Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC:
resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)
Posted by Chandra Seetharaman on Thu, 14 Sep 2006 23:28:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Wed, 2006-09-13 at 18:27 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:

<snip>
> > > As said earlier, if strict QoS is desired then system should be
> > > appropriately partitioned so that the sum of limits doesn't exceed
> > > physical limit (that is cost of QoS). Let us first get at least that
> > > much settled on and accepted in mainline before getting into these
> > > esoteric features.
> > >
> >
> > esoteric ?! Please look at the different operating system that provide
> > resource management and other resource management capability providers.
> > All of them have both guarantees and limits (they might call them
> > differently).
> >
>
> Is this among the very first features you would like (to get absolutely
> right) before containers get in mm tree? Or is this something that can

Let me make it clear, I am interested in resource management and not in containers.

IMO, for resource management to work as expected (as is in other OSes), guarantee is needed. It will be a good idea to have it from start as it would affect the design of controllers.

For example, instead of writing two controllers (one to control limit and another to provide guarantee), controller writers can provide both in a single controller. (OpenVZ has two parameters, oomguarpages and vmguarpages whose purpose is to provide some sort of guarantee using the barrier and/or limit available in BC)

> wait after the minimal infrastructure is in Andrew's tree and the code
> gets wider testing...And above all we have agreed upon user interface.
>
> -rohit
>

--

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