

Clock-Synchronized Optical Networks for Distributed Machine Learning Systems

Carlo Seidel

School of Information Technology, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA.
carloseidel824@uc.edu

Natan Leks

School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA.

natanmail@oregonstate.edu

Abstract

Distributed machine learning has become a central computational model for training large neural networks, yet its performance increasingly depends on the ability of computing nodes to exchange data with predictable latency and tightly bounded temporal uncertainty. Electrical interconnection fabrics, while mature and widely deployed, confront fundamental limits in bandwidth density, energy per bit, and synchronization jitter as accelerator clusters expand. Clock-synchronized optical networks offer a promising system-level response by combining wavelength-division multiplexing, low-latency optical switching, and precise time distribution into an integrated communication substrate. This paper examines the architectural, operational, and governance implications of such networks for distributed machine learning. It analyzes how synchronization quality affects collective communication, parameter aggregation, pipeline parallelism, and failure detection. It then considers structural trade-offs among scalability, reconfigurability, optical circuit provisioning, and fault tolerance. The discussion extends to deployment constraints, energy and cooling burdens, fairness in resource allocation, and policy questions surrounding infrastructure concentration and access. Through cross-domain comparisons with high-performance computing, financial trading networks, and scientific instruments, the paper argues that clock-synchronized optical fabrics are not merely faster interconnects but socio-technical infrastructures that reshape scheduling, reliability, and accountability in machine learning systems. The conclusion identifies co-design, standardization, and equitable governance as conditions for responsible adoption.

Keywords

distributed machine learning, optical networks, clock synchronization, data center interconnects, system architecture, fairness, sustainability, governance.

1. Introduction

Distributed machine learning has moved from a niche parallel computing technique to the dominant method for training models whose parameters and training data exceed the capacity of any single accelerator. Systems such as TensorFlow, MapReduce-style data processing, and specialized parameter servers established the basic patterns of data parallelism, model parallelism, and collective communication that remain central today [1], [2], [6]. As model scale has grown, however, the communication fabric has become a first-order determinant of training throughput, energy consumption, and failure behavior. A cluster that possesses abundant computational capacity but suffers from variable network latency will spend

increasing fractions of time waiting for gradient exchange, parameter updates, or pipeline stage transitions. Consequently, the network is no longer a passive transport layer but an active participant in the temporal logic of learning.

Electrical packet-switched networks have historically provided the flexibility and ubiquity needed for data centers. Yet the bandwidth demands of modern accelerator clusters push electrical fabrics toward higher radix, more complex switching hierarchies, and greater signal-conditioning overhead. Optical networks have long been proposed as a way to overcome these limits because they can carry high-bandwidth signals over distance with lower loss and greater wavelength parallelism [8], [9]. More recently, reconfigurable optical circuit switches and hybrid electrical-optical architectures have demonstrated that optical fabrics can adapt to changing traffic patterns in data centers [10]. The missing element in many architectures is not optical bandwidth but temporal coherence. Distributed machine learning algorithms often assume that nodes can order events, detect stragglers, and align communication phases. Without precise clock synchronization, optical bandwidth may be underutilized because nodes cannot coordinate transmissions tightly enough to exploit it.

Clock-synchronized optical networks address this problem by distributing a common time reference across the optical infrastructure. Protocols such as the Network Time Protocol and IEEE 1588 precision time protocol provide foundations for synchronization in packet networks, while optical transport can reduce jitter and asymmetry by avoiding many sources of queuing delay [11], [12], [13]. When clock synchronization is integrated with wavelength switching and low-latency fiber, the network can support coordinated collective operations, deterministic scheduling, and fine-grained telemetry. The required reference at position seven in this paper illustrates how wavelength-switched, clock-synchronized intra-data center interconnects enabled by hollow core fiber can reduce latency and improve temporal consistency [7]. The significance of such work lies less in any single component than in the system-level possibility of treating time as a managed network resource.

This paper argues that clock-synchronized optical networks should be understood as socio-technical infrastructures rather than mere hardware upgrades. Their design affects algorithmic choices, fault tolerance, energy governance, and equitable access to computation. The analysis proceeds through foundations, architectures, trade-offs, robustness, fairness, sustainability, case comparisons, and future directions. The central claim is that precise time distribution over optical fabrics can improve distributed machine learning performance, but only if synchronization is paired with careful orchestration, resilient governance, and attention to deployment externalities.

