Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value. Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 11:02:31 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message	View Forum	Message <>	Reply to	Message
----------------------------------------	------------	------------	----------	---------

Balbir Singh wrote:

- > 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

So what? I'm the administrator and I don't want this particular subgroup to open any files:)

> that matter anything with 0 will not work. You'll always exceed the

Yet again - I don't want some subgroup to consume any of some resource. E.g. I don't want some subgroup to use any private pages :) shared only, what can I do?

- > limit.
- >
- > Setting 0 to mean unlimited might make sense.

Setting 0 as unlimited is used nowhere in the kernel, isn't it?

Thanks,

Pavel

Containers mailing list

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

Page 2 of 2 ---- Generated from OpenVZ Forum