Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value. Posted by Paul Menage on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 20:40:52 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 9/25/07, David Rientjes <rientjes@google.com> wrote:

>

> If you're fine with rounding up to the nearest page, then what's the point

- > of exposing it as a number of bytes?? You'll never get a granularity
- > finer than a kilobyte.

API != implementation.

>

> So by expressing it in terms of bytes instead of kilobytes, you're just

> making the largest amount of memory allowed via this interface smaller

> that is should have to be.

Yes, that's true. With a 64-bit count in bytes, we can only limit people to 16 exabytes of memory. We're going to bump up against that limit in no time.

>

> > > That fundamental unit being charged are pages,

> >

> No, that just happens to be the implementation mechanism in this controller.

>

- > And this controller owns the memory.limit file so it can express its
- > memory limits in whatever unit it wants.

>

Right, but it would be nice to have different memory controllers be API-compatible with one another. Bytes is the lowest common denominator.

Paul

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