

---

Subject: Re: containers (was Re: -mm merge plans for 2.6.23)  
Posted by [Peter Zijlstra](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 11:24:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed, 2007-07-11 at 04:10 -0700, Paul Jackson wrote:

> Srivatsa wrote:  
> > So Ingo was proposing we use cpuset as that user interface to manage  
> > task-groups. This will be only for 2.6.23.  
>  
> Good explanation - thanks.  
>  
> In short, the proposal was to use the task partition defined by cpusets  
> to define CFS task-groups, until the real process containers are  
> available.  
>  
> Or, I see in the next message, Ingo responding favorably to your  
> alternative, using task uid's to partition the tasks into CFS  
> task-groups.  
>  
> Yeah, Ingo's preference for using uid's (or gid's ??) sounds right to  
> me - a sustainable API.  
>  
> Wouldn't want to be adding a cpuset API for a single 2.6.N release.  
>  
> .... gid's -- why not?

Or process or process groups, or all of the above :-)

One thing to think on though, we cannot have per process,uid,gid,pgrp scheduling for one release only. So we'd have to manage interaction with process containers. It might be that a simple weight multiplication scheme is good enough:

$$\text{weight} = \text{uid\_weight} * \text{pgrp\_weight} * \text{container\_weight}$$

Of course, if we'd only have a single level group scheduler (as was proposed IIRC) it'd have to create intersection sets (as there might be non trivial overlaps) based on these various weights and schedule these resulting sets instead of the initial groupings.

---

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

---