

---

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

Posted by [Sam Vilain](#) on Sat, 10 Mar 2007 09:06:11 GMT

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

---

Herbert Poetzi wrote:

> On Wed, Mar 07, 2007 at 11:44:58PM -0700, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

>

>> 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.

>> [...]

>> 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, [...]

I like these a lot, particularly in that "mount space" could be a reasonable replacement for "namespace".

As a result of this discussion, I see the sense in Paul Menage's original choice of term.

There's just one problem. We'd have to rename the mailing list to "spaces and containers" :-)

Sam.

---

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

---