2. Foundations of Clock Synchronization in Distributed Machine Learning

Distributed machine learning depends on repeated synchronization points. In data parallelism, workers compute gradients on shards of data and then aggregate them through all-reduce or parameter-server exchanges [5], [6]. In model parallelism and pipeline parallelism, different layers or partitions reside on different devices, and activations must flow between stages with minimal idle time [4]. In both cases, the algorithm's effective progress is shaped by the slowest participant and by the variance in communication latency. A network with high average bandwidth but unpredictable delay can force conservative synchronization, reducing utilization. A network with tightly synchronized clocks can instead support more aggressive scheduling, because nodes share a common temporal frame for deciding when to send, when to wait, and when to declare a peer unresponsive.

Classical synchronization protocols provide different levels of precision and scope. The Network Time Protocol is designed for wide-area packet networks and tolerates substantial asymmetry and jitter, making it suitable for loose coordination but insufficient for the tightest distributed training phases [11]. IEEE 1588 was developed for networked measurement and control, offering sub-microsecond synchronization in well-provisioned local networks [12]. Engineering treatments of IEEE 1588 emphasize that accuracy depends on hardware timestamping, transparent clocks, and careful topology design [13]. Optical networks can improve these properties because propagation delay is more stable and because wavelength-level switching can avoid queuing in intermediate electronic buffers. However, optical transparency also creates challenges: without careful calibration, different wavelengths may experience slightly different delays, and protection switching can introduce phase discontinuities.

From a machine learning perspective, clock synchronization interacts with optimization semantics. Synchronous stochastic gradient descent assumes that updates are applied in a coherent order. Asynchronous methods relax ordering to tolerate slower workers, but they introduce staleness and can destabilize training. Between these extremes lie bounded-staleness and periodic synchronization schemes that rely on time windows. If clocks are imprecise, the actual window experienced by each worker may diverge from the intended window, making reproducibility difficult and obscuring the causes of convergence failures. Precise time distribution therefore supports not only speed but also scientific accountability. It allows researchers to reconstruct when gradients were computed, when they were transmitted, and how delays affected model updates.

Time synchronization also underpins observability. Distributed training systems generate telemetry about queue depths, link utilization, accelerator temperature, and collective completion. Without a shared clock, correlating these signals across thousands of nodes becomes probabilistic. With synchronized optical networks, operators can construct a coherent timeline of events and attribute performance anomalies to specific switches, wavelengths, or software phases. This capability is valuable for autoscaling, failure diagnosis, and energy management. It also creates governance questions, because fine-grained temporal telemetry can reveal workload patterns, user behavior, and infrastructure vulnerabilities. Thus, synchronization is simultaneously a performance enabler and a data-governance concern.

3. Optical Network Architectures and Synchronization Mechanisms

Optical network architectures for distributed machine learning can be arranged along a spectrum from fully packet-switched electrical fabrics to hybrid electrical-optical designs and toward reconfigurable all-optical paths. Hybrid architectures such as Helios demonstrated that optical circuit switching can complement electrical packet switching by providing high-bandwidth, low-latency paths for elephant flows [9]. Projector and related systems showed that reconfigurable optical interconnects can adapt to traffic demands in data centers, though reconfiguration latency and control-plane complexity remain constraints [10]. These designs indicate that optics are most valuable when traffic is bursty but predictable enough to justify circuit provisioning. Distributed machine learning exhibits exactly this combination: collective communication creates synchronized bursts, while different training phases may shift traffic between parameter servers, pipeline stages, and storage.

Clock synchronization can be integrated into these architectures at multiple layers. At the physical layer, optical fibers and amplifiers can transport timing signals with low jitter. At the link layer, wavelength division multiplexing can allocate dedicated wavelengths to

synchronization channels, separating time distribution from data traffic. At the network layer, control protocols can use synchronized clocks to schedule circuit setup and teardown. At the application layer, collective communication libraries can align reductions and broadcasts to shared time slots. The required study at reference position seven exemplifies this integration by combining wavelength switching with hollow core fiber to reduce latency and support clock-synchronized intra-data center interconnects [7]. Hollow core fiber is relevant because its lower propagation delay and reduced nonlinearity can improve both latency and timing stability compared with conventional silica fiber.

