
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH] UBC: user resource beancounters
Posted by [dev](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 11:10:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chandra Seetharaman wrote:

> On Thu, 2006-08-24 at 10:27 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:

>

> <snip>

>

>>>What do you mean by "resource management part for non-container world

>>>already exist ?

>>>

>>>It does not. CKRM/Resource Groups is trying to do that, but is not in

>>>Linux's tree.

>>>

>>

>>Please, non-container is the environment that exist today in Linux.

>>Actually cpuset does provide some part of it. But beyond that no.

>

>

> cpuset provides resource isolation, not necessarily resource
> management.

>

>

>>But then we are all using different terminology like beancounters,
>>containers, resource groups and now non-containers...

>>

>

>

> <snip>

>

>>>>I'm sure when container support gets in then for the above scenario it

>>>>will read -1 ...

>>>

>>>So, how can one get the list of tasks belonging to a resource group in
>>>that case ?

>>>

>>...and that brings to the starting question...why do you need it?

>

>

> Like I said earlier, there is no other way to get the list of tasks
> belonging to a resource group.

>

>

>>Commands like ps and top will show appropriate container number for each
>>task.

>

>

> There is `_no_` container number in the non-container environment (or it
> will be same for `_all_` tasks).

Chandra, virtual container number is essentially the same as user id in non-container environment. UBC were desgined for `_users_` first. Containers were just the first environment which started to use it widely.

And I really disagree when you say that non-container usecase is a superset of container usecase. I believe it is vice versa, since in container usecase you have a `_full_` environment with root user and need more resources to be taken into account.

Thanks,
Kirill
