

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Andrew Morton](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 16:42:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700  
Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:  
> >  
> > A) Have separate memory management for each container,  
> > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.  
> > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there  
> > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.  
>  
> Hold on here for just a sec...  
>  
> It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container  
> while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.  
>  
> There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less  
> efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide  
> up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.  
>

I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake  
NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine  
"mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
no kernel changes needed.

Unfortunately this is not testable because numa=fake=256 doesn't come even  
vaguely close to working. Am trying to get that fixed.

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Dave Hansen](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 17:29:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:  
> I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake  
> NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
> So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine  
> "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
> no kernel changes needed.

Is this similar to Mel Gorman's zone-based anti-fragmentation approach?  
I thought he was discouraged from pursuing that at the VM summit.

-- Dave

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)

Posted by [Andrew Morton](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 17:38:20 GMT

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

---

On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 10:29:16 -0700

Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:

> > I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake

> > NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.

> > So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine

> > "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,

> > no kernel changes needed.

>

> Is this similar to Mel Gorman's zone-based anti-fragmentation approach?

I don't think so - it's using zones, but for a quite different thing.

> I thought he was discouraged from pursuing that at the VM summit.

That seemed to be a 49%/51% call, iirc.

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)

Posted by [Rohit Seth](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 17:59:06 GMT

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

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:

> On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700

> Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

>

> > On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:

> > >

> > > A) Have separate memory management for each container,

> > > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.

> > > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there

> > > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.

> >

> > Hold on here for just a sec...

> >

> > It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container

> > while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.

> >

> > There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less

> > efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide  
> > up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.  
> >  
>  
> I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake  
> NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
> So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine  
> "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
> no kernel changes needed.  
>  
Sounds like an interesting idea. Will have to depend on something like  
memory hot-plug to get the things move around...

-rohit

> Unfortunately this is not testable because numa=fake=256 doesn't come even  
> vaguely close to working. Am trying to get that fixed.

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 18:09:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Andrew wrote:

> "mems" (what are these called?)

I call them "Memory Nodes", or "nodes" for short when the qualifier  
"memory" is clear from the context.

I was just reading up on FB-DIMM memory, and notice that each DIMM on  
a channel has a different latency. That sure looks like the defining  
characteristic of NUMA memory to my way of thinking - non-uniform memory.

So for extra credit if your fake numa nodes pan out, it would be cute if  
the fake nodes could be defined so as to respect these latency  
differences - memory in different nodes if at different positions along  
a memory channel. Then a sysadmin could put their most latency  
sensitive jobs on the DIMMs closest to the CPUs.

--

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] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 18:17:45 GMT

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:

> On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700

> Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

>

> > On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:

> > >

> > > A) Have separate memory management for each container,

> > > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.

> > > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there

> > > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.

> >

> > Hold on here for just a sec...

> >

> > It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container

> > while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.

> >

> > There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less

> > efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide

> > up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.

> >

>

> I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake

> NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.

> So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine

> "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,

> no kernel changes needed.

In this model memory and container are tightly coupled, hence memory might be unused/wasted in one container/resource group", while a different group is hitting its limit too often.

In order to minimize this effect, resource controllers should be providing both minimum and maximum amount of resources available for a resource group.

>

> Unfortunately this is not testable because numa=fake=256 doesn't come even

> vaguely close to working. Am trying to get that fixed.

>

> -----

> 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>

--

-----  
Chandra Seetharaman | Be careful what you choose....  
- sekharan@us.ibm.com | .....you may get it.  
-----

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Andrew Morton](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 18:18:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 10:59:06 -0700  
Rohit Seth <rohitseth@google.com> wrote:

> On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:  
> > On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700  
> > Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:  
> >  
> > > On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:  
> > > >  
> > > > A) Have separate memory management for each container,  
> > > > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.  
> > > > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there  
> > > > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.  
> > >  
> > > Hold on here for just a sec...  
> > >  
> > > It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container  
> > > while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.  
> > >  
> > > There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less  
> > > efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide  
> > > up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.  
> > >  
> > >  
> > I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake  
> > NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
> > So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine  
> > "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
> > no kernel changes needed.  
> >  
> Sounds like an interesting idea. Will have to depend on something like  
> memory hot-plug to get the things move around...  
>

mmm, hadn't thought that far ahead. One could manually resize such a  
contained with `sys_move_pages()`. Or just sit and wait: normal page

allocation and reclaim activity would eventually resize the job to the new set of mems.

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 18:27:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 11:17 -0700, Chandra Seetharaman wrote:

> On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:

> > On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700

> > Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:

> >

> > > On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:

> > > >

> > > > A) Have separate memory management for each container,

> > > > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.

> > > > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there

> > > > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.

> > >

> > > Hold on here for just a sec...

> > >

> > > It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container

> > > while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.

