

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 17/23] kmem controller charge/uncharge infrastructure  
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Wed, 25 Apr 2012 14:43:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 04/24/2012 07:54 PM, David Rientjes wrote:

> On Tue, 24 Apr 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:

>

>>> Yes, for user memory, I see charging to p->mm->owner as allowing that  
>>> process to eventually move and be charged to a different memcg and there's  
>>> no way to do proper accounting if the charge is split amongst different  
>>> memcgs because of thread membership to a set of memcgs. This is  
>>> consistent with charges for shared memory being moved when a thread  
>>> mapping it moves to a new memcg, as well.

>>

>> But that's the problem.

>>

>> When we are dealing with kernel memory, we are allocating a whole slab page.

>> It is essentially impossible to track, given a page, which task allocated

>> which object.

>>

>

> Right, so you have to make the distinction that slab charges cannot be  
> migrated by memory.move\_charge\_at\_immigrate (and it's not even specified  
> to do anything beyond user pages in Documentation/cgroups/memory.txt),

Never intended to.

> but

> it would be consistent to charge the same memcg for a process's slab  
> allocations as the process's user allocations.

>

> My response was why we shouldn't be charging user pages to  
> mem\_cgroup\_from\_task(current) rather than  
> mem\_cgroup\_from\_task(current->mm->owner) which is what is currently  
> implemented.

Ah, all right. Well, for user memory I agree with you. My point was  
exactly that user memory can always be pinpointed to a specific address  
space, while kernel memory can't.

>

> If that can't be changed so that we can still migrate user memory amongst  
> memcgs for memory.move\_charge\_at\_immigrate, then it seems consistent to  
> have all allocations done by a task to be charged to the same memcg.  
> Hence, I suggested current->mm->owner for slab charging as well.

All right. This can be done. Although I don't see this as a must for  
slab as already explained, I certainly don't oppose doing so as well.

---