Subject: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by mephisto on Wed, 05 Apr 2006 10:24:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

I've run into problems with one system running a development kernel while the other one doesn't (described here: http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&th=374).

Now one distinct difference between the two systems is that the one that works has everything compiled without NPTL while the one that gets unstable after awhile (just having the openvz modules loaded) is compiled with NPTL. Could this cause the described problems?

Regards,

Mephisto

Subject: Re: Could NPTL cause problems?
Posted by dev on Wed, 05 Apr 2006 11:50:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mephisto, can you describe more preciesly how unstable it is? Oopses? Crashes? Lockups? Please, attach some then. It is also helpfull to get outputs of Alt-SysRq-p, Alt-SysRq-t, Alt-SysRq-m.
If it is a memory leak or something, need /proc/slabinfo and /proc/meminfo

I also wonder, have you succeeded building initrd in gentoo for i2o_block driver or not? I suppose it is easier to use this driver instead of deprecated one.

Subject: Re: Could NPTL cause problems?
Posted by mephisto on Wed, 05 Apr 2006 11:53:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, I have no physical access to the system (200km away) so it's kinda hard to diagnose. I will lay my hands in a few days and will report how it behaves, also with the SysRQ messages. So far I was unable to boot it with i2o_block, initrd or not. Will see how this goes, too.

Subject: Re: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by mephisto on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 16:57:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, I narrowed it down. First of all I'm still unable to use i2o_block, but that's also the case for vanilla kernels, so I gave it up for now.

More importantly I was finally able to diagnose my crashes. I watched the host closely while it was under heavy network load (samba mostly and some rsync). When the errors appeared (network connection very slow, until the host is unreachable). I checked /proc/user_beancounters and found this:

```
Version: 2.5
       uid  resource           held    maxheld    barrier      limit    failcnt
         0: kmemsize        5500576    9732444 2147483647 2147483647          0
            lockedpages        1027       1027 2147483647 2147483647          0
            privvmpages       19654      53732 2147483647 2147483647          0
            shmpages           1326       1345 2147483647 2147483647          0
            dummy                 0          0 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numproc              64        153 2147483647 2147483647          0
            physspages         5236      16629 2147483647 2147483647          0
            vmguarpages           0          0 2147483647 2147483647          0
            oomguarpages       5280      16673 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numtcpsock           23        109 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numflock             66        569 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numpty                2          2 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numsiginfo            0         69 2147483647 2147483647          0
            tcpsndbuf    2147163432 2147486264 2147483647 2147483647       2898
            tcprcvbuf         13112     843416 2147483647 2147483647          0
            othersockbuf      44320    2678104 2147483647 2147483647          0
            dgramrcvbuf           0      26960 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numothersock         34         50 2147483647 2147483647          0
            dcachesize      3643446    4167100 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numfile              535       2536 2147483647 2147483647          0
            dummy                 0          0 2147483647 2147483647          0
            dummy                 0          0 2147483647 2147483647          0
            dummy                 0          0 2147483647 2147483647          0
            numiptent             0          0 2147483647 2147483647          0
       101: kmemsize        5550088    5980112  105495756  116045331          0
            lockedpages           0          0       5151       5151          0
            privvmpages      311785     386062 2147483647 2147483647          0
            shmpages           2655       3295       7726       7726          0
            dummy                 0          0          0          0          0
            numproc             163        178       8000       8000          0
            physspages        66399      67751          0 2147483647          0
            vmguarpages           0          0      77267 2147483647          0
            oomguarpages      66399      67751     200000 2147483647          0
            numtcpsock           20         31       8000       8000          0
            numflock             14         21       1000       1100          0
            numpty                0          1        512        512          0
            numsiginfo            0          3       1024       1024          0
            tcpsndbuf       3239936    3333776   23792300   35147230          0
            tcprcvbuf          1192     159528    2397252   35165252          0
            othersockbuf      28128      85104   20480000 2147483647          0
            dgramrcvbuf           0     243168    1198626    1198626          0
```

numothersock	24	53	8000	8000	0
dcachesize	402711	456183	23031052	23721984	0
numfile	3530	4337	41184	41184	0
dummy	0	0	0	0	0
dummy	0	0	0	0	0
dummy	0	0	0	0	0
numiptent	0	0	200	200	0

So the host's tcpsndbuf is running full. I should mention that I moved eth1 to the vps with NETDEV="eth1". This is the major configuration difference to my test system that runs fine with a venet0 interface.
The error also occured without the vps loaded and traffic occuring just on the not virtualized eth0 interface. I've seen the error with 2.6.15-025stab014 and 2.6.16-026stab007. Do you need any more information?

Subject: Re: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by dev on Sat, 08 Apr 2006 18:45:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:So the host's tcpsndbuf is running full.
looks like a memory leak... bug! can you please post one to bugzilla with a ref to forum and descriptions of your setup, network card etc.

Quote:I should mention that I moved eth1 to the vps with NETDEV="eth1". This is the major configuration difference to my test system that runs fine with a venet0 interface.

oh, this is important info, will try to reproduce it locally then. thanks!

Quote:
The error also occured without the vps loaded and traffic occuring just on the not virtualized eth0 interface. I've seen the error with 2.6.15-025stab014 and 2.6.16-026stab007. Do you need any more information?

sorry, the last statement looks a bit contradictionary to the prev quote. Can you make it clear for me? do you see the same bug, w/o eth1 delegated to VPS?

Subject: Re: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by mephisto on Sat, 08 Apr 2006 19:12:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

dev wrote on Sat, 08 April 2006 20:45
sorry, the last statement looks a bit contradictionary to the prev quote. Can you make it clear for me? do you see the same bug, w/o eth1 delegated to VPS?

You're right, it is. If I think about it, the virtualized eth1 most likely has nothing to do with it. I tried

to reproduce the error locally on another computer but the tcpsndbuf goes back to 0 while there is no traffic, so it might be related to some obscure kernel setting or to the hardware.
I also should mention that I removed the start_net section from my vz initscript (Gentoo that is) because I don't need the venet0 interface.
I'll open a bug tomorrow.

Subject: Re: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by dev on Sun, 09 Apr 2006 05:52:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

any way, mephisto, I would appreciate if you could report the described information (AltSysRq-M, /proc/meminfo, /proc/slabinfo, slabtop) after some time machine is working, but before it goes unresponsible/totally slow. Can you do it please? slab information will help quickly to determine where the leak occurs, so I will be able to make a patch for you.

Subject: Re: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by mephisto on Sun, 09 Apr 2006 08:20:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, will do. This will most likely take till Tuesday, though.

Subject: Re: 0:tcpsndbuf running full [was: Could NPTL cause problems?]
Posted by mephisto on Tue, 11 Apr 2006 14:51:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I opened the bug report here:
http://bugzilla.openvz.org/show_bug.cgi?id=135
