
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [patch00/05]: Containers(V2)- Introduction

Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 20:27:34 GMT

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

Chandra wrote:

> We had this discussion more than 18 months back and concluded that it is
> not the right thing to do. Here is the link to the thread:

Because it is easy enough to carve memory up into nice little nameable chunks, it might be the case that we can manage the percentage of memory used by the expedient of something like cpusets and fake nodes.

Indeed, that seems to be doable, based on this latest work of Andrew and others (David, some_bright_spark@jp, Magnus, ...). There are still a bunch of wrinkles that remain to be ironed out.

For other resources, such as CPU cycles and network bandwidth, unless another bright spark comes up with an insight, I don't see how to express the "percentage used" semantics provided by something such as CKRM, using anything resembling cpusets.

... Can one imagine having the scheduler subdivide each second of time available on a CPU into several fake-CPU's, each one of which speaks for one of those sub-second fake-CPU slices? Sounds too weird to me, and a bit too rigid to be a servicable CKRM substitute.

--

I won't rest till it's the best ...
Programmer, Linux Scalability
Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> 1.925.600.0401