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

Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 18:49:50 GMT

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

On Mon, 2006-09-11 at 12:13 +0400, Pavel Emelianov wrote:

<snip>

> >

> > Don't start the new container or change the guarantees of the existing

> > ones

> > to accommodate this one :) The QoS design (done by the administrator)

> > should

> > take care of such use-cases. It would be perfectly ok to have a container

> > that does not care about guarantees to set their guarantee to 0 and set

> > their limit to the desired value. As Chandra has been stating we need two

> > parameters (guarantee, limit), either can be optional, but not both.

> If I set up 9 groups to have 100Mb limit then I have 100Mb assured (on

> 1Gb node)

> for the 10th one exactly. And I do not have to set up any guarantee as

> it won't affect

> anything. So what a guarantee parameter is needed for?

I do not think it is that simple since

- there is typically more than one class I want to set guarantee to
- I will not able to use both limit and guarantee
- Implementation will not be work-conserving.

Also, How would you configure the following in your model ?

5 classes: Class A(10, 40), Class B(20, 100), Class C (30, 100), Class D
(5, 100), Class E(15, 50); (class_name(guarantee, limit))

"Limit only" approach works for DoS prevention. But for providing QoS
you would need guarantee.

--

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