

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] BC: resource beancounters (v2)  
Posted by [Alan Cox](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 15:36:08 GMT

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

---

Ar Sad, 2006-08-26 am 01:14 +1000, ysgrifennodd Nick Piggin:

> I still think doing simple accounting per-page would be a better way to  
> go than trying to pin down all "user allocatable" kernel allocations.  
> And would require all of about 2 hooks in the page allocator. And would  
> track \*actual\* RAM allocated by that container.

You have a variety of kernel objects you want to worry about and they have very differing properties.

Some are basically shared resources - page cache, dentries, inodes, etc and can be balanced pretty well by the kernel (ok the dentries are a bit of a problem right now). Others are very specific "owned" resources - like file handles, sockets and vmas.

Tracking actual RAM use by container/user/.. isn't actually that interesting. It's also inconveniently sub page granularity.

Its a whole seperate question whether you want a separate bean counter limit for sockets, file handles, vmas etc.

Alan

---