Subject: Re: Supporting overcommit with the memory controller
Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Thu, 06 Mar 2008 09:07:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:
> On Thu, 06 Mar 2008 11:55:47 +0300
> Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:
>
>>>> Can Balbir's soft-limit patches help ?
>> [snip]
>>
>>> Yes, that could be a useful part of the solution - I suspect we'd need
>>> to have kswapd do the soft-limit push back as well as in
>>> try_to_free_pages(), to avoid the high-priority jobs getting stuck in
>>> the reclaim code. It would also be nice if we had:
>> BTW, one of the way OpenVZ users determine how much memory they
>> need for containers is the following: they set the limits to
>> maximal values and then check the "maxheld" (i.e. the maximal level
>> of consumption over the time) value.
>>
>> Currently, we don't have such in res_counters and I'm going to
>> implement this. Objections?
>>
> Basically, no objection.
>
> BTW, which does it means ?
> - create a new cgroup to accounting max memory consumption, etc...
> or
> - add new member to mem_cgroup
> or
> - add new member to res_counter

The third one - new member on res_counter. This will cost us 8 more
bytes on mem_cgroup and no performance impact, since the new field
is about to be touched only together with the limit and usage ones,
and thus is in one cacheline.

> Thanks,
> -Kame
>
>

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers