Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices
Posted by Paul Menage on Wed, 01 Nov 2006 23:48:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 11/1/06, Chris Friesen <cfriesen@nortel.com> wrote:
>
> I just thought I'd weigh in on this. As far as our usage pattern is
> concerned, guarantees cannot be met via limits.
>
> I want to give "x" cpu to container X, "y" cpu to container Y, and "z"
> cpu to container Z.

I agree that these are issues - but they don't really affect the
container framework directly.

The framework should be flexible enough to let controllers register
any control parameters (via the filesystem?) that they need, but it
shouldn't contain explicit concepts like guarantees and limits. Some
controllers won't even have this concept (cpusets doesn't really, for
instance, and containers don't have to be just to do with
quantitative resource control).

I sent out a patch a while ago that showed how ResGroups could be
turned into effectively a library on top of a generic container system
- so ResGroups controllers could write to the ResGroups interface, and
let the library handle setting up control parameters and parsing
limits and guarantees. I expect the same thing could be done for UBC.

Paul