
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Mon, 30 Oct 2006 18:01:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 10/30/06, Pavel Emelianov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

- > > Debated:
- > > - syscall vs configs interface
- >
- > 1. One of the major configs 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"! As you have seen from
- > our (beancounters) patches beancounters disappeared
- > as soon as the last reference was dropped.

Why is this an important feature for beancounters? All the other resource control approaches seem to prefer having userspace handle removing empty/dead groups/containers.

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

Why is depending on a feature like configs worse than depending on a feature of being able to extend the system call interface?

- > > - Interaction of resource controllers, containers and cpusets
- > > - Should we support, for instance, creation of resource
- > > groups/containers under a cpuset?
- > > - Should we have different groupings for different resources?
- >
- > This breaks the idea of groups isolation.

That's fine - some people don't want total isolation. If we're looking for a solution that fits all the different requirements, then we need that flexibility. I agree that the default would probably want to be that the groupings be the same for all resource controllers / subsystems.

Paul
