

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v7 0/8] Request for inclusion: tcp memory buffers  
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2011 20:14:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 10/14/2011 12:12 AM, David Miller wrote:

> From: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>

> Date: Fri, 14 Oct 2011 00:05:58 +0400

>

>> Also, I kind of dispute the affirmation that !cgroup will encompass  
>> the majority of users, since cgroups is being enabled by default by  
>> most vendors. All systemd based systems use it extensively, for  
>> instance.

>

> I will definitely advise people against this, since the cost of having  
> this on by default is absolutely non-trivial.

>

> People keep asking every few releases "where the heck has my performance  
> gone" and it's because of creeping features like this. This socket  
> cgroup feature is a prime example of where that kind of stuff comes  
> from.

>

> I really get irritated when people go "oh, it's just one indirect  
> function call" and "oh, it's just one more pointer in struct sock"

>

> We work really hard to `_remove_` elements from structures and make them  
> smaller, and to remove expensive operations from the fast paths.

>

> It might take someone weeks if not months to find a way to make a  
> patch which compensates for the extra overhead your patches are adding.

>

> And I don't think you fully appreciate that.

Let's focus on this:

Are you happy, or at least willing to accept, an approach that keep  
things as they were with cgroups *\*compiled out\**, or were you referring  
to not in use == compiled in, but with no users?