
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC:
resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 23:13:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 2006-09-13 at 18:22 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:

<snip>

> >

> > 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=111325064322_305&w=2

> > http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=ckrm-tech&m=111385973226_267&w=2

> > http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=ckrm-tech&m=111291409731_929&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

IMO, overhead may not increase for a _non-user_ of the feature.

> like lmbench.

I think we have run those, but I could not find the results in the
mailing list.

>

> > <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.

Yes, it does mean doing something in the reclamation path.

>

>

> -rohit

>

--

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