

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC: resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)

Posted by [Balbir Singh](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 19:17:56 GMT

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

---

Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> Balbir Singh wrote:

>> Kirill Korotaev wrote:

>>

>>> Core Resource Beancounters (BC) + kernel/user memory control.

>>>

>>> BC allows to account and control consumption

>>> of kernel resources used by group of processes.

>>>

>>> Draft UBC description on OpenVZ wiki can be found at

>>> [http://wiki.openvz.org/UBC\\_parameters](http://wiki.openvz.org/UBC_parameters)

>>>

>>> The full BC patch set allows to control:

>>> - kernel memory. All the kernel objects allocatable

>>> on user demand should be accounted and limited

>>> for DoS protection.

>>> E.g. page tables, task structs, vmas etc.

>>

>> One of the key requirements of resource management for us is to be able to

>> migrate tasks across resource groups. Since bean counters do not associate

>> a list of tasks associated with them, I do not see how this can be done

>> with the existing bean counters.

> It was discussed multiple times already.

> The key problem here is the objects which do not belong to tasks.

> e.g. IPC objects. They exist in global namespace and can't be reaccounted.

> At least no one proposed the policy to reaccount.

> And please note, IPCs are not the only such objects.

>

> But I guess your comment mostly concerns user pages, yeah?

Yes.

> In this case reaccounting can be easily done using page beancounters

> which are introduced in this patch set.

> So if it is a requirement, then lets cooperate and create such functionality.

>

Sure, let's cooperate and talk.

> So for now I see 2 main requirements from people:

> - memory reclamation

> - tasks moving across beancounters

>

Some not quite so urgent ones - like support for guarantees. I think this can be worked out as we make progress.

- > I agree with these requirements and lets move into this direction.
- > But moving so far can't be done without accepting:
- > 1. core functionality
- > 2. accounting
- >

Some of the core functionality might be a limiting factor for the requirements. Lets agree on the requirements, I think its a great step forward and then build the core functionality with these requirements in mind.

- > Thanks,
- > Kirill
- >
- 

Balbir Singh,  
Linux Technology Center,  
IBM Software Labs

---