Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [patch00/05]: Containers(V2)- Introduction
Posted by Chandra Seetharaman on Fri, 22 Sep 2006 00:06:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, 2006-09-21 at 15:09 -0700, Paul Menage wrote:
> On 9/21/06, Chandra Seetharaman <sekharan@us.ibm.com> wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > > But, there's no reason that the OpenVZ resource control mechanisms
> > > > couldn't be hooked into a generic process container mechanism along
> > > > with cpusets and RG.
> >
> > Isn't that one of the things we are trying to avoid (each one having
> > their own solution, especially when we _can_ have a common solution).
>
> Can we actually have a single common solution that works for everyone,
> no matter what their needs? It's already apparent that there are
> multiple different and subtly incompatible definitions of what "memory
> controller" means and needs to do. Maybe these can be resolved - but
> maybe it's better to have, say, two simple but very different memory
> controllers that the user can pick between, rather than one big and
> complicated one that tries to please everyone.

Paul,

Think about what will be available to customer through a distro.

There are two (competing) memory controllers in the kernel. But, distro
can turn only one ON. Which in turn mean
 - there will be a debate from the two controller users/advocates with
   the distro (headache to distro) about which one to turn ON
 - one party will _not_ get what they want and hence no point in them
   getting the feature into the mainline in the first place
   (dissatisfaction of the users/original implementors of one solution).

So, IMHO, it is better to sort out the differences before we get things
in mainline kernel.

>
> Paul
--

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