Subject: Re: [PATCH 04/10] memcg: Introduce __GFP_NOACCOUNT.
Posted by Glauber Costa on Tue, 06 Mar 2012 10:36:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 03/04/2012 04:10 AM, Suleiman Souhlal wrote:
> On Sat, Mar 3, 2012 at 3:24 PM, Glauber Costa<glommer@parallels.com> wrote:
>> On 03/03/2012 01:38 PM, Suleiman Souhlal wrote:
>>> Another possible example might be the skb data, which are just kmalloc
>>> and are already accounted by your TCP accounting changes, so we might
>>> not want to account them a second time.
>>
>>
>> How so?
>>
>> struct sk_buff *__alloc_skb(unsigned int size, gfp_t gfp_mask,
>>   int fclone, int node)
>> {
>>   [...]
>>   cache = fclone ? skbuff_fclone_cache : skbuff_head_cache;
>>
>>   /* Get the HEAD */
>>   skb = kmem_cache_alloc_node(cache, gfp_mask& ~__GFP_DMA, node);
>
> Just a few lines below:
>
>   data = kmalloc_node_track_caller(size, gfp_mask, node);
>
> -- Suleiman
Can't we just make sure those come from the root cgroup's slabs?
Then we need no flag.

Subject: Re: [PATCH 04/10] memcg: Introduce __GFP_NOACCOUNT.
Posted by Suleiman Souhlal on Tue, 06 Mar 2012 16:13:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, Mar 6, 2012 at 2:36 AM, Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com> wrote:
> On 03/04/2012 04:10 AM, Suleiman Souhlal wrote:
>>
>> Just a few lines below:
>>
>>   data = kmalloc_node_track_caller(size, gfp_mask, node);
>>
>> -- Suleiman
>
> Can't we just make sure those come from the root cgroup's slabs?
> Then we need no flag.

Do you mean make it so that all kmallocs come from the root cgroup's slabs?
We would really like to account kmallocs in general (and all the other
slab types) to the right cgroup...

That said, I'm probably going to concentrate on accounting specially
marked caches only, for now, since there seems to be a strong
opposition on accounting everything, even though I don't understand
this point of view.

-- Suleiman