

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] [PATCH 0/3] Add group fairness to CFS  
Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Thu, 31 May 2007 09:36:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, May 31, 2007 at 02:15:34AM -0700, William Lee Irwin III wrote:  
> Yes, the larger number of schedulable entities and hence slower  
> convergence to groupwise weightings is a disadvantage of the flattening.  
> A hybrid scheme seems reasonable enough.

Cool! This puts me back on track to implement hierarchical scheduling in CFS :)

Once this is done and once I can get containers running on a box, I will experiment with the flattening trick for user and process levels inside containers.

Thanks for your feedback so far!

> Ideally one would chop the  
> hierarchy in pieces so that n levels of hierarchy become k levels of n/k  
> weight-flattened hierarchies for this sort of attack to be most effective  
> (at least assuming similar branching factors at all levels of hierarchy  
> and sufficient depth to the hierarchy to make it meaningful) but this is  
> awkward to do. Peeling off the outermost container or whichever level is  
> deemed most important in terms of accuracy of aggregate enforcement as  
> a hierarchical scheduler is a practical compromise.  
>  
> Hybrid schemes will still incur the difficulties of hierarchical  
> scheduling, but they're by no means insurmountable. Sadly, only  
> complete flattening yields the simplifications that make task group  
> weighting enforcement orthogonal to load balancing and the like. The  
> scheme I described for global nice number behavior is also not readily  
> adaptable to hybrid schemes.

--  
Regards,  
vatsa

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---