Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!
Posted by Paul Menage on Wed, 07 Mar 2007 23:18:25 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 3/7/07, Eric W. Biederman <ebiederm@xmission.com> wrote:
> > Effectively, container_group is to container as nsproxy is to namespace.
>
> The statement above nicely summarizes the confusion in terminology.
>
> In the namespace world when we say container we mean roughly at the level
> of nsproxy and container_group.

So you're saying that a task can only be in a single system-wide container.

My patch provides multiple potentially-independent ways of dividing up
the tasks on the system - if the "container" is the set of all
divisions that the process is in, what's an appropriate term for the
sub-units?

>
> You are calling something that is on par with a namespace a container.

Yes.

> Which
> seriously muddies the waters. About as much as calling as referring to your
> shoe as your whole outfit.
> Without fixing the terminology it is going to be very hard to
> successfully communicate.

That assumes the viewpoint that your terminology is "correct" and
other people's needs "fixing". :-)

But as I've said I'm not particularly wedded to the term "container"
if that really turned out to be what's blocking acceptance from people
like Andrew or Linus. Do you have a suggestion for a better name? To
me, "process container" seems like the ideal name, since it's an
abstraction that "contains" processes and associates them with some
(subsystem-provided) state.

Paul

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers