## Subject: Re: [RFC 2/4] memcg: make it suck faster Posted by Daniel P. Berrange on Wed, 26 Sep 2012 09:03:43 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Wed, Sep 26, 2012 at 12:53:21PM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:
> On 09/26/2012 01:02 AM, Andrew Morton wrote:
>>> nomemcg: memcg compile disabled.
             : memcg enabled, patch not applied.
> >> > base
>>> bypassed: memcg enabled, with patch applied.
> >> >
> >> >
                base
                       bypassed
> >> User
                 109.12
                           105.64
                  1646.84
>>> > System
                             1597.98
>>> > Elapsed
                  229.56
                             215.76
> >> >
> >> >
              nomemcg
                          bypassed
> >> > User
                 104.35
                           105.64
> >> > System
                  1578.19
                             1597.98
> >> > Elapsed
                  212.33
                             215.76
> >> >
>>> So as one can see, the difference between base and nomemcg in terms
>>> of both system time and elapsed time is guite drastic, and consistent
>>> with the figures shown by Mel Gorman in the Kernel summit. This is a
>>> > ~ 7 % drop in performance, just by having memcg enabled. memcg functions
>>> appear heavily in the profiles, even if all tasks lives in the root
> >> > memcg.
> >> >
>>> With bypassed kernel, we drop this down to 1.5 %, which starts to fall
>>> > in the acceptable range. More investigation is needed to see if we can
>>> claim that last percent back, but I believe at last part of it should
> >> > be.
>> Well that's encouraging. I wonder how many users will actually benefit
> > from this - did I hear that major distros are now using memcg in some
> > system-infrastructure-style code?
> >
> If they do, they actually be come "users of memcg". This here is aimed
> at non-users of memcg, which given all the whining about it, it seems to
> be plenty.
> Also, I noticed, for instance, that libvirt is now creating memcg
> hierarchies for lxc and gemu as placeholders, before you actually create
> any vm or container.
```

This is mostly just lazyness on our part. There's no technical reason why we can't delay creating our intermediate cgroups until we actually have a VM ready to start, it was just simpler to create them when we started the main daemon.

## Daniel

--

|: http://berrange.com -o- http://www.flickr.com/photos/dberrange/:|
|: http://libvirt.org -o- http://virt-manager.org:|
|: http://autobuild.org -o- http://search.cpan.org/~danberr/:|
|: http://entangle-photo.org -o- http://live.gnome.org/gtk-vnc:|