

On 10/16/2012 10:25 PM, Christoph Lameter wrote:

> On Tue, 16 Oct 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:

>  
>>  
>> + memory.kmem.limit\_in\_bytes # set/show hard limit for kernel memory  
>> + memory.kmem.usage\_in\_bytes # show current kernel memory allocation  
>> + memory.kmem.failcnt # show the number of kernel memory usage hits limits  
>> + memory.kmem.max\_usage\_in\_bytes # show max kernel memory usage recorded  
>

> Does it actually make sense to limit kernel memory?

Yes.

> The user generally has  
> no idea how much kernel memory a process is using and kernel changes can  
> change the memory footprint. Given the fuzzy accounting in the kernel a  
> large cache refill (if someone configures the slab batch count to be  
> really big f.e.) can account a lot of memory to the wrong cgroup. The  
> allocation could fail.  
>

It heavily depends on the type of the user. The user may not know how much kernel memory precisely will be used, but he/she usually knows quite well that it shouldn't be all cgroups together shouldn't use more than available in the system.

IOW: It is usually safe to overcommit user memory, but not kernel memory. This is absolutely crucial in any high-density container host, and we've been doing this in OpenVZ for ages (in an uglier form than this)

> Limiting the total memory use of a process (U+K) would make more sense I  
> guess. Only U is probably sufficient? In what way would a limitation on  
> kernel memory in use be good?  
>

The kmem counter is also fed into the u counter. If the limit value of "u" is equal or greater than "k", this is actually what you are doing.

For a lot of application yes, only U is sufficient. This is the default, btw, since "k" is only even accounted if you set the limit.

All those use cases are detailed a bit below in this file.

A limitation of kernel memory use would be good, for example, to prevent

abuse from non-trusted containers in a high density, shared, container environment.

---