
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Thu, 08 Mar 2007 06:44:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Matt Helsley <matthlhc@us.ibm.com> writes:

> On Thu, 2007-03-08 at 16:32 +-1300, Sam Vilain wrote:

>

> +ADw-snip+AD4

>

> +AD4 Kirill, 06032418:36+-03:

> +AD4 +AD4 I propose to use +ACI-namespace+ACI naming.

> +AD4 +AD4 1. This is already used in fs.

> +AD4 +AD4 2. This is what IMHO suites at least OpenVZ/Eric

> +AD4 +AD4 3. it has good acronym +ACI-ns+ACI.

> +AD4

> +AD4 Right. So, now I'll also throw into the mix:

> +AD4

> +AD4 - resource groups (I get a strange feeling of d+AOk-j+AOA v+APo there)

>

> +ADw-offtopic+AD4

> Re: d+AOk-j+AOA v+APo: yes+ACE

>

> It's like that Star Trek episode ... except we can't agree on the name

> of the impossible particle we will invent which solves all our problems.

> +ADw-/offtopic+AD4

>

> At the risk of prolonging the agony I hate to ask: are all of these

> groupings really concerned with +ACI-resources+ACI?

>

> +AD4 - supply chains (think supply and demand)

> +AD4 - accounting classes

>

> CKRM's use of the term +ACI-class+ACI drew negative comments from Paul Jackson

> and Andrew Morton about this time last year. That led to my suggestion

> of +ACI-Resource Groups+ACI. Unless they've changed their minds...

>

> +AD4 Do any of those sound remotely close? If not, your turn :)

>

> I'll butt in here: task groups? task sets? confuselets? +ADs)

Generically we can use subsystem now for the individual pieces without confusing anyone.

I really don't much care as long as we don't start redefining container as something else. I think the IBM guys took it from solaris originally which seems to define a zone as a set of

isolated processes (for us all separate namespaces). And a container as a set of as a zone that uses resource control. Not exactly how we have been using the term but close enough not to confuse someone.

As long as we don't go calling the individual subsystems or the process groups they need to function a container I really don't care.

I just know that if we use container for just the subsystem level it makes effective communication impossible, and code reviews essentially impossible. As the description says one thing the reviewer reads it as another and then the patch does not match the description. Leading to NAKs.

Resource groups at least for subset of subsystems that aren't namespaces sounds reasonable. Heck resource group, resource controller, resource subsystem, resource just about anything seems sane to me.

The important part is that we find a vocabulary without doubly defined words so we can communicate and a small common set we can agree on so people can work on and implement the individual resource controllers/groups, and get the individual pieces merged as they are reading.

Eric

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