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