The choice of switching granularity is a central architectural decision. Fine-grained packet switching offers statistical multiplexing and rapid adaptation but requires electronic processing that can add jitter. Coarse-grained circuit switching offers deterministic latency and high bandwidth but may waste capacity when traffic patterns change quickly. Wavelength switching occupies an intermediate position: it can reconfigure at the optical layer while preserving many benefits of circuits. If clocks are synchronized, the control plane can schedule wavelength assignments in advance, reducing contention and enabling predictable collective operations. This is particularly attractive for all-reduce, where multiple nodes must exchange large blocks within a narrow time window. Without synchronization, wavelength switching may oscillate or collide; with synchronization, it can become a scheduled resource.

Optical architectures also raise questions about topology. A fat-tree or dragonfly topology optimized for electrical packet switching may not be ideal for scheduled optical circuits. Ring, torus, and mesh topologies can provide multiple disjoint paths, but they require careful wavelength assignment to avoid blocking. Synchronization can help by allowing time-division multiplexing across paths, but it also imposes strict requirements on clock stability. If clocks drift, scheduled slots may misalign, causing data loss or retransmission. Therefore, architecture and synchronization are co-designed. The network must not only distribute time but also tolerate small timing errors without collapsing into congestion. This suggests that future optical fabrics will need adaptive guard intervals, in-band timing telemetry, and control algorithms that treat synchronization quality as a variable to be monitored and managed.

4. System-Level Trade-Offs and Resource Orchestration

The adoption of clock-synchronized optical networks involves trade-offs among performance, flexibility, cost, and complexity. Higher synchronization precision generally requires dedicated hardware, careful calibration, and redundant timing paths. These investments may be justified for large-scale training clusters where communication dominates, but they may be excessive for inference or small-scale experimentation. The decision is therefore not merely technical but economic. Organizations must estimate the value of reduced training time, improved reproducibility, and lower energy per useful computation against the capital and operational expense of optical switching and precision timing. In multi-tenant environments, these trade-offs become governance decisions about who receives deterministic low-latency paths and who must tolerate best-effort service.

Resource orchestration is the mechanism that translates synchronization into practical benefit. A scheduler with access to a shared time reference can place jobs so that collective communication phases align with available optical circuits. It can reserve wavelengths for all-reduce operations, stagger checkpointing to avoid contention, and migrate jobs away from links with degrading timing accuracy. Such orchestration resembles traffic engineering in traditional networks, but it operates at finer temporal granularity because machine learning workloads are iterative and communication-heavy. Frameworks such as Horovod and

PipeDream already expose communication patterns that a synchronized optical control plane could exploit [4], [5]. If the scheduler knows that a job will perform an all-reduce every few milliseconds, it can pre-provision optical capacity rather than reacting after congestion appears.

However, tight scheduling can reduce flexibility. If optical circuits are reserved for predictable training phases, other workloads may face increased latency or reduced bandwidth. This is a classic fairness-efficiency tension. In private clusters, operators may prioritize high-value training jobs, but in public cloud or shared research infrastructure, such prioritization requires transparent policies. Without governance, clock-synchronized optical networks could deepen the advantage of large organizations that can afford dedicated timing infrastructure, while smaller users rely on noisier, less predictable networks. The technical architecture thus intersects with questions of equitable access to advanced computing.

Another trade-off concerns centralization versus distribution. A centralized timing authority can provide strong coordination but becomes a single point of failure and a potential bottleneck. A distributed synchronization scheme can improve resilience but may require complex consensus and may suffer from drift between domains. Optical networks can support both models by using redundant timing channels and hierarchical synchronization. Yet hierarchy itself can reproduce existing concentrations of power, because the entity controlling the root clock can influence scheduling and metering. Therefore, the design of synchronization governance is not peripheral; it determines whether the infrastructure is robust, accountable, and fair.

