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

Posted by [Sam Vilain](#) on Thu, 08 Mar 2007 00:35:46 GMT

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

Paul Menage wrote:

>> 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.

>

Nope, we didn't make the mistake of nailing down what a "container" was too far before it is implemented. We talked before about containers-within-containers because, inevitably if you provide a feature you'll end up having to deal with virtualising systems that in turn use that feature.

> 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?

>

namespace, since 2.4.x

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

>

Absolutely. Please respect the semantics established so far; changing them adds nothing at the cost of much confusion.

> 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.

>

It's not even really the term, it's the semantics.

Sam.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.osdl.org

<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
