
Subject: Re: containers development plans
Posted by [Paul Jackson](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 07:38:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul M wrote:

> How about if we adopt "process containers" or "task containers" as the
> term for the generic container framework, to distinguish from more
> general user-space containers?

As I just spent the last hour writing in another reply (not noticing your message in my queue), I suspect that these are not best called 'process' (or 'task') containers, but rather 'resource' containers.

You provide what look like more good examples of why this is so, with your mention of various proposals for managing network traffic, which (I'm unsure of this) seem not to bind per-task, but per-link or some such.

Do the various 'subsystems' that you're thinking of correspond to the various resources that we're virtualizing?

Separate question -- what do you mean by 'the generic container framework' ... I'm clueless.

--

I won't rest till it's the best ...
Programmer, Linux Scalability
Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> 1.925.600.0401