5. Robustness, Fault Tolerance, and Security

Robustness in clock-synchronized optical networks requires attention to failures in both time and data planes. A clock failure can be more disruptive than a link failure because it undermines the assumptions of many distributed algorithms simultaneously. If nodes lose synchronization, collective operations may stall, timeouts may trigger incorrectly, and debugging becomes difficult. Fault tolerance therefore demands redundant clock sources, holdover oscillators, and graceful degradation modes. In optical networks, protection switching must be designed to preserve phase continuity or to resynchronize quickly enough that training can resume without full rollback. This is especially important for long-running training jobs where checkpointing is expensive and frequent restarts are undesirable.

Security is closely related to robustness. Time synchronization protocols are vulnerable to spoofing, delay manipulation, and denial-of-service attacks. An adversary who can alter timing signals might cause subtle performance degradation, induce incorrect ordering, or trigger unnecessary failovers. In distributed machine learning, such attacks could be used to poison training, extract information through timing side channels, or disrupt service. Optical networks can reduce some attack surfaces by using dedicated wavelengths and physical-layer protections, but they also introduce new risks. For example, an attacker with physical access to fiber or an optical switch could inject or tap signals. Therefore, synchronization security must include authentication, integrity checking, anomaly detection, and physical security.

Failure detection also depends on time. Distributed systems often use timeouts to infer node failure, but timeouts are unreliable when clocks are imprecise or when network latency varies. A synchronized optical fabric allows failure detectors to distinguish between a slow node and a delayed message with greater confidence. This can reduce false positives and improve recovery decisions. However, it also raises the stakes of synchronization errors: if the

common clock is wrong, failure detection may systematically misclassify healthy nodes. Robust design therefore requires independent verification of timing quality and explicit uncertainty bounds. Operators should know not only that clocks are synchronized but also how confident the system is in that synchronization.

Finally, robustness includes resilience to workload dynamics. Distributed machine learning jobs may change communication patterns during training, shifting from all-reduce to pipeline parallelism or from compute-heavy to communication-heavy phases. An optical network that is optimized for one pattern may perform poorly for another. Clock synchronization can help by enabling rapid reconfiguration, but the control plane must avoid instability. If many jobs attempt to reconfigure wavelengths simultaneously, the network may oscillate. Therefore, robust orchestration requires dampening, prioritization, and policy-aware admission control.

6. Fairness, Governance, and Policy Implications

Clock-synchronized optical networks are not neutral infrastructure. Their deployment affects who can train large models, how quickly they can do so, and under what conditions. In public research networks, fairness may mean allocating deterministic low-latency paths to projects that cannot afford private clusters. In commercial clouds, fairness may mean transparent service tiers and clear disclosure of latency and synchronization guarantees. If precision timing is available only to premium customers, it could become a form of computational advantage that compounds over time. Governance frameworks must therefore consider synchronization as an allocable resource, not merely a background property.

Algorithmic fairness and infrastructure fairness are connected. A model trained on a highly synchronized, low-latency cluster may differ in convergence behavior and reproducibility from a model trained on a best-effort network. If research results depend on privileged infrastructure, the scientific record may become biased toward findings that are reproducible only under specific conditions. Funding agencies and conference venues may need to require disclosure of synchronization and network conditions, much as they require disclosure of compute resources. This would allow the community to assess whether reported gains are robust or artifacts of infrastructure.

Policy implications extend to competition and innovation. Optical networking equipment, hollow core fiber, and precision timing hardware are specialized technologies with limited supplier bases. Governments may view them as strategic infrastructure, especially when they support artificial intelligence capabilities. Subsidies, standards, and procurement rules can shape adoption. However, policies that favor incumbents or national champions may reduce interoperability and exclude smaller actors. Open standards for synchronization and optical control are therefore important. They allow diverse vendors to participate and enable public institutions to build systems that are not locked into proprietary timing domains.

Governance also concerns data and privacy. Fine-grained synchronization enables detailed telemetry about when computations occur and how data flows. In multi-tenant environments, this telemetry could reveal sensitive information about workloads, model architectures, or user behavior. Access controls, aggregation, and retention limits are necessary. Moreover, cross-border data flows may be affected if timing infrastructure spans jurisdictions with different privacy regimes. Thus, the policy conversation around optical networks must include not only bandwidth and latency but also surveillance, accountability, and due process.

