

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH] UBC: user resource beancounters  
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 23:00:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Sat, 2006-08-26 at 00:12 +0100, Alan Cox wrote:

> Ar Gwe, 2006-08-25 am 15:23 -0700, ysgrifennodd Chandra Seetharaman:  
> > > 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).  
>  
> If a task created resource remains then the beancounter remains until  
> the resources are destroyed, so it may exit well after the last task (eg  
> an object handed to another process with a different luid is stil  
> charged to us)  
>

It is the `_implicit destruction_` that is a problem.

> > 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()`.  
>  
> So that you can preserve the limits on the resource group ? That also  
> makes sense if you are trying to do long term resource management.

Yup.

>  
> Alan  
--

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