

---

Subject: Re: Re: [PATCH v5 00/10] per-cgroup tcp memory pressure  
Posted by [davem](#) on Fri, 18 Nov 2011 19:51:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

From: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>  
Date: Fri, 18 Nov 2011 17:39:03 -0200

> On 11/17/2011 07:35 PM, David Miller wrote:  
>> From: James Bottomley<jbottomley@parallels.com>  
>> Date: Tue, 15 Nov 2011 18:27:12 +0000  
>>  
>>> Ping on this, please. We're blocked on this patch set until we can  
>>> get  
>>> an ack that the approach is acceptable to network people.  
>>  
>> \_\_sk\_mem\_schedule is now more expensive, because instead of  
>> short-circuiting  
>> the majority of the function's logic when "allocated<=  
>> prot->sysctl\_mem[0]"  
>> and immediately returning 1, the whole rest of the function is run.  
>  
> Not the whole rest of the function. Rather, just the other two  
> tests. But that's the behavior we need since if your parent is on  
> pressure, you should be as well. How do you feel if we'd also provide  
> two versions for this:  
> 1) non-cgroup, try to return 1 as fast as we can  
> 2) cgroup, also check your parents.

Fair enough.

> How about we make the jump\_label only used for sockets (which is basic  
> what we have now, just need a clear name to indicate that), and then  
> enable it not when the first non-root cgroup is created, but when the  
> first one sets the limit to something different than unlimited?  
>  
> Of course to that point, we'd be accounting only to the root  
> structures,  
> but I guess this is not a big deal.

This sounds good for now.

>> TCP specific stuff in mm/memcontrol.c, at best that's not nice at all.  
>  
> How crucial is that?

It's a big deal. We've been working for years to yank protocol specific things even out of net/core/\*.c, it simply doesn't belong there.

I'd even be happier if you had to create a `net/ipv4/tcp_memcg.c` and `include/net/tcp_memcg.h`

> Thing is that as far as I am concerned, all the  
> memcg people

...

What the memcg people want is entirely their problem, especially if it involves crapping up non-networking files with protocol specific junk.

---