
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [patch00/05]: Containers(V2)- Introduction

Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 00:07:59 GMT

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

Paul M wrote:

> An alternative would be a way of binding files (or directory
> hierarchies) to a particular set of memory nodes. Then you wouldn't
> need to pre-fault the data. Extended attributes might be one way of
> doing it.

Some of the file system folks have considered such use of extended attributes, yes.

I remain unaware that any relation between that work and cpusets exists or should exist.

--

I won't rest till it's the best ...
Programmer, Linux Scalability
Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> 1.925.600.0401

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [patch00/05]: Containers(V2)- Introduction

Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Thu, 21 Sep 2006 00:10:52 GMT

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

On 9/20/06, Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> wrote:

> Some of the file system folks have considered such use of extended
> attributes, yes.
>
> I remain unaware that any relation between that work and cpusets
> exists or should exist.

It doesn't have to be linked to cpusets - but userspace could use it in conjunction with cpusets to control/account pagecache memory sharing.

Paul
