Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 5/7] UBC: kernel memory accounting (core)
Posted by dev on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 08:49:57 GMT

Rohit Seth wrote:
> On Thu, 2006-08-17 at 07:26 -0700, Dave Hansen wrote:
>
>>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!
>
>
>
> hmm, not sure why it is simpler.
because introducing additonal lookups/hashes etc. is harder and
adds another source for possible mistakes.
we can always optimize it out if people insist (by cost of slower accounting).

Kirill