
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
>>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