7. Sustainability and Deployment Considerations

Sustainability is a critical but often under-examined dimension of network design. Data centers already consume substantial energy, and the growth of artificial intelligence has renewed concerns about electricity demand and carbon emissions [23]. Optical interconnects can reduce energy per bit compared with electrical links over certain distances, but they also require lasers, amplifiers, cooling, and control electronics. Clock synchronization adds additional hardware and may increase standby power. The net sustainability effect depends on utilization: if optical circuits are reserved but unused, their embodied and operational costs may outweigh efficiency gains. Therefore, deployment should be coupled with workload-aware scheduling that maximizes utilization and minimizes idle capacity.

Deployment considerations include physical space, fiber routing, and cooling. Hollow core fiber and advanced optical switches may require different installation practices than conventional cabling. In existing data centers, retrofitting optical fabrics can be disruptive. Greenfield deployments offer more freedom but require long-term planning. Edge and federated learning scenarios introduce additional complexity because nodes may be geographically distributed and not share a controlled environment. In such cases, precise clock synchronization may be impossible or prohibitively expensive, and the system must rely on looser coordination. This suggests a tiered architecture in which tightly synchronized optical domains handle the most communication-intensive training, while wider-area networks use more tolerant protocols.

Sustainability also has a fairness dimension. If advanced optical infrastructure is concentrated in regions with abundant renewable energy, it may reduce carbon intensity but also centralize computational power. If it is deployed in regions with fossil-heavy grids, it may increase emissions. Policy instruments such as carbon accounting, renewable energy procurement, and waste heat reuse can influence outcomes. Researchers should therefore evaluate clock-synchronized optical networks not only by throughput per watt but also by lifecycle emissions, water use, and equity of access.

8. Case Illustrations and Cross-Domain Comparisons

High-performance computing offers a useful comparison. Scientific simulations have long used tightly coupled interconnects and precise clocks to coordinate parallel computations. Systems such as the Google File System and Spark addressed data-intensive workloads with different assumptions, prioritizing fault tolerance and scalability over deterministic timing [15], [16]. Distributed machine learning sits between these traditions: it needs the scale and fault tolerance of data-intensive systems, but it also needs the communication efficiency of high-performance computing. Clock-synchronized optical networks can bridge this gap by providing deterministic paths for collective operations while retaining reconfigurable capacity for data loading and checkpointing.

Financial trading networks provide another comparison. They rely on precise time synchronization for ordering transactions, detecting latency arbitrage, and meeting regulatory requirements. Their experience shows that synchronization can become a matter of market integrity, not just performance. Similar concerns may arise in machine learning markets, where training data, model updates, and inference requests are exchanged among parties. If timing determines priority or pricing, then synchronization infrastructure becomes a locus of economic power. Governance models from finance, including audit trails and mandatory clock accuracy standards, may offer lessons.

Scientific instruments and sensor networks offer a third comparison. Telescopes, particle accelerators, and distributed environmental sensors use precise timing to combine observations. Their architectures often prioritize determinism and calibration over flexibility. Distributed machine learning could borrow techniques such as hierarchical synchronization, redundant timing, and uncertainty quantification. However, machine learning workloads are more dynamic and less predictable than many scientific instruments, so the design must balance determinism with adaptability.

Transformer models and large language models illustrate the scale challenge. Attention mechanisms and massive parameter counts create communication patterns that are both structured and variable [17], [18]. Training such models involves frequent all-reduce operations and pipeline stages that are sensitive to latency. A clock-synchronized optical fabric could reduce idle time and improve energy efficiency, but it would also require software frameworks to expose timing information and adapt scheduling. Systems research on hidden technical debt in machine learning reminds us that integration complexity can erode benefits if not managed carefully [19]. Thus, case comparisons should focus on socio-technical fit, not just raw speed.

