

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value.

Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 11:29:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 25 Sep 2007 16:19:18 +0530

Balbir Singh <[balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com](mailto:balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com)> wrote:

> Hi, Kamezawa-San,

>

Hi,

> Your changes make sense, but not CLUI (Command Line Usage) sense.

> 1. The problem is that when we mix strings with numbers, tools that

> parse/use get confused and complicated

yes, maybe.

> 2. ULONGLONG\_MAX is a real limit, there is no such thing as unlimited.

> If the user does ever go beyond ULONGLONG\_MAX, we will limit him :-)

>

Oh. res\_counter.c uses LONGLONG\_MAX as default value.

need fix ? or intended ?

And okay there is no "unlimited" state.

> Having said that, I do wish to have a more intuitive interface for

> users. May be a perl/python script to hide away the numbers game

> from the users. What do you think?

>

I agree with you that perl/python script can hide details. but they need knowledge about the maximum value, which is given as default value.

In short, what I want is some value like RLIM\_INFINITY in ulimit.

Because it seems that res\_counter.c will be used for other resource control purpose, I thought some generic way (value) to know/specify "the maximum value" is helpful for all resource controller interface.

If there is an consensus that treating ULONGLONG\_MAX as default, it's ok.

Thanks,

-Kame

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---