

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v5 11/14] memcg: allow a memcg with kmem charges to be destructed.

Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Thu, 18 Oct 2012 09:33:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 10/18/2012 02:12 AM, Andrew Morton wrote:

> On Tue, 16 Oct 2012 14:16:48 +0400

> Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com> wrote:

>

>> Because the ultimate goal of the kmem tracking in memcg is to track slab

>> pages as well,

>

> It is? For a major patchset such as this, it's pretty important to

> discuss such long-term plans in the top-level discussion. Covering

> things such as expected complexity, expected performance hit, how these

> plans affected the current implementation, etc.

>

> The main reason for this is that if the future plans appear to be of

> doubtful feasibility and the current implementation isn't sufficiently

> useful without the future stuff, we shouldn't merge the current

> implementation. It's a big issue!

>

Not really. I am not talking about plans when it comes to slab. The code is there, and usually always posted to linux-mm a few days after I post this series. It also lives in the kmemcg-slab branch in my git tree.

I am trying to logically split it in two to aid reviewers work. I may have made a mistake by splitting it this way, but so far I think it was the right decision: it allowed people to focus on a part of the work first, instead of going all the way in a 30-patch patch series that would be merged atomically.

I believe they should be merged separately, to allow us to find any issues easier. But I also believe that this "separate" should ultimately live in the same merge window.

Pekka, from the slab side, already stated that 3.8 would not be unreasonable.

As for the performance hit, my latest benchmark, quoted in the opening mail of this series already include results for both patchsets.

---