
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC] Resource Management - Infrastructure choices
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Wed, 01 Nov 2006 23:48:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 11/1/06, Chris Friesen <cfriesen@nortel.com> wrote:

>
> I just thought I'd weigh in on this. As far as our usage pattern is
> concerned, guarantees cannot be met via limits.
>
> I want to give "x" cpu to container X, "y" cpu to container Y, and "z"
> cpu to container Z.

I agree that these are issues - but they don't really affect the container framework directly.

The framework should be flexible enough to let controllers register any control parameters (via the filesystem?) that they need, but it shouldn't contain explicit concepts like guarantees and limits. Some controllers won't even have this concept (cpusets doesn't really, for instance, and containers don't have to be just to do with quantitative resource control).

I sent out a patch a while ago that showed how ResGroups could be turned into effectively a library on top of a generic container system - so ResGroups controllers could write to the ResGroups interface, and let the library handle setting up control parameters and parsing limits and guarantees. I expect the same thing could be done for UBC.

Paul
