
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 5/7] UBC: kernel memory accounting (core)
Posted by [Dave Hansen](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 14:26:28 GMT

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

On Thu, 2006-08-17 at 01:24 +0100, Alan Cox wrote:

> Ar Mer, 2006-08-16 am 12:59 -0700, ysgrifennodd Dave Hansen:
> > relationship between processes and mm's. We could also potentially have
> > two different threads of a process in two different accounting contexts.
> > But, that might be as simple to fix as disallowing things that share mms
> > from being in different accounting contexts, unless you unshare the mm.
>
> At the point I have twenty containers containing 20 copies of glibc to
> meet your suggestion it would be *far* cheaper to put it in the page
> struct.

My main thought is that `_everybody_` is going to have to live with the entry in the 'struct page'. Distros ship one kernel for everybody, and the cost will be paid by those not even using any kind of resource control or containers.

That said, it sure is simpler to implement, so I'm all for it!

-- Dave
