Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC: resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)
Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Fri, 15 Sep 2006 07:15:49 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chandra Seetharaman wrote:
> On Thu, 2006-09-14 at 11:53 +0400, Pavel Emelianov wrote:
>
> <snip>
>
>
>>> What if I have 40 containers each with 2% guarantee ? what do we do
>>> then ? and many other different combinations (what I gave was not the
>>> _only_ scenario).
>>>
>>>
>> Then you need to solve a set of 40 equations. This sounds weird, but
>> don't afraid - sets like these are solved lightly.
>>
>
> extrapolate that to a varying # of permutations and real time changes in
> the system workload. Won't it be complex ?
>
I have a C program that computes limits to obtain desired guarantees
in a single 'for (i = 0; i < n; n++)' loop for any given set of guarantees.
With all error handling, beautifull output, nice formatting etc it weights
only 60 lines.
> Wouldn't it be a lot simpler if we have the guarantee support instead ?
> Why you do not like guarantee ? :)
>
I do not 'do not like guarantee'. I'm just sure that there are two ways
for providing guarantee (for unreclaimable resorces):
1. reserving resource for group in advance
2. limit resource for others
Reserving is worse as it is essentially limiting (you cut off 100Mb from
1Gb RAM thus limiting the other groups by 900Mb RAM), but this limiting
is too strict - you _have_ to reserve less than RAM size. Limiting in
run-time is more flexible (you may create an overcommited BC if you
want to) and leads to the same result - guarantee.
> <snip>
>
[snip]