
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC:
resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)
Posted by [Rohit Seth](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 01:22:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 2006-09-13 at 15:20 -0700, Chandra Seetharaman wrote:
> On Tue, 2006-09-12 at 18:25 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:
> > On Tue, 2006-09-12 at 18:10 -0700, Chandra Seetharaman wrote:
> > > On Tue, 2006-09-12 at 17:39 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:
> > > <snip>
> > > > yes, it would be there, but is not heavy, IMO.
> > > >
> > > > I think anything greater than 1% could be a concern for people who are
> > > > not very interested in containers but would be forced to live with them.
> > >
> > > If they are not interested in resource management and/or containers, i
> > > do not think they need to pay.
> > > >
> >
> > Think of a single kernel from a vendor that has container support built
> > in.
>
> Ok. Understood.
>
> Here are results of some of the benchmarks we have run in the past
> (April 2005) with CKRM which showed no/negligible performance impact in
> that scenario.
> <http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=ckrm-tech&m=111325064322305&w=2>
> <http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=ckrm-tech&m=111385973226267&w=2>
> <http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=ckrm-tech&m=111291409731929&w=2>
> >

These are good results. But I still think the cost will increase over a period of time as more logic gets added. Any data on microbenchmarks like Imbench.

> <snip>
>
> > > Not at all. If the container they are interested in is guaranteed, I do
> > > not see how apps running outside a container would affect them.
> > >
> >
> > Because the kernel (outside the container subsystem) doesn't know of
>
> The core resource subsystem (VM subsystem for memory) would know about
> the guarantees and don't cares, and it would handle it appropriately.
>

...meaning hooks in the generic kernel reclaim algorithm. Getting something like that in mainline will be at best tricky.

-rohit
