

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 2/7] UBC: core (structures, API)

Posted by [dev](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 12:46:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Srivatsa Vaddagiri wrote:

> On Mon, Aug 21, 2006 at 03:02:17PM +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

>

>>>Except that you eventually have to lock ub0. Seems that the cache line

>>>for that spinlock could bounce quite a bit in such a hot path.

>>

>>do you mean by ub0 host system ub which we call ub0

>>or you mean a top ub?

>

>

> If this were used for pure resource management purpose (w/o containers)

> then the top ub would be ub0 right? "How bad would the contention on the

> ub0->lock be then" is I guess Matt's question.

Probably we still misunderstand here each other.

top ub can be any UB. it's children do account resources

to the whole chain of UBs to the top parent.

i.e. ub0 is not a tree root.

Kirill

---