Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 04/13] kmem accounting basic infrastructure
Posted by Michal Hocko on Thu, 27 Sep 2012 12:15:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Wed 26-09-12 16:33:34, Tejun Heo wrote:
[...]
> > > So, this seems properly crazy to me at the similar level of
> > > use_hierarchy fiasco.  I'm gonna NACK on this.
> >
> > As I said: all use cases I particularly care about are covered by a
> > global switch.
> >
> > I am laying down my views because I really believe they make more sense.
> > But at some point, of course, I'll shut up if I believe I am a lone voice.
> >
> > I believe it should still be good to hear from mhocko and kame, but from
> > your point of view, would all the rest, plus the introduction of a
> > global switch make it acceptable to you?
>
> The only thing I'm whining about is per-node switch + silently
> ignoring past accounting, so if those two are solved, I think I'm
> pretty happy with the rest.

I think that per-group "switch" is not nice as well but if we make it
hierarchy specific (which I am proposing for quite some time) and do not
let enable accounting for a group with tasks then we get both
flexibility and reasonable semantic. A global switch sounds too coars to
me and it really not necessary.

Would this work with you?
--
Michal Hocko
SUSE Labs