

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 2/7] RSS controller core  
Posted by [Herbert Poetzl](#) on Tue, 13 Mar 2007 15:05:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, Mar 13, 2007 at 10:17:54AM +0300, Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> Herbert Poetzl wrote:  
> > On Mon, Mar 12, 2007 at 12:02:01PM +0300, Pavel Emelianov wrote:  
> >>>> Maybe you have some ideas how we can decide on this?  
> >>>> We need to work out what the requirements are before we can  
> >>>> settle on an implementation.  
> >>> Linux-VServer (and probably OpenVZ):  
> >>>  
> >>> - shared mappings of 'shared' files (binaries  
> >>> and libraries) to allow for reduced memory  
> >>> footprint when N identical guests are running  
> >> This is done in current patches.  
> >  
> > nice, but the question was about \_requirements\_  
> > (so your requirements are?)  
> >  
> >>> - virtual 'physical' limit should not cause  
> >>> swap out when there are still pages left on  
> >>> the host system (but pages of over limit guests  
> >>> can be preferred for swapping)  
> >> So what to do when virtual physical limit is hit?  
> >> OOM-kill current task?  
> >  
> > when the RSS limit is hit, but there \_are\_ enough  
> > pages left on the physical system, there is no  
> > good reason to swap out the page at all  
> >  
> > - there is no benefit in doing so (performance  
> > wise, that is)  
> >  
> > - it actually hurts performance, and could  
> > become a separate source for DoS  
> >  
> > what should happen instead (in an ideal world :)  
> > is that the page is considered swapped out for  
> > the guest (add guest penalty for swapout), and  
> >  
> > Is the page stays mapped for the container or not?  
> > If yes then what's the use of limits? Container mapped  
> > pages more than the limit is but all the pages are  
> > still in memory. Sounds weird.

sounds weird, but makes sense if you look at the full picture

just because the guest is over its page limit doesn't mean that you actually want the system to swap stuff out, what you really want to happen is the following:

- somehow mark those pages as 'gone' for the guest
- penalize the guest (and only the guest) for the 'virtual' swap/page operation
- penalize the guest again for paging in the page
- drop/swap/page out those pages when the host system decides to reclaim pages (from the host PoV)

> > when the page would be swapped in again, the guest  
> > takes a penalty (for the 'virtual' page in) and  
> > the page is returned to the guest, possibly kicking  
> > out (again virtually) a different page

> >

> >>> - accounting and limits have to be consistent  
> >>> and should roughly represent the actual used  
> >>> memory/swap (modulo optimizations, I can go  
> >>> into detail here, if necessary)

> >> This is true for current implementation for  
> >> booth - this patchset and OpenVZ beancounters.

> >>

> >> If you sum up the physpages values for all containers  
> >> you'll get the exact number of RAM pages used.

> >

> > hmm, including or excluding the host pages?

>

> Depends on whether you account host pages or not.

you tell me? or is that an option in OpenVZ?

best,  
Herbert

> >>> - OOM handling on a per guest basis, i.e. some  
> >>> out of memory condition in guest A must not  
> >>> affect guest B

> >> This is done in current patches.

> >

> >> Herbert, did you look at the patches before  
> >> sending this mail or do you just want to  
> >> 'take part' in conversation w/o understanding  
> >> of what is going on?

> >

> > again, the question was about requirements, not  
> > your patches, and yes, I had a look at them \_and\_  
> > the OpenVZ implementations ...

> >  
> > best,  
> > Herbert  
> >  
> > PS: hat is going on? :)  
> >  
> >>> HTC,  
> >>> Herbert  
> >>>  
> >>>> Sigh. Who is running this show? Anyone?  
> >>>>  
> >>>> You can actually do a form of overcommittment by allowing multiple  
> >>>> containers to share one or more of the zones. Whether that is  
> >>>> sufficient or suitable I don't know. That depends on the requirements,  
> >>>> and we haven't even discussed those, let alone agreed to them.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> \_\_\_\_\_  
> >>>> Containers mailing list  
> >>>> Containers@lists.osdl.org  
> >>>> <https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>  
> >

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

---