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

memory) Posted by Chandra Seetharaman on Tue, 12 Sep 2006 23:58:08 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message
On Tue, 2006-09-12 at 14:48 +0400, Pavel Emelianov wrote:

- <snip>
- > > 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))

- > What's the total memory amount on the node? Without it it's hard to make
- > guarantee.

I wrote the example treating them as %, so 100 would be the total amount of memory.

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

- sekharan@us.ibm.com |

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

I agree with that, but the other way around (i.e provide guarantee for everyone by imposing limits on everyone) is what I am saying is not possible.

•	
>	
>	
Get stuff done quickly with pDownload IBM WebSphere	o more? Need to support web services, security? re-integrated technology to make your job easier Application Server v.1.0.1 based on Apache Geronimo el?cmd=lnk&kid=120709&b id=263057&dat=121642
>	
ckrm-tech mailing listhttps://lists.sourceforge.net/l	ists/listinfo/ckrm-tech
Chandra Seetharaman	Be careful what you choose

.....you may get it.