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

Posted by [Rohit Seth](#) on Fri, 08 Sep 2006 21:43:54 GMT

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

On Fri, 2006-09-08 at 12:23 -0700, Chandra Seetharaman wrote:

> On Fri, 2006-09-08 at 11:33 +0400, Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> > 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?

>

> may be (I am not sure :), lets get it clarified.

>

> > 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

>

> I would say (1) with slight modification

> "container will be able to touch _at least_ that number of pages"

>

Does this scheme support running of tasks outside of containers on the same platform where you have tasks running inside containers. If so then how will you ensure processes running outside any container will not leave less than the total guaranteed memory to different containers.

-rohit
