Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!
Posted by Herbert Poetzl on Tue, 06 Mar 2007 13:28:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, Mar 06, 2007 at 04:09:40PM +0530, Srivatsa Vaddagiri wrote:
> On Mon, Mar 05, 2007 at 07:39:37PM +0100, Herbert Poetzl wrote:
> > > Thats why nsproxy has pointers to resource control objects, rather
> > > than embedding resource control information in nsproxy itself.
> >
> > which makes it a (name)space, no?
>
> I tend to agree, yes!
>
> > > This will let different nsproxy structures share the same resource
> > > control objects (ctlr_data) and thus be governed by the same
> > > parameters.
> >
> > as it is currently done for vfs, uts, ipc and soon
> > pid and network l2/l3, yes?
>
> yes (by vfs do you mean mnt_ns?)

yep

> > > Where else do you think the resource control information for a
> > > container should be stored?
> >
> > an alternative for that is to keep the resource
> > stuff as part of a 'context' structure, and keep
> > a reference from the task to that (one less
> > indirection, as we had for vfs before)
>
> something like:
>
> struct resource_context {
>   int cpu_limit;
>   int rss_limit;
>   /* all other limits here */
> }
>
> struct task_struct {
>   ...
>   struct resource_context *rc;
>
> }
>
> ?

>
> With this approach, it makes it hard to have task-grouping that are
> unique to each resource.

that is correct ...

> For ex: lets say that CPU and Memory needs to be divided as follows:
>
> CPU : C1 (70%), C2 (30%)
> Mem : M1 (60%), M2 (40%)
>
> Tasks T1, T2, T3, T4 are assigned to these resource classes as follows:
>
> C1 : T1, T3
> C2 : T2, T4
> M1 : T1, T4
> M2 : T2, T3
>
> We had a lengthy discussion on this requirement here:
>
> http://lkml.org/lkml/2006/11/6/95
> http://lkml.org/lkml/2006/11/1/239
>
> Linus also has expressed a similar view here:
>
> http://lwn.net/Articles/94573/

you probably could get that flexibility by grouping
certain limits into a separate struct, but IMHO the
real world use of this is limited, because the resource
limitations usually only fulfill one purpose, being
protection from malicious users and DoS prevention

groups like Memory, Disk Space, Sockets might make
sense though, although we never had a single request
for any overlapping in the resource management (while
we have quite a few users of overlapping Network spaces)

> Paul Menage's (and its clone rcfs) patches allows this flexibility by
> simply mounting different hierarchies:
>
> mount -t container -o cpu none /dev/cpu
> mount -t container -o mem none /dev/mem
>
> The task-groups created under /dev/cpu can be completely independent of
> task-groups created under /dev/mem.
>
> Lumping together all resource parameters in one struct (like

> resource_context above) makes it difficult to provide this feature.
>
> Now can we live w/o this flexibility? Maybe, I don't know for sure.
> Since (stability of) user-interface is in question, we need to take a
> carefull decision here.

I don't like the dev/filesystem interface at all
but I can probably live with it :)

> > > then other derefences (->ctlr_data[] and ->limit) should be fast,
> > > theas y should be in the cache?
> >
> > please provide real world numbers from testing ...
>
> What kind of testing did you have in mind?

for example, implement RSS/VM limits and run memory
intensive tests like kernel building or so, see that
the accounting and limit checks do not add measureable
overhead ...

similar could be done for socket/ipc accounting and
multithreaded network tests (apache comes to my mind)

HTH,
Herbert

> --
> Regards,
> vatsa

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!
Posted by Srivatsa Vaddagiri on Tue, 06 Mar 2007 16:21:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, Mar 06, 2007 at 02:28:39PM +0100, Herbert Poetzl wrote:
> groups like Memory, Disk Space, Sockets might make
> sense though, although we never had a single request
> for any overlapping in the resource management (while
> we have quite a few users of overlapping Network spaces)

If we have to provide this flexibilty of different groupings for

different resources, then I dont see how we can get to the limit with
less than 3 dereferences (unless we bloat the task_struct to point to
the various limit structures directly).

--
Regards,
vatsa

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers