Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 1/5] Virtualization/containers: startup Posted by Jeff Garzik on Fri, 03 Feb 2006 18:55:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Dave Hansen wrote:
```

- > On Fri, 2006-02-03 at 09:49 -0800, Linus Torvalds wrote:
- >>One thing I don't particularly like is some of the naming. To me "vps"
- >>doesn't sound particularly generic or logical. I realize that it probably
- >>makes perfect sense to you (and I assume it just means "virtual private >>servers"), but especially if you see patches 1-3 to really be independent
- >>servers), but especially if you see patches 1-3 to really be independe >>of any "actual" virtualization code that is totally generic, I'd actually
- >>prefer a less specialized name.

>

- > I just did a global s/vps/container/ and it looks pretty reasonable, at
- > least from my point of view.

I would have chosen the much shorter "box" or "jar", but that's just me:)

- > "tsk->owner_container" That makes it sound like a pointer to the "task
- > owner's container". How about "owning_container"? The "container
- > owning this task". Or, maybe just "container"?

slip 'parent' in there...

- > Any particular reason for the "u32 id" in the vps info struct as opposed
- > to one of the more generic types? Do we want to abstract this one in
- > the same way we do pid_t?

>

- > The "host" in "host_container_info" doesn't mean much to me. Though, I
- > guess it has some context in the UML space. Would "init_container_info"
- > or "root_container_info" be more descriptive?

probably

Jeff