

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 04/11] kmem accounting basic infrastructure  
Posted by [James Bottomley](#) on Wed, 15 Aug 2012 13:29:57 GMT

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

---

On Wed, 2012-08-15 at 14:55 +0200, Michal Hocko wrote:

> 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.

Sure, to get things moving, can you pre-prime us with what you're thinking in this area so we can be prepared (and if it doesn't work, tell you beforehand)?

Thanks,

James

---