadline-aware Datacenter TCP (D2TCP). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2012 Conference*, SIGCOMM '12, pages 115–126, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.

[32] C. Wilson, H. Ballani, T. Karagiannis, and A. Rowtron. Better Never Than Late: Meeting Deadlines in Datacenter Networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2011 Conference*, SIGCOMM '11, pages 50–61, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.

[33] D. Zats, T. Das, P. Mohan, D. Borthakur, and R. Katz. Detail: Reducing the flow completion time tail in datacenter networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2012 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication*, SIGCOMM '12, pages 139–150, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.

[34] Y. Zhu, H. Eran, D. Firestone, C. Guo, M. Lipshteyn, Y. Liron, J. Padhye, S. Raindel, M. H. Yahia, and M. Zhang. Congestion Control for Large-Scale RDMA Deployments. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, SIGCOMM '15, pages 523–536, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.