
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> 1.925.600.0401
