Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value.
Posted by Balbir Singh on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 10:59:32 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Pavel Emelyanov wrote:
> KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:
>> On Wed, 26 Sep 2007 00:51:59 +0530
>> Balbir Singh <balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com> wrote:
>>
>>> David Rientjes wrote:
>>> Yes, I prefer 0 as well and had that in a series in the Lost World
>>> of my earlier memory/RSS controller patches. I feel now that 0 is
>>> a bit confusing, we don't use 0 to mean unlimited, unless we
>>> treat the memory.limit_in_bytes value as boolean. 0 is false,
>>> meaning there is no limit, > 0 is true, which means the limit
>>> is set and the value is specified to the value read out.
>> I prefer 0 than -1, too
>
> Remember, that we may use resource counters for other control groups
> 0 would make ore sense, like for numfile CG. 0 can mean that this
> group is not allowed to open any files. Treating 0 as unlimited for
> some CGs and as 0 for others is a mess.
>

I disagree, numfile CG using 0 will not work, cause you'll not be able
to do anything with 0, you can't even cat the numfile.limit file; for
that matter anything with 0 will not work. You'll always exceed the
limit.

Setting 0 to mean unlimited might make sense.

--
 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