
Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 04/11] kmem accounting basic infrastructure
Posted by [Michal Hocko](#) on Wed, 15 Aug 2012 12:55:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed 15-08-12 12:12:23, James Bottomley wrote:

> On Wed, 2012-08-15 at 13:33 +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:
> > > This can
> > > be quite confusing. I am still not sure whether we should mix the two
> > > things together. If somebody wants to limit the kernel memory he has to
> > > touch the other limit anyway. Do you have a strong reason to mix the
> > > user and kernel counters?
> >
> > This is funny, because the first opposition I found to this work was
> > "Why would anyone want to limit it separately?" =p
> >
> > It seems that a quite common use case is to have a container with a
> > unified view of "memory" that it can use the way he likes, be it with
> > kernel memory, or user memory. I believe those people would be happy to
> > just silently account kernel memory to user memory, or at the most have
> > a switch to enable it.
> >
> > What gets clear from this back and forth, is that there are people
> > interested in both use cases.
>
> Haven't we already had this discussion during the Prague get together?
> We discussed the use cases and finally agreed to separate accounting for
> k and then k+u mem because that satisfies both the Google and Parallels
> cases. No-one was overjoyed by k and k+u but no-one had a better
> suggestion ... is there a better way of doing this that everyone can
> agree to?
> We do need to get this nailed down because it's the foundation of the
> patch series.

There is a slot in MM/memcg minisum at KS so we have a slot to discuss this.

>
> James
>
>
> --
> To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe cgroups" in
> the body of a message to majordomo@vger.kernel.org
> More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

--
Michal Hocko
SUSE Labs