> > >

> > > There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less

> > > efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide

> > > up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.

> > >

> >

> > I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake

> > NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.

> > So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine

> > "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,

> > no kernel changes needed.

>

> In this model memory and container are tightly coupled, hence memory

> might be unused/wasted in one container/resource group", while a

> different group is hitting its limit too often.

>

> In order to minimize this effect, resource controllers should be

> providing both minimum and maximum amount of resources available for a

> resource group.

Forgot to mention... There is a set of patches submitted by KUROSAWA Takahiro that implements this by creating pseudo zones (It has the same limitation though). <http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=ckrm-tech&m=113867467006531&w=2>

>  
> >  
> > Unfortunately this is not testable because numa=fake=256 doesn't come even  
> > vaguely close to working. Am trying to get that fixed.  
> >  
> > -----  
> > 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>  
--

-----  
Chandra Seetharaman | Be careful what you choose....  
- sekharan@us.ibm.com | .....you may get it.  
-----

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Magnus Damm](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 02:38:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:  
> On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700  
> Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:  
>  
> > On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:  
> > >  
> > > A) Have separate memory management for each container,  
> > > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.  
> > > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there  
> > > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.  
> >  
> > Hold on here for just a sec...  
> >  
> > It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container  
> > while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.  
> >  
> > There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less  
> > efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide  
> > up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.  
> >  
>  
> I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake



> NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
> So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine  
> "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
> no kernel changes needed.  
>  
> Unfortunately this is not testable because numa=fake=256 doesn't come even  
> vaguely close to working. Am trying to get that fixed.

You may be looking for the NUMA emulation patches posted here:

<http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=112806587501884&w=2>

There is a slightly updated x86\_64 version here too:

<http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=113161386520342&w=2>

/ magnus

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Magnus Damm](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 02:42:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 10:59 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:

> On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 09:42 -0700, Andrew Morton wrote:  
> > On Fri, 18 Aug 2006 07:45:48 -0700  
> > Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> wrote:  
> >  
> > > On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:08 +0400, Andrey Savochkin wrote:  
> > > >  
> > > > A) Have separate memory management for each container,  
> > > > with separate buddy allocator, lru lists, page replacement mechanism.  
> > > > That implies a considerable overhead, and the main challenge there  
> > > > is sharing of pages between these separate memory managers.  
> > >  
> > > Hold on here for just a sec...  
> > >  
> > > It is quite possible to do memory management aimed at one container  
> > > while that container's memory still participates in the main VM.  
> > >  
> > > There is overhead here, as the LRU scanning mechanisms get less  
> > > efficient, but I'd rather pay a penalty at LRU scanning time than divide  
> > > up the VM, or coarsely start failing allocations.  
> > >  
> > >  
> > > I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake  
> > > NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
> > > So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine



> > "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
> > no kernel changes needed.  
> >  
> Sounds like an interesting idea. Will have to depend on something like  
> memory hot-plug to get the things move around...

Yeah, moving things around: The pzone memory resource controller introduces dynamically sized zones if I remember correctly.

<http://www.opensubscriber.com/message/ckrm-tech@lists.sourceforge.net/3133911.html>

/ magnus

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Andi Kleen](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 07:48:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> You may be looking for the NUMA emulation patches posted here:  
>  
> [http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1128065875018 84&w=2](http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1128065875018%2084&w=2)  
>  
> There is a slightly updated x86\_64 version here too:  
>  
> [http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1131613865203 42&w=2](http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1131613865203%2042&w=2)

Hmm, I must have missed that version. Seems like a improvement. Best you resubmit it, although I'll probably only take it after the .19 merge

-Andi

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Magnus Damm](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 08:42:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, 2006-08-21 at 09:48 +0200, Andi Kleen wrote:

> > You may be looking for the NUMA emulation patches posted here:  
> >  
> > [http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1128065875018 84&w=2](http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1128065875018%2084&w=2)  
> >  
> > There is a slightly updated x86\_64 version here too:  
> >  
> > [http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1131613865203 42&w=2](http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-mm&m=1131613865203%2042&w=2)  
> >  
> > Hmm, I must have missed that version. Seems like a improvement. Best you

> resubmit it, although I'll probably only take it after the .19 merge

No problem. The second URL pointed to a x86\_64 version where I tried to break out code to make some kind of generic NUMA emulation layer. At that time no one seemed interested in that strategy as a simple resource control solution so I gave that up.

For x86\_64 I think it's only worth mucking around with the code if people believe that it is the right way to go for in-kernel resource control.

The x86\_64 patches above include code to divide each real NUMA node into several smaller emulated nodes, but that is kind of pointless if people only use it for non-resource control purposes, ie just to play with CPUSETS and NUMA on non-NUMA hardware. For simple purposes like that I think the existing NUMA emulation code for x86\_64 works perfectly well.

