

---

Subject: Re: containers development plans (July 10 version)  
Posted by [Balbir Singh](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 06:31:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Paul Menage wrote:

> On 7/10/07, Serge E. Hallyn <[serge@hallyn.com](mailto:serge@hallyn.com)> wrote:

>>

>> A (still under construction) list of features we expect to be worked on  
>> next year looks like this:

>> 4. task containers functionality  
>> specific containers

>

> A couple of more container subsystem requests that have come out of  
> the Linux Foundation Japan symposium, although I think they've also  
> been mentioned before more than once - per-container swap and disk I/O  
> scheduling.  
>

I think per container swap is interesting

> I'm not familiar enough with the current Linux disk scheduler code to  
> know how easy/hard it is to add rate guarantees on a per-container  
> basis, but the swap one should be easier.

>

> One potential issue with the swap container is how integrated should  
> it be with the memory controller? I can certainly see people wanting  
> to be able to use a swap controller without requiring a page-based  
> memory controller (e.g. you might want to combine it with node-based  
> control via cpusets instead) but adding two pointers to the mm\_struct,  
> one for swap controller subsystem and one for memory controller  
> subsystem, seems a little bit ugly.  
>

Well, it depends on how you define ugly. We could do something like  
the namespace approach, have something like

```
struct mem_container_ptrs {  
    swap_list;  
    mem_container_ptr;  
};
```

Although, I agree that per container swap is important, I feel that  
we should add in the functionality, once we have basic page based  
memory controller. It would make the whole setup easier to test  
for functionality and performance.

> Paul

--

Warm Regards,  
Balbir Singh  
Linux Technology Center  
IBM, ISTL

---