Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] containers development plans
Posted by serge on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 16:32:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quoting Paul Jackson (pj@sgi.com):
> Kirill, Serge, et al,
>
> Is it fair to say then that Paul Menage's containers are primarily
> for the purposes of managing resources, while namespaces are for the
> purposes of managing identifiers?
>
> We've got some resources, like cpu cycles, memory bytes, network
> bandwidth, that we want to allocate and account for differentially
> by groups of tasks -- that's Menage's containers.
>
> We've got some system wide namespaces, like process id's, that we
> want to virtualize, for more flexible uses -- these are the name-
> space containers.
>
> In Serge's opening post to this thread, he wrote:
> 1. namespaces
> 2. process containers
> 3. checkpoint/restart
>
> Are the 'process containers' of item (2) the containers of Paul Menage?

Yup.

> If so, then I propose that this thread is misnamed. It should not be
> "containers development plans", but rather "namespace, container and
> c/r development plans." And if so, there is really no conflict over
> the use of the word 'container' -- that applies just to the resource
> virtualization efforts, of which my cpusets is the granddaddy example,
> being generalized by Paul Menage with his container patches. The other
> work is, as Serge actually termed it in the body of his post, better
> called 'namespaces'.
>
> Perhaps the confusion arose from looking for a single word to encompass
> all three parts, listed above, of this work. The efforts have some strong

Not exactly - the "confusion" arose because the ksummit committee wanted
to hear about "containers", and agreed that by that term they mean each
of those three. So I kept the term 'containers' in the roadmap title,
but we can change that if it's preferred.

thanks,
-serge

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers