
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Wed, 01 Nov 2006 07:58:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul Menage wrote:

> On 10/31/06, Pavel Emelianov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

>>

>> That's functionality user may want. I agree that some users
>> may want to create some kind of "persistent" beancounters, but
>> this must not be the only way to control them. I like the way
>> TUN devices are done. Each has TUN_PERSIST flag controlling
>> whether or not to destroy device right on closing. I think that
>> we may have something similar - a flag BC_PERSISTENT to keep
>> beancounters with zero refcounter in memory to reuse them.

>

> How about the cpusets approach, where once a cpuset has no children
> and no processes, a usermode helper can be executed - this could

Hmm... Sounds good. I'll think over this.

> immediately remove the container/bean-counter if that's what the user
> wants. My generic containers patch copies this from cpusets.

>

>>

>> Moreover, I hope you agree that beancounters can't be made as
>> module. If so user will have to built-in configs, and thus
>> CONFIG_CONFIGFS_FS essentially becomes "bool", not a "tristate".

>

> How about a small custom filesystem as part of the containers support,
> then? I'm not wedded to using configs itself, but I do think that a
> filesystem interface is much more debuggable and extensible than a
> system call interface, and the simple filesystem is only a couple of
> hundred lines.

This sounds more reasonable than using configs for me.

> Paul

>
