

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value.  
Posted by [Balbir Singh](#) on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 13:31:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pavel Emelyanov wrote:

> Balbir Singh wrote:

>> KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:

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

>>> Balbir Singh <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 ?

>> Pavel do you remember why LONG was chosen instead of ULONG?

>

> To prevent the overflow in "charge" routine.

> See, if you add two numbers less than LONG\_MAX, but with

> unsigned long type each, you will never have an overflowed result.

>

Aah.. Thanks, my memory short circuited on me.

>>> 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.

>>>

>> I like the idea of RLIM\_INFINITY and how ulimit as a tool shows

>> a value. I guess we need something like RES\_COUNTER\_LIMIT\_MAX

>> and the user tool can show the limit as maximum. We could also

>> define a special number, RES\_COUNTER\_LIMIT\_INFINITY, such that

>> containers will not enforce limits when the limit is set to  
>> this value.  
>>  
>>> 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 a consensus that treating ULONGLONG\_MAX as default, it's ok.  
>>>  
>> When I worked on the first version of res\_counters, I used 0 to indicate  
>> unlimited. When Pavel posted his version, I think derived from  
>> beancounters, we did not want to have unlimited containers, so he used  
>> the maximum value  
>  
> Yup! Setting LONGMAX pages for container means that this container  
> is unlimited, since there're no such many pages on any arch :)  
>

Pavel, we no longer account in pages, we do it in bytes. Second,  
this assumption cannot hold for long, memory sizes are growing,  
I think we need a special value.

>>> Thanks,  
>>> -Kame  
>>>  
>> Thanks for looking into this,  
>>  
>

--

Warm Regards,  
Balbir Singh  
Linux Technology Center  
IBM, ISTL

---

Containers mailing list  
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---