
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [patch00/05]: Containers(V2)- Introduction
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 19:35:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, 2006-09-20 at 12:25 -0700, Paul Menage wrote:

> On 9/20/06, Chandra Seetharaman <sekharan@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> >

> > We had this discussion more than 18 months back and concluded that it is
> > not the right thing to do. Here is the link to the thread:

>

> Even if the resource control portions aren't totally compatible,
> having two separate process container abstractions in the kernel is
> sub-optimal, both in terms of efficiency and userspace management. How
> about splitting out the container portions of cpuset from the actual
> resource control, so that CKRM/RG can hang off of it too? Creation of
> a cpuset or a resource group would be driven by creation of a
> container; at fork time, a task inherits its parent's container, and
> hence its cpuset and/or resource groups.

>

> At its most crude, this could be something like:

>

```
> struct container {  
> #ifdef CONFIG_CPUSETS  
>   struct cpuset cs;  
> #endif  
> #ifdef CONFIG_RES_GROUPS  
>   struct resource_group rg;  
> #endif  
> };
```

Won't it restrict the user to choose one of these, and not both.

It will also prevent the possibility of having resource groups within a cpuset.

>

> but at least it would be sharing some of the abstractions.

>

> Paul

>

> -----

> Take Surveys. Earn Cash. Influence the Future of IT

> Join SourceForge.net's Techsay panel and you'll get the chance to share your

> opinions on IT & business topics through brief surveys -- and earn cash

> [http://www.techsay.com/default.php?page=join.php&p=sourc eforge&CID=DEVDEV](http://www.techsay.com/default.php?page=join.php&p=sourc%20eforge&CID=DEVDEV)

>

> _____
> ckrm-tech mailing list

> <https://lists.sourceforge.net/lists/listinfo/ckrm-tech>

--

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