
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 2/7] UBC: core (structures, API)
Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 14:38:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, Aug 22, 2006 at 04:46:50PM +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> Srivatsa Vaddagiri wrote:

> > On Mon, Aug 21, 2006 at 03:02:17PM +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> >

> >>>Except that you eventually have to lock ub0. Seems that the cache line

> >>>for that spinlock could bounce quite a bit in such a hot path.

> >>

> >>do you mean by ub0 host system ub which we call ub0

> >>or you mean a top ub?

> >

> >

> > If this were used for pure resource management purpose (w/o containers)

> > then the top ub would be ub0 right? "How bad would the contention on the

> > ub0->lock be then" is I guess Matt's question.

> Probably we still misunderstand here each other.

> top ub can be any UB. it's children do account resources

> to the whole chain of UBs to the top parent.

>

> i.e. ub0 is not a tree root.

Hmm ..if I understand you correctly, there is no one single root of the ubc tree? In other words, there can be several roots (each representing a distinct group of processes)? CKRM has one single root afaik, under which multiple resource/task groups are derived.

--

Regards,
vatsa
