Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] containers development plans Posted by Balbir Singh on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 06:59:16 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Paul Menage wrote:

- > On 7/9/07, Balbir Singh <balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com> wrote:
- >> > splitting the memory and cpu isolation parts of cpusets into two
- >> > separate subsystems (still backwards-compatible)

>>

- >> I see memory isolation using cpusets as very topology dependent
- >> and I am not sure if the model would work for memory controllers.

>

- > I wasn't suggesting making any changes to the page-based memory
- > controllers as part of this.

>

- > Currently in the mainline kernel, the cpumask and nodemask portions of
- > cpusets are essentially two mostly-independent modules that happen to
- > be coupled together in the same file and use the same process tracking
- > system (cpusets). Once we have generic process containers, splitting
- > this into a "cpusets" subsystem that handles all the cpumask portions
- > of the existing cpusets, and a "memsets" subsystem that handles all
- > the nodemask and memory migration portions would remove that coupling
- > and give more flexibility.

>

> Paul

Aaah.. I see, that makes sense from a cpusets/containers perspective.

--\^

Warm Regards, Balbir Singh Linux Technology Center IBM, ISTL