9. Future Directions

Future work should pursue co-design across devices, networks, and learning algorithms. Accelerators such as tensor processing units and reconfigurable fabrics have shown that domain-specific hardware can transform performance [14], [24]. Optical networks should be designed with similar specialization, exposing timing and wavelength capabilities to schedulers and collective communication libraries. Standard interfaces for synchronization quality, circuit reservation, and failure semantics would allow diverse components to interoperate. Without standards, adoption may fragment into proprietary silos.

Artificial intelligence can also be used to manage optical networks. Machine learning models can predict traffic bursts, optimize wavelength assignment, and detect anomalies in timing signals. However, using machine learning to control critical infrastructure raises concerns about explainability and failure modes. A model that mispredicts traffic could cause widespread congestion. Therefore, AI-based control should be constrained by formal safety envelopes and human oversight. The same fairness and accountability principles that apply to machine learning applications should apply to the infrastructure that trains them.

Finally, research should examine the long-term societal effects of pervasive synchronization. If computation becomes more temporally coordinated, it may enable new forms of collaboration but also new forms of control. Standards bodies, regulators, and research communities must engage with these questions early. The goal should be an infrastructure that is fast, resilient, sustainable, and just. That requires not only optical innovation but also institutional innovation.

10. Conclusion

Clock-synchronized optical networks represent a significant architectural opportunity for distributed machine learning. By aligning precise time distribution with high-bandwidth, low-latency optical transport, they can reduce communication bottlenecks, improve scheduling determinism, and enhance observability. The required study at reference position seven demonstrates that wavelength-switched, clock-synchronized intra-data center interconnects enabled by hollow core fiber can advance latency and temporal consistency, but the broader lesson is systemic. Performance gains depend on orchestration, fault tolerance, security, and

governance as much as on photonics. Trade-offs between flexibility and determinism, efficiency and fairness, and centralization and resilience must be managed explicitly.

The paper has argued that these networks are socio-technical infrastructures. Their deployment affects who can train large models, how energy is consumed, and how accountability is maintained. Fair access, transparent policy, and sustainable design are not optional additions to technical work; they are constitutive of responsible systems research. Future progress will require co-design among optical engineers, machine learning systems researchers, policymakers, and civil society. If pursued with care, clock-synchronized optical networks can support a more capable, reproducible, and equitable era of distributed machine learning.

References

1. Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Irving, G., Isard, M., Kudlur, M., Levenberg, J., Monga, R., Moore, S., Murray, D. G., Steiner, B., Tucker, P., Vasudevan, V., Warden, P., Wicke, M., Yu, Y., & Zheng, X. (2016). TensorFlow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation* (pp. 265–283). USENIX Association.
2. Dean, J., & Ghemawat, S. (2008). MapReduce: Simplified data processing on large clusters. *Communications of the ACM*, 51(1), 107–113.
3. Ben-Nun, T., & Hoefler, T. (2019). Demystifying parallel and distributed deep learning: An in-depth concurrency analysis. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 52(4), Article 65.
4. Narayanan, D., Harlap, A., Phanishayee, A., Seshadri, V., Devanur, N. R., Ganger, G. R., Gibbons, P. B., & Zaharia, M. (2019). PipeDream: Generalized pipeline parallelism for DNN training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (pp. 1–15). ACM.
5. Sergeev, A., & Del Balso, M. (2018). Horovod: Fast and easy distributed deep learning in TensorFlow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05799*.
6. Li, M., Andersen, D. G., Park, J. W., Smola, A. J., Ahmed, A., Josifovski, V., Long, J., Shekita, E. J., & Su, B.-Y. (2014). Scaling distributed machine learning with the parameter server. In *Proceedings of the 11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation* (pp. 583–598). USENIX Association.
7. Zhou, Z., Dzieciol, H., Clark, K., Luo, Y., Richardson, D., Poletti, F., ... & Liu, Z. (2023). Low-latency wavelength-switched clock-synchronized intra-data center interconnects enabled by hollow core fiber. *Optics Express*, 31(15), 24739-24748.
8. Kachris, C., Kanonakis, K., & Tomkos, I. (2014). Optical interconnection networks in data centers: Recent trends and future challenges. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 52(9), 118–125.
9. Farrington, N., Porter, G., Radhakrishnan, S., Bazzaz, H. H., Subramanya, V., Fainman, Y., Papen, G., & Vahdat, A. (2010). Helios: A hybrid electrical/optical switch architecture for modular data centers. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, 40(4), 339–350.
10. Ghobadi, M., Mahajan, R., Phanishayee, A., Devanur, N. R., Kulkarni, J., Ranade, G., Blanche, P.-A., Rastegarfar, H., Glick, M., & Kilper, D. (2016). Projector: Agile

reconfigurable data center interconnect. In Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGCOMM Conference (pp. 216–229). ACM.

