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

Posted by Herbert Poetzl on Fri, 09 Mar 2007 01:06:28 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Wed, Mar 07, 2007 at 11:44:58PM -0700, Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> Matt Helsley <matthltc@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.

from my personal PoV the following would be fine:

spaces (for the various 'spaces')

- similar enough to the old namespace
- can be easily used with prefix/postfix
 like in pid_space, mnt_space, uts_space etc
- AFAIK, it is not used yet for anything else

container (for resource accounting/limits)

- has the 'containment' principle built in :)
- is used in similar ways in other solutions
- sounds similar to context (easy to associate)

note: I'm also fine with other names, as long as we find some useable vocabulary soon, as the different terms start confusing me on a regular basis, and we do not go for already used names, which would clash with Linux-VServer or OpenVZ terminology (which would confuse the hell out of the end-users:)

best, Herbert

- > Eric
- >_____
- > Containers mailing list
- > Containers@lists.osdl.org
- > https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

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