Subject: Re: Re: BC: resource beancounters (v2)
Posted by Rohit Seth on Tue, 29 Aug 2006 19:15:16 GMT

On Tue, 2006-08-29 at 20:06 +0100, Alan Cox wrote:
> Ar Maw, 2006-08-29 am 10:30 -0700, ysgrifennodd Rohit Seth:
> > On Tue, 2006-08-29 at 11:15 +0100, Alan Cox wrote:
> > > Ar Llu, 2006-08-28 am 15:28 -0700, ysgrifennodd Rohit Seth:
> > > > Though if we have file/directory based accounting then shared pages
> > > > belonging to /usr/lib or /usr/bin can go to a common container.
> > >
> > > So that one user can map all the spare libraries and config files and
> > > DoS the system by preventing people from accessing the libraries they do
> > > need ?
> > >
> >
> > Well, there is a risk whenever there is sharing across containers. The
> > point though is, give the choice to sysadmin to configure the platform
> > the way it is appropriate.
>
> In other words your suggestion doesn't actually work for the real world
> cases like web serving.
>

Containers are not going to solve all the problems particularly the
scenarios like when a machine is a web server and an odd user can log on
to the same machine and (w/o any ulimits) claim all the memory that is
present in the system.

Though it is quite possible to implement a combination of two (task and
fs based) policies in containers and sysadmin can set a preference of
each each container. [this probably is another reason for having a per
page container pointer].

-rohit