
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Mon, 30 Oct 2006 15:26:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul Jackson wrote:

> Pavel wrote:
>>>> 3. Configs may be easily implemented later as an additional
>>>> interface. I propose the following solution:
>>>> ...
>> Resource controller has nothing common with configfs.
>> That's the same as if we make netfilter depend on procfs.
>
> Well ... if you used configfs as an interface to resource
> controllers, as you said was easily done, then they would
> have something to do with each other, right ;)?

Right. We'll create a dependency that is not needed.

> Choose the right data structure for the job, and then reuse
> what fits for that choice.
>
> Neither avoid nor encouraging code reuse is the key question.
>
> What's the best fit, long term, for the style of kernel-user
> API, for this use? That's the key question.

I agree, but you've cut some important questions away,
so I ask them again:

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

This is important to solve now - whether we want or not to
keep "empty" bean counters in memory. If we do not then configfs
usage is not acceptable.

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

I haven't seen any objections against system calls yet.
