

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 04/11] kmem accounting basic infrastructure  
Posted by [Christoph Lameter](#) on Wed, 15 Aug 2012 15:34:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed, 15 Aug 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:

> On 08/15/2012 06:47 PM, Christoph Lameter wrote:  
> > On Wed, 15 Aug 2012, Michal Hocko wrote:  
> >  
> >>> That is not what the kernel does, in general. We assume that if he wants  
> >>> that memory and we can serve it, we should. Also, not all kernel memory  
> >>> is unreclaimable. We can shrink the slabs, for instance. Ying Han  
> >>> claims she has patches for that already...  
> >>  
> >> Are those patches somewhere around?  
> >  
> > You can already shrink the reclaimable slabs (dentries / inodes) via  
> > calls to the subsystem specific shrinkers. Did Ying Han do anything to  
> > go beyond that?  
> >  
> That is not enough for us.  
> We would like to make sure that the objects being discarded belong to  
> the memcg which is under pressure. We don't need to be perfect here, and  
> an occasional slip is totally fine. But if in general, shrinking from  
> memcg A will mostly wipe out objects from memcg B, we harmed the system  
> in return for nothing good.

How can you figure out which objects belong to which memcg? The ownerships  
of dentries and inodes is a dubious concept already.

---