11. Mills, D. L. (1991). Internet time synchronization: The network time protocol. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 39(10), 1482–1493.
12. IEEE. (2008). IEEE 1588-2008: IEEE standard for a precision clock synchronization protocol for networked measurement and control systems. IEEE.
13. Eidson, J. C. (2006). *Measurement, control, and communication using IEEE 1588*. Springer.
14. Jouppe, N. P., Young, C., Patil, N., Patterson, D., Agrawal, G., Bajwa, R., Bates, S., Bhatia, S., Boden, N., Borchers, A., Boyle, R., Cantin, P.-L., Chao, C., Clark, C., Coriell, J., Daley, M., Dau, M., Dean, J., Gelb, B., Ghaemmaghami, T. V., Gottipati, R., Gulland, W., Hagmann, R., Ho, C. R., Hogberg, D., Hu, J., Hundt, R., Hurt, D., Ibarz, J., Jaffey, A., Jaworski, A., Kaplan, A., Khaitan, H., Killebrew, D., Koch, A., Kumar, N., Lacy, S., Laudon, J., Law, J., Le, D., Leary, C., Liu, Z., Lucke, K., Lundin, A., MacKean, G., Maggiore, A., Mahony, M., Miller, K., Nagarajan, R., Narayanaswami, R., Ni, R., Nix, K., Norum, T., Ockerman, M., Penukonda, N., Phelps, A., Ross, J., Ross, M., Salek, A., Samadiani, E., Severn, C., Sizikov, G., Snelham, M., Souter, J., Steinberg, D., Swing, A., Tan, M., Thorson, G., Tian, B., Toma, H., Tuttle, E., Vasudevan, V., Walter, R., Wang, W., Wilcox, E., & Yoon, D. H. (2017). In-datacenter performance analysis of a tensor processing unit. In Proceedings of the 44th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (pp. 1–12). ACM.
15. Ghemawat, S., Gobioff, H., & Leung, S.-T. (2003). The Google file system. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*, 37(5), 29–43.
16. Zaharia, M., Chowdhury, M., Franklin, M. J., Shenker, S., & Stoica, I. (2010). Spark: Cluster computing with working sets. In Proceedings of the 2nd USENIX Conference on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (pp. 10–10). USENIX Association.
17. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 5998–6008.
18. Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901.
19. Sculley, D., Holt, G., Golovin, D., Davydov, E., Phillips, T., Ebner, D., Chaudhary, V., Young, M., Crespo, J.-F., & Dennison, D. (2015). Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2503–2511.
20. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 1–21.
21. Cath, C. (2018). Governing artificial intelligence: Ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376(2133), 20180080.

22. Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707.
23. Masanet, E., Shehabi, A., Lei, N., Smith, S., & Koomey, J. (2020). Recalibrating global data center energy-use estimates. *Science*, 367(6481), 984–986.
24. Putnam, A., Caulfield, A. M., Chung, E. S., Chiou, D., Constantinides, K., Demme, J., Esmaeilzadeh, H., Fowers, J., Gopal, G. P., Gray, J., Haselman, M., Hauck, S., Heil, S., Hormati, A., Kim, J.-Y., Lanka, S., Larus, J., Peterson, E., Pope, S., Smith, A., Thong, J., Xiao, P. Y., & Burger, D. (2014). A reconfigurable fabric for accelerating large-scale datacenter services. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 42(3), 13–24.
25. Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., Dieleman, S., Grewe, D., Nham, J., Kalchbrenner, N., Sutskever, I., Lillicrap, T., Leach, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., Graepel, T., & Hassabis, D. (2016). Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587), 484–489.