

---

Subject: Re: containers development plans  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 17:23:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> writes:

>> they are indirectly related. Sorry for the noise.  
>  
> Well ... if this is noise, it should be me apologizing, not you <grin>.  
> I'm the one who asked.  
>  
>> Paul Menage's container patches provide a process aggregation mechanism,  
>> like PAGG did. This is a common requirement for resource management and  
>> other container features like resource isolation and checkpoint/restart.  
>  
> So ... will you (those using the netns patches) be using Paul Menage's  
> containers, or competing with them for the same ends, or what?  
>  
> To repeat my original question, what is the relation between the work  
> described on this thread (which some OLS discussions have decided to  
> base on the netns patches) and Paul Menage's containers and my (now the  
> community's) cpusets.

Largely orthogonal.

This discussions is hard because Paul has appropriated our term for the user space aggregation of all of the pieces (a container) using for some subset of that, so my apologies if there is some confusion.

There are a few issues with the filesystem part of Paul's patchset that currently do not allow for nested containers.

Generally the Paul's container filesystem work provides a generic framework for resources controls that we want in addition to the namespaces. I'm not at all certain I like the filesystem interface to user space, but having a common interface to user space and helper code to use it for all of the resource controls makes sense.

I think there is a little more like a user space visible identifier that is also interesting.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---