

---

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] containers development plans

Posted by [serge](#) on Tue, 10 Jul 2007 21:30:45 GMT

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

---

Quoting Serge E. Hallyn ([serge@hallyn.com](mailto:serge@hallyn.com)):

> Quoting Paul Jackson ([pj@sgi.com](mailto: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.

I plan to keep the thread titled 'containers' precisely because \*I\*

don't care whose work gets renamed, while several other people on both

sides care so strongly, so it would seem rude for me to make that decision de-facto in this way.

Maybe renaming one or both projects should be listed in the roadmap as a todo :)

thanks,  
-serge

---

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

---