
Subject: Re: [PATCH v9 1/9] Basic kernel memory functionality for the Memory Controller

Posted by [Michal Hocko](#) on Fri, 16 Dec 2011 13:30:49 GMT

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

On Fri 16-12-11 17:02:51, Glauber Costa wrote:

> On 12/16/2011 04:32 PM, Michal Hocko wrote:

[...]

> > So why do we need kmem accounting when tcp (the only user at the moment)

> > doesn't use it?

>

> Well, a bit historical. I needed a basic placeholder for it, since

> it tcp is officially kmem. As the time passed, I took most of the

> stuff out of this patch to leave just the basics I would need for

> tcp.

> Turns out I ended up focusing on the rest, and some of the stuff was

> left here.

>

> At one point I merged tcp data into kmem, but then reverted this

> behavior. the kmem counter stayed.

>

> I agree deferring the whole behavior would be better.

>

> >> In summary, we still never do non-independent accounting. When we

> >> start doing it for the other caches, We will have to add a test at

> >> charge time as well.

> >

> > So we shouldn't do it as a part of this patchset because the further

> > usage is not clear and I think there will be some real issues with

> > user+kmem accounting (e.g. a proper memcg-oom implementation).

> > Can you just drop this patch?

>

> Yes, but the whole set is in the net tree already.

Isn't it only in some for-next branch? Can that one be updated?

> (All other patches are tcp-related but this) Would you mind if I'd

> send a follow up patch removing the kmem files, and leaving just the

> registration functions and basic documentation? (And sorry for that as

> well in advance)

Yes a followup patch would work as well.

--

Michal Hocko

SUSE Labs

SUSE LINUX s.r.o.

Lihovarska 1060/12

190 00 Praha 9
Czech Republic
