Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 09/11] memcg: propagate kmem limiting information to children
Posted by Michal Hocko on Tue, 21 Aug 2012 10:00:07 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue 21-08-12 13:22:09, Glauber Costa wrote:
> On 08/21/2012 11:54 AM, Michal Hocko wrote:
[...]
> > But maybe you have a good use case for that?
> >
> Honestly, I don't. For my particular use case, this would be always on,
> and end of story. I was operating under the belief that being able to
> say "Oh, I regret", and then turning it off would be beneficial, even at
> the expense of the - self contained - complication.
>
> For the general sanity of the interface, it is also a bit simpler to say
> "if kmem is unlimited, x happens", which is a verifiable statement, than
> to have a statement that is dependent on past history.

OK, fair point. We shouldn't rely on the history. Maybe
memory.kmem.limit_in_bytes could return some special value like -1 in
such a case?

> But all of those need of course, as you pointed out, to be traded off
> by the code complexity.
>
> I am fine with either, I just need a clear sign from you guys so I don't
> keep deimplementing and reimplementing this forever.

I would be for make it simple now and go with additional features later
when there is a demand for them. Maybe we will have runtimg switch for
user memory accounting as well one day.

But let's see what others think?
--
Michal Hocko
SUSE Labs