

On Mon, 2006-08-21 at 14:51 +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> Chandra Seetharaman wrote:

> > Kirill,

> >

> > IMO, a UBC with resource constraint(limit in this case) should behave no

> > different than a kernel with limited memory. i.e it should do

> > reclamation before it starts failing allocation requests. It could even

> > do it preemptively.

> first, please notice, that this thread is not about user memory.

> we can discuss it later when about to control user memory. And

> I still need to notice, that different models of user memory control

> can exist. With and without reclamation.

>

we can talk about it then :)

> > There is no guarantee support which is required for providing QoS.

> where? in UBC? in UBC _there_ are guarentees, even in regard to OOM killer.

I do not see it in the patches you have submitted. May be I overlooked.

Can you please point me the code where guarantee is handled.

>

> > Each controller modifying the infrastructure code doesn't look good. We

> > can have proper interfaces to add a new resource controller.

> controllers do not modify interfaces nor core. They just add

> themself to the list of resources and setup default limits.

> do you think it is worth creating infrastructure for these

> 2 one-line-changes?

Yes, IMO, it is cleaner.

Think of the documentation that explains how to write a controller for UBC.

With a proper interface it will read something like: One have to call `register_controller(char *name)` and on success it returns a unique id which is the id for the controller.

Vs

With changing lines in the core code: One have to edit the file `filename.c` and add a macro to this of macros with an incremented value for their controller and add the name of their controller to the array named `controller_names[]`.

I think the first one is cleaner, what do you think ?

<snip>

--

Chandra Seetharaman | Be careful what you choose....
- sekharan@us.ibm.com |you may get it.
