
Subject: Strange problem with lockedpages limits
Posted by [kamistral](#) on Sun, 26 Dec 2010 18:18:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Since a few months it happens sometimes that the failcnt increases without hitting the soft or hard limit:

uid	resource	held	maxheld	barrier	limit	failcnt
104:	lockedpages	0	948	1536	1536	8
103:	lockedpages	0	966	1536	1536	3

I'm using Debian 5.0.7 with Kernel linux-image-2.6.26-2-openvz-amd64, the containers with the mentioned problems have both running varnish 2.1, one with lighttpd behind, one with tomcat.

I really searched the forums, mailing lists and more but didn't find anything useful regarding this, any ideas?

Subject: Re: Strange problem with lockedpages limits
Posted by [jakob](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2010 01:16:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Looks like something tries to lock a large number of pages at once and would exceed the limit by that. The whole operation fails of course, so failcnt increases, but maxheld stays the same.

1536 is quite low - I'd just double that at least.

Subject: Re: Strange problem with lockedpages limits
Posted by [kamistral](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2010 10:20:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jarg wrote on Wed, 29 December 2010 20:16 Looks like something tries to lock a large number of pages at once and would exceed the limit by that. The whole operation fails of course, so failcnt increases, but maxheld stays the same.

Thanks, that didn't came into my mind

Quote:1536 is quite low - I'd just double that at least.
I've set them to 15360:15360 and I'll keep watching the failcnt numbers.

Subject: Re: Strange problem with lockedpages limits
Posted by [kamistral](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2010 10:24:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jarg wrote on Thu, 30 December 2010 02:16 Looks like something tries to lock a large number of pages at once and would exceed the limit by that. The whole operation fails of course, so failcnt

increases, but maxheld stays the same.
Thanks, that didn't come into my mind

Quote:1536 is quite low - I'd just double that at least.
I've set them to 15360:15360 for now, and I'll keep an eye on the failcnt numbers - could take some weeks to get results, it only happens sometimes (the last days the failcnt didn't increase).
