

---

Subject: Re: containers (was Re: -mm merge plans for 2.6.23)  
Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 04:55:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, Jul 10, 2007 at 11:53:19AM -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:

> On Tue, 10 Jul 2007 11:34:38 -0700

> "Paul Menage" <menage@google.com> wrote:

>

> > Andrew, how about we merge enough of the container framework to  
> > support CFS? Bits we could leave out for now include container\_clone()  
> > support and the nsproxy subsystem, fork/exit callback hooks, and  
> > possibly leave cpusets alone for now (which would also mean we could  
> > skip the automatic release-agent stuff). I'm in Tokyo for the Linux  
> > Foundation Japan symposium right now, but I should be able to get the  
> > new patchset to you for Friday afternoon.

>

> mm.. Given that you propose leaving bits out for the 2.6.23 merge, and  
> that changes are still pending and that nothing will \_use\_ the framework in  
> 2.6.23 [...]

Andrew,

The cpu group scheduler is ready and waiting for the container patches  
in 2.6.23 :)

Here are some options with us:

- a. (As Paul says) merge enough of container patches to enable  
its use with cfs group scheduler (and possibly cpusets?)
- b. Enable group scheduling bits in 2.6.23 using the user-id grouping  
mechanism (aka fair user scheduler). For 2.6.24, we could remove  
this interface and use Paul's container patches instead. Since this  
means change of API interface between 2.6.23 and 2.6.24, I don't  
prefer this option.
- c. Enable group scheduling bits only in -mm for now (2.6.23-mmX), using  
Paul's container patches. I can send you a short patch that hooks up  
cfs group scheduler with Paul's container infrastructure.

If a. is not possible, I would prefer c.

Let me know your thoughts ..

--

Regards,  
vatsa

---

Containers mailing list

