Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!
Posted by Srivatsa Vaddagiri on Sat, 10 Mar 2007 03:19:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Sat, Mar 10, 2007 at 07:32:20AM +0530, Srivatsa Vaddagiri wrote:
> Ok, let me see if I can convey what I had in mind better:
>
>   uts_ns pid_ns ipc_ns
> \ | /
> ---------------
> | nsproxy |
>   ---------------
>   / | \   \ <-- 'nsproxy' pointer
> T1 T2 T3 ...T1000
> | | | | <-- 'containers' pointer (4/8 KB for 1000 task)
>   -------------------
> | container_group |
>   ------------------
> /
>   ----------
> | container |
>   ----------
> |
>   ----------
> | cpu_limit |
>   ----------

[snip]

> We save on 4/8 KB (for 1000 tasks) by avoiding the 'containers' pointer
> in each task_struct (just to get to the resource limit information).

Having the 'containers' pointer in each task-struct is great from a
non-container res mgmt perspective. It lets you dynamically decide what
is the fundamental unit of res mgmt.

It could be {T1, T5} tasks/threads of a process, or {T1, T3, T8, T10} tasks of
a session (for limiting login time per session), or {T1, T2 ..T10, T18, T27}
tasks of a user etc.

But from a vserver/container pov, this level flexibility (at a -task- level) of
deciding the unit of res mgmt is IMHO not needed. The
vserver/container/namespace (tsk->nsproxy->some_ns) to which a task
belongs automatically defines that unit of res mgmt.

--

Regards,
vatsa

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers