

Herbert,

Thanks a lot for the details, I will give it a try once again. Looks like fairness in this scenario simply requires sched_hard settings.

Herbert... I don't know why you've decided that my goal is to prove that your scheduler is bad or not precise. My goal is simply to investigate different approaches and make some measurements. I suppose you can benefit from such a volunteer, don't you think so? Anyway, thanks again and don't be cycled on the idea that OpenVZ are so cruel bad guys :)

Thanks,
Kirill

```
> well, your mistake seems to be that you probably haven't
> tested this yet, because with the following (simple)
> setups I seem to get what you consider impossible
> (of course, not as precise as your scheduler does it)
>
>
> vcontext --create --xid 100 ./cpuhog -n 1 100 &
> vcontext --create --xid 200 ./cpuhog -n 1 200 &
> vcontext --create --xid 300 ./cpuhog -n 1 300 &
>
> vsched --xid 100 --fill-rate 1 --interval 6
> vsched --xid 200 --fill-rate 2 --interval 6
> vsched --xid 300 --fill-rate 3 --interval 6
>
> vattribute --xid 100 --flag sched_hard
> vattribute --xid 200 --flag sched_hard
> vattribute --xid 300 --flag sched_hard
>
>
> PID USER    PR NI  VIRT  RES  SHR S %CPU %MEM  TIME+  COMMAND
> 39 root     25  0 1304  248  200 R   74  0.1  0:46.16 ./cpuhog -n 1 300
> 38 root     25  0 1308  252  200 H   53  0.1  0:34.06 ./cpuhog -n 1 200
> 37 root     25  0 1308  252  200 H   28  0.1  0:19.53 ./cpuhog -n 1 100
> 46 root      0  0 1804  912  736 R    1  0.4  0:02.14 top -cid 20
>
> and here the other way round:
>
> vsched --xid 100 --fill-rate 3 --interval 6
> vsched --xid 200 --fill-rate 2 --interval 6
> vsched --xid 300 --fill-rate 1 --interval 6
```

```
>
> PID USER    PR NI  VIRT  RES  SHR S %CPU %MEM  TIME+  COMMAND
>  36 root      25  0 1304  248  200 R   75  0.1  0:58.41 ./cpuhog -n 1 100
>  37 root      25  0 1308  252  200 H   54  0.1  0:42.77 ./cpuhog -n 1 200
>  38 root      25  0 1308  252  200 R   29  0.1  0:25.30 ./cpuhog -n 1 300
>  45 root       0  0 1804  912  736 R    1  0.4  0:02.26 top -cid 20
```

```
>
>
> note that this was done on a virtual dual cpu
> machine (QEMU 8.0) with 2.6.16-vs2.1.1-rc16 and
> that there were roughly 25% idle time, which I'm
> unable to explain atm ...
```

```
>
> feel free to jump on that fact, but I consider
> it unimportant for now ...
```

```
>
> best,
> Herbert
```

```
>
>
>>Thanks,
>>Kirill
```