
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 2/7] UBC: core (structures, API)
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 17:35:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, 2006-08-18 at 19:38 -0700, Matt Helsley wrote:

<snip>

```
> > >
> > >+ for (p = ub; p != NULL; p = p->parent) {
> > >
> > >
> > > Seems rather expensive to walk up the tree for every charge. Especially
> > > if the administrator wants a fine degree of resource control and makes a
> > > tall tree. This would be a problem especially when it comes to resources
> > > that require frequent and fast allocation.
> > in heirarchical accounting you always have to update all the nodes :/
> > with flat UBC this doesn't introduce significant overhead.
>
> Except that you eventually have to lock ub0. Seems that the cache line
> for that spinlock could bounce quite a bit in such a hot path.
>
> Chandra, doesn't Resource Groups avoid walking more than 1 level up the
> hierarchy in the "charge" paths?
```

Yes, charging happens at one level only (except the case where the group is over its guarantee, it has to borrow from its parent, it will go up).

<snip>

--

```
-----
Chandra Seetharaman      | Be careful what you choose....
- sekharan@us.ibm.com    | .....you may get it.
-----
```