I still think that i386 users would benefit from NUMA emulation though. If you want me to up-port the i386-specific code just let me know.

Thanks,

/ magnus

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)

Posted by [Andi Kleen](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 09:03:45 GMT

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

---

On Monday 21 August 2006 10:42, Magnus Damm wrote:

> No problem. The second URL pointed to a x86\_64 version where I tried to  
> break out code to make some kind of generic NUMA emulation layer. At  
> that time no one seemed interested in that strategy as a simple resource  
> control solution so I gave that up.

>

> For x86\_64 I think it's only worth mucking around with the code if  
> people believe that it is the right way to go for in-kernel resource  
> control.

Does it by chance fix the existing code? Andrew has been complaining (and I could reproduce) that numa=fake=16 makes it triple fault at boot. The theory was that it didn't like empty nodes which can happen this way. I unfortunately didn't have time to look into it closely so far.

> The x86\_64 patches above include code to divide each real NUMA node into  
> several smaller emulated nodes, but that is kind of pointless if people  
> only use it for non-resource control purposes, ie just to play with

> CPUSETS and NUMA on non-NUMA hardware. For simple purposes like that I  
> think the existing NUMA emulation code for x86\_64 works perfectly well.  
>  
> I still think that i386 users would benefit from NUMA emulation though.  
> If you want me to up-port the i386-specific code just let me know.

I personally have my doubts about 32bit NUMA -- it will always have  
ZONE\_NORMAL only on a single node, which limits it very much.  
But ok I guess it might be useful to somebody.

-Andi

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Magnus Damm](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 09:18:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, 2006-08-21 at 11:03 +0200, Andi Kleen wrote:

> On Monday 21 August 2006 10:42, Magnus Damm wrote:  
>  
> > No problem. The second URL pointed to a x86\_64 version where I tried to  
> > break out code to make some kind of generic NUMA emulation layer. At  
> > that time no one seemed interested in that strategy as a simple resource  
> > control solution so I gave that up.  
> >  
> > For x86\_64 I think it's only worth mucking around with the code if  
> > people believe that it is the right way to go for in-kernel resource  
> > control.  
>  
> Does it by chance fix the existing code? Andrew has been complaining  
> (and I could reproduce) that numa=fake=16 makes it triple fault at boot.  
> The theory was that it didn't like empty nodes which can happen this way.  
> I unfortunately didn't have time to look into it closely so far.

The code does rearrange how the boundaries are calculated, and it may  
happen to fix that specific problem. I'll try to find some time later  
this week to have a look at it.

> > The x86\_64 patches above include code to divide each real NUMA node into  
> > several smaller emulated nodes, but that is kind of pointless if people  
> > only use it for non-resource control purposes, ie just to play with  
> > CPUSETS and NUMA on non-NUMA hardware. For simple purposes like that I  
> > think the existing NUMA emulation code for x86\_64 works perfectly well.  
> >  
> > I still think that i386 users would benefit from NUMA emulation though.  
> > If you want me to up-port the i386-specific code just let me know.  
>  
> I personally have my doubts about 32bit NUMA -- it will always have

> ZONE\_NORMAL only on a single node, which limits it very much.  
> But ok I guess it might be useful to somebody.

Very true. I was mainly thinking about the i386 code as a simple way for people to play with NUMA and CPUSETS.

/ magnus

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [dev](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 13:33:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Andrew Morton wrote:

> I have this mad idea that you can divide a 128GB machine up into 256 fake  
> NUMA nodes, then you use each "node" as a 512MB unit of memory allocation.  
> So that 4.5GB job would be placed within an exclusive cpuset which has nine  
> "mems" (what are these called?) and voila: the job has a hard 4.5GB limit,  
> no kernel changes needed.  
this doesn't allow memory overcommitment, does it?

Kirill

---

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 17:51:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> this doesn't allow memory overcommitment, does it?

Uh - no - I don't think so. You can over commit  
the memory of a task in a small cpuset just as well  
as you can a task in a big cpuset or even one in the  
top cpuset covering the entire system.

Perhaps I didn't understand your point.

--

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] [PATCH 4/7] UBC: syscalls (user interface)  
Posted by [dev](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 08:50:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Paul Jackson wrote:

>>this doesn't allow memory overcommitment, does it?

>

>

> Uh - no - I don't think so. You can over commit

> the memory of a task in a small cpuset just as well

> as you can a task in a big cpuset or even one in the

> top cpuset covering the entire system.

>

> Perhaps I didn't understand your point.

My point was that when you have lots of containers

their summary memory limit can be much higher then available RAM.

This allows bursts of memory usage for containers, since

it is very unlikely for all of them to consume the memory

simulatenously. E.g. hosters usually oversell memory

say 2 times on the node.

So the question was whether it is possbile to overcommit memory  
with NUMA emulation?

Thanks,  
Kirill

---