

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 6/7] BC: kernel memory (core)  
Posted by [Chandra Seetharaman](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 19:25:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tue, 2006-08-29 at 18:58 +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

```
> --- ./include/bc/beancounter.h.bckmem 2006-08-28 12:47:52.000000000 +0400
> +++ ./include/bc/beancounter.h 2006-08-28 12:59:28.000000000 +0400
> @@ -12,7 +12,9 @@
>  * Resource list.
>  */
>
> -#define BC_RESOURCES 0
> +#define BC_KMEMSIZE 0
> +
> +#define BC_RESOURCES 1
```

<snip>

```
> --- ./kernel/bc/beancounter.c.bckmem 2006-08-28 12:52:11.000000000 +0400
> +++ ./kernel/bc/beancounter.c 2006-08-28 12:59:28.000000000 +0400
> @@ -20,6 +20,7 @@ static void init_beancounter_struct(stru
> struct beancounter init_bc;
>
> const char *bc_rnames[] = {
> + "kmemsize", /* 0 */
> };
>
> static struct hlist_head bc_hash[BC_HASH_SIZE];
> @@ -221,6 +222,8 @@ static void init_beancounter_syslimits(s
> {
> int k;
>
> + bc->bc_parms[BC_KMEMSIZE].limit = 32 * 1024 * 1024;
> +
> for (k = 0; k < BC_RESOURCES; k++)
> bc->bc_parms[k].barrier = bc->bc_parms[k].limit;
> }
```

As I mentioned in one of my earlier email

( <http://marc.theaimsgroup.com/?l=linux-kernel&m=115619384500289&w=2>),  
IMHO, this way of defining an interface is not clean/clear (for  
controller writers).

<snip>

--

-----  
Chandra Seetharaman | Be careful what you choose....

- sekharan@us.ibm.com | .....you may get it.