

---

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

Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 10:48:18 GMT

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

---

Chandra Seetharaman wrote:

> 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 be 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))

>

What's the total memory amount on the node? Without it it's hard to make

any

guarantee.

> "Limit only" approach works for DoS prevention. But for providing QoS

> you would need guarantee.

>

You may not provide guarantee on physical resource for a particular group without limiting its usage by other groups. That's my major idea.

---