Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Mon, 30 Oct 2006 14:38:33 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Paul Jackson wrote:

- > Pavel wrote:
- >> 1. One of the major configfs ideas is that lifetime of
- >> the objects is completely driven by userspace.
- >> Resource controller shouldn't live as long as user
- >> want. It "may", but not "must"!

>

> I had trouble understanding what you are saying here.

>

> What does the phrase "live as long as user want" mean?

What if if user creates a controller (configfs directory) and doesn't remove it at all. Should controller stay in memory even if nobody uses it?

> >

- >> 2. Having configfs as the only interface doesn't alow
- >> people having resource controll facility w/o configfs.
- >> Resource controller must not depend on any "feature".

>>

- >> 3. Configfs may be easily implemented later as an additional
- >> interface. I propose the following solution:
- First we make an interface via any common kernelfacility (syscall, ioctl, etc);
- >> Later we may extend this with configfs. This will
- >> alow one to have configfs interface build as a module.

>

- > So you would add bloat to the kernel, with two interfaces
- > to the same facility, because you don't want the resource
- > controller to depend on configfs.

>

> I am familiar with what is wrong with kernel bloat.

>

- > Can you explain to me what is wrong with having resource
- > groups depend on configfs? Is there something wrong with

Resource controller has nothing common with confgifs. That's the same as if we make netfilter depend on procfs.

> configfs that would be a significant problem for some systems> needing resource groups?

Why do we need to make some dependency if we can avoid it?

- > It is better where possible, I would think, to reuse common
- > infrastructure and minimize redundancy. If there is something
- > wrong with configfs that makes this a problem, perhaps we
- > should fix that.

The same can be said about system calls interface, isn't it?