

---

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

---

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

---