
Subject: Re: [RFC/PATCH] cgroup swap subsystem
Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Thu, 06 Mar 2008 00:33:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 05 Mar 2008 17:14:12 +0300

Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

> > Strongly agree. Nobody's interested in swap as such: it's just
> > secondary memory, where RAM is primary memory. People want to
> > control memory as the sum of the two; and I expect they may also
> > want to control primary memory (all that the current memcg does)
> > within that. I wonder if such nesting of limits fits easily
> > into cgroups or will be problematic.

>

> This nesting would affect the res_counter abstraction, not the
> cgroup infrastructure. Current design of resource counters doesn't
> allow for such thing, but the extension is a couple-of-lines patch :)

>

IMHO, keeping res_counter simple is better.

Is this kind of new entry in mem_cgroup not good ?

==

```
struct mem_cgroup {  
    ...  
    struct res_counter memory_limit.  
    struct res_counter swap_limit.  
    ..  
}
```

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