Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC: resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)
Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Fri, 08 Sep 2006 07:33:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chandra Seetharaman wrote:
> On Thu, 2006-09-07 at 00:47 +0530, Balbir Singh wrote:
>
> <snip>
>> Some not quite so urgent ones - like support for guarantees. I think
>> this can
>
> IMO, guarantee support should be considered to be part of the
> infrastructure. Controller functionalities/implementation will be
> different with/without guarantee support. In other words, adding
> guarantee feature later will cause re-implementations.
I'm afraid we have different understandings of what a "guarantee" is.
Don't we?
Guarantee may be one of

1. container will be able to touch that number of pages
2. container will be able to sys_mmap() that number of pages
3. container will not be killed unless it touches that number of pages
4. anything else

Let's decide what kind of a guarantee we want.
>> 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
>>>