Subject: Re: [RFC/PATCH] cgroup swap subsystem
Posted by KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki on Thu, 06 Mar 2008 08:33:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, 06 Mar 2008 11:20:17 +0300
Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

> KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:
> > 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_couter 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.
> > ..
> > }
>
> I meant the same thing actually. By "nesting would affect" I
> meant, that we might want to make res_counters hierarchical.
>
> That would kill two birds with one stone - we will make a true
> hierarchical memory accounting and let charging of two counters
> with one call.

Hierarchical res_counter makes sense.
Making it in simple/reasonable style will be our challenge.

Thanks,
-Kame

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