
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
