
Subject: Re: [RFC/PATCH] cgroup swap subsystem
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Thu, 06 Mar 2008 08:20:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:

> On Wed, 05 Mar 2008 17:14:12 +0300
> Pavel Emelianov <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.
> ..
> }

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.

>

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