

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 5/7] UBC: kernel memory accounting (core)  
Posted by [Rohit Seth](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 17:38:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 12:54 +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> Rohit Seth wrote:

> > On Thu, 2006-08-17 at 10:23 -0700, Dave Hansen wrote:

> >

> >> On Thu, 2006-08-17 at 10:16 -0700, Rohit Seth wrote:

> >>

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

> >>>

> >>> hmm, not sure why it is simpler.

> >>

> >> When you ask the question, "which container owns this page?", you don't

> >> have to look far,

> >

> >

> > as in page->mapping->container for user land?

> in case of anon\_vma, page->mapping can be the same

> for 2 pages belonging to different containers.

>

In your experience, have you seen processes belonging to different containers sharing the same anon\_vma? On a more general note, could you please point me to a place that has the list of requirements for which we are designing this solution.

> >> nor is it ambiguous in any way. It is very strict,

> >> and very straightforward.

> >

> > What additional ambiguity you have when inode or task structures have

> > the required information.

> inodes can belong to multiple containers and so do the pages.

>

I'm still thinking that inodes should belong to one container (or may be have it configurable based on some flag).

-rohit

---