Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH] UBC: user resource beancounters
Posted by Chandra Seetharaman on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 22:23:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 2006-08-25 at 21:52 +0100, Alan Cox wrote:
> Ar Gwe, 2006-08-25 am 11:47 -0700, ysgrifennodd Chandra Seetharaman:
> > I think my original point is getting lost in the discussion, which is,
> > there should be way (for the sysadmin) to get a list of tasks belonging
> > to a resource group (in a non-container environment).
>
> Ok that much is easy to deal with. You print the luid in /proc.
>
> > - ability for the sysadmin to move a task to a resource group.
>
> So you want a setpluid(pid, luid) ? Trivial to add although you might
> want to refuse it in many secure environments but thats an SELinux rule
> again.

yes.
>
> > - assignment of task to a resource group should be transparent to the
> >   app.
>
> In those cases its akin to and matches security domain transitions which
> says to me SELinux (or AppArmour) should do it.

If setpluid(pid, luid) exists, then this is more easy to handle.
>
> > - a resource group could exist with no tasks associated.
>
> Bean counters can exist with no tasks, and the CKRM people have been
> corrected repeatedly on this point.

Hmm... from what I understand from the code, when the last resource in
the beancounter is dropped, the beancounter is destroyed. Which to me
means that when there are no tasks in a beancounter it will be
destroyed. (I just tested the code and verified that the beancounter is
destroyed when the task dies).

Please correct me if my understanding is incorrect.

Let me reword the requirement: beancounter/resource group should _not_
be destroyed implicitly. It should be destroyed only when requested by
the user/sysadmin. In other words, we need a create_luid() and
destroy_luid().
>
>
>

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