
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [patch00/05]: Containers(V2)- Introduction
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Wed, 20 Sep 2006 19:25:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 9/20/06, Chandra Seetharaman <sekharan@us.ibm.com> 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:

Even if the resource control portions aren't totally compatible, having two separate process container abstractions in the kernel is sub-optimal, both in terms of efficiency and userspace management. How about splitting out the container portions of cpuset from the actual resource control, so that CKRM/RG can hang off of it too? Creation of a cpuset or a resource group would be driven by creation of a container; at fork time, a task inherits its parent's container, and hence its cpuset and/or resource groups.

At its most crude, this could be something like:

```
struct container {  
#ifdef CONFIG_CPUSETS  
    struct cpuset cs;  
#endif  
#ifdef CONFIG_RES_GROUPS  
    struct resource_group rg;  
#endif  
};
```

but at least it would be sharing some of the abstractions.

Paul
