Subject: Re: Question: memrlimit cgroup's task\_move (2.6.26-rc5-mm3) Posted by KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki on Thu, 19 Jun 2008 10:19:05 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Thu, 19 Jun 2008 12:24:29 +0900
KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com> wrote:
> On Thu, 19 Jun 2008 08:43:43 +0530
> Balbir Singh <balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com> wrote:
>
> >
>>> I think the charge of the new group goes to minus. right?
>> (and old group's charge never goes down.)
>>> I don't think this is "no problem".
>>> What kind of patch is necessary to fix this?
>>> task attach() should be able to fail in future?
>> I'm sorry if I misunderstand something or this is already in TODO list.
>>>
> >
>> It's already on the TODO list. Thanks for keeping me reminded about it.
> Okay, I'm looking foward to see how can_attach and roll-back(if necessary)
> is implemnted.
> As you know, I'm interested in how to handle failure of task move.
One more thing...
Now, charge is done at
- vm is inserted (special case?)
- vm is expanded (mmap is called, stack growth...)
And uncharge is done at
- vm is removed (success of munmap)
- exit mm is called (exit of process)
But it seems charging at may expand vm() is not good.
The mmap can fail after may_expand_vm() because of various reason,
but charge is already done at may expand vm()....and no roll-back.
== an easy example of leak in stack growth handling ==
[root@iridium kamezawa]# cat /opt/cgroup/test/memrlimit.usage in bytes
```

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ls

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ls

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ulimit -s 3

71921664

Killed

Killed

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ls

Killed

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ls

Killed

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ls

Killed

[root@iridium kamezawa]# ulimit -s unlimited

[root@iridium kamezawa]# cat /opt/cgroup/test/memrlimit.usage\_in\_bytes

72368128

[root@iridium kamezawa]#

==

Thanks,

-Kame

\_\_\_\_\_

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers