
Subject: Loadable cgroup subsystems

Posted by [Nikanth Karthikesan](#) on Tue, 08 Apr 2008 05:39:35 GMT

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

> On 4/1/08, Pavel Machek <pavel@ucw.cz> wrote:
> > > > --- a/include/linux/cgroup_subsys.h
> > > > +++ b/include/linux/cgroup_subsys.h
> > > > @@ -42,3 +42,9 @@ SUBSYS(mem_cgroup)
> > > > #endif
> > > >
> > > > /* */
> > > > +
> > > > +#ifdef CONFIG_CGROUP_DEVICE
> > > > +SUBSYS(devices)
> > > > +#endif
> > > > +
> > > > +/* */
> > > >
> > > I don't know what this is, but it does not look like C...
> >
> > Huh?
> >
> > Empty comments as separators?
>
> They help when multiple people add such SUBSYS things and
> do not have to fight rejects.
>

Why not provide a interface to add subsystems at run-time instead?

Are there any reason for not letting a subsystem to be implemented as a loadable module? IOW make cgroups usable by modules?

Thanks

Nikanth Karthikesan

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

Subject: Re: Loadable cgroup subsystems

Posted by [Nikanth Karthikesan](#) on Tue, 08 Apr 2008 09:40:29 GMT

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

On Mon, 2008-04-07 at 22:43 -0700, Paul Menage wrote:

> On Mon, Apr 7, 2008 at 10:39 PM, Nikanth Karthikesan <knikanth@suse.de> wrote:

> >
> > Why not provide a interface to add subsystems at run-time instead?
> > Are there any reason for not letting a subsystem to be implemented as a
> > loadable module? IOW make cgroups usable by modules?
> >
>
> Having all the subsystems declared at compile time makes a lot of
> things (number of subsystems, size of css_set, etc) statically known,
> which makes the code clearer and more importantly eliminates a bunch
> of locking/synchronization overhead.
>

true

> It would be possible to make cgroups support dynamically-loaded
> subsystems, and in fact, some of the earliest cgroups patches did
> support this, for a predefined max number of subsystems. But it would
> introduce more complexity and overhead.
>
> I'd rather not add support for this without a strong case of a
> subsystem that really needs to be dynamically loaded.

There were some band-width control patches based on cfq + cgroups, which
I guess will mandate cfq to be built-in?

Thanks
Nikanth Karthikesan

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
