
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH] BC: resource beancounters (v4) (added user memory)

Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Wed, 13 Sep 2006 12:15:25 GMT

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

On Wed, Sep 13, 2006 at 12:06:41PM +0400, Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> OK. Then limiting must be done this way (unreclaimable limit/total limit)

> A (15/40)

> B (25/100)

> C (35/100)

s/35/30?

Also the different b/n total and unreclaimable limits goes towards limiting reclaimable memory i suppose? And 1st limit seems to be a hard-limit while the 2nd one is soft?

> D (10/100)

> E (20/50)

> In this case each group will receive it's guarantee for sure.

>

> E.g. even if A, B, E and D will eat all it's unreclaimable memory then

> we'll have

> $100 - 15 - 25 - 20 - 10 = 30\%$ of memory left (maybe after reclaiming) which

> is perfectly enough for C's guarantee.

I agree by carefully choosing these limits, we can provide some sort of QoS, which is a good step to begin with.

--

Regards,
vatsa
