

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices  
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Mon, 30 Oct 2006 18:07:05 GMT

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

---

On 10/30/06, Dave McCracken <dmccr@us.ibm.com> wrote:

>  
> Is there any user demand for heirarchy right now? I agree that we should  
> design the API to allow heirarchy, but unless there is a current need for it  
> I think we should not support actually creating heirarchies. In addition to  
> the reduction in code complexity, it will simplify the paradigm presented to  
> the users. I'm a firm believer in not giving users options they will never  
> use.

The current CPUsets code supports hierarchies, and I believe that there are people out there who depend on them (right, PaulJ?) Since CPUsets are at heart a form of resource controller, it would be nice to have them use the same resource control infrastructure as other resource controllers (see the generic container patches that I sent out as an example of this). So that would be at least one user that requires a hierarchy.

Paul

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices  
Posted by [Dave McCracken](#) on Mon, 30 Oct 2006 18:12:59 GMT

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

---

On Monday 30 October 2006 12:07 pm, Paul Menage wrote:

> On 10/30/06, Dave McCracken <dmccr@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> > design the API to allow heirarchy, but unless there is a current need for

> > addition to the reduction in code complexity, it will simplify the

> > options they will never use.

>

> The current CPUsets code supports hierarchies, and I believe that  
> there are people out there who depend on them (right, PaulJ?) Since  
> CPUsets are at heart a form of resource controller, it would be nice  
> to have them use the same resource control infrastructure as other  
> resource controllers (see the generic container patches that I sent  
> out as an example of this). So that would be at least one user that  
> requires a hierarchy.

Hmm, ok. If someone is actually using it I'd say let's go ahead and implement it now.

Dave McCracken

-----  
Using Tomcat but need to do more? Need to support web services, security?  
Get stuff done quickly with pre-integrated technology to make your job easier  
Download IBM WebSphere Application Server v.1.0.1 based on Apache Geronimo  
<http://sel.as-us.falkag.net/sel?cmd=lnk&kid=120709&b id=263057&dat=121642>

---

ckrm-tech mailing list  
<https://lists.sourceforge.net/lists/listinfo/ckrm-tech>

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices  
Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Mon, 30 Oct 2006 20:41:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> I believe that  
> there are people out there who depend on them (right, PaulJ?)

Yes. For example a common usage pattern has the system admin carve off a big chunk of CPUs and Memory Nodes into a cpuset for the batch scheduler to manage, within which the batch scheduler creates child cpusets, roughly one for each job under its control.

--  
I won't rest till it's the best ...  
Programmer, Linux Scalability  
Paul Jackson <[pj@sgi.com](mailto:pj@sgi.com)> 1.925.600.0401

---