

---

Subject: Re: How to draw values for /proc/stat  
Posted by [Peter Zijlstra](#) on Mon, 12 Dec 2011 09:33:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 2011-12-09 at 12:55 -0200, Glauber Costa wrote:

> On 12/09/2011 12:03 PM, Peter Zijlstra wrote:

> > Namespaces seem to be about limiting visibility, cgroups about  
> > controlling resources.  
> >  
> > The two things are hopelessly disjoint atm, but I believe someone was  
> > looking at this mess.  
>  
> I did take a look at this (if anyone else was, I'd like to know so we  
> can share some ideas), but I am not convinced we should do anything to  
> join them anymore. We virtualization people are to the best of my  
> knowledge the only ones doing namespaces. Cgroups, OTOH, got a lot bigger.  
>  
> What I am mostly concerned about now, is how consistent they will be.  
> /proc always being always global indeed does make sense, but my question  
> still stands: if you live in a resource-controlled world, why should you  
> even see resources you will never own ?

Since without namespaces you can still see the rest of the world. So it makes sense to me to still see all resources too.

Also, proportional controllers might not see a consistent slice of the resource, making the stats rather awkward to interpret.

Furthermore, not everybody might care about these statistics at all and I know pjt objected to being subjected to the extra accounting (pjt do speak up etc..).

> If it is not co-mounted, we draw the global value. If you don't mount  
> it, I someone does not mount it, I can assure you he doesn't care about  
> it. We for sure will.

Anyway, looking at the rest of the emails in this thread the current proposal is a cgroup mount option that indicates if you want these per-cgroup stats or not, right?

---