Subject: Naming the "Task containers" framework
Posted by Paul Menage on Wed, 05 Sep 2007 05:54:29 GMT

At the mini-summit, and at other times, I've heard the repeated complaint that having the word "container" in the name of the "task container" framework leads to ambiguity. And separately from the complaints, I've seen the awkwardness that people end up with when they feel they have to distinguish between the "containers" abstract concept, and "Paul's containers" ...

With the hope/prospect of having the framework merged some time after the kernel summit, I guess now's a good time to bow to the pressure and find some compromise that everyone likes, before we actually hit mainline. (Maybe earlier would have been even better, but ...)

Of the various possible names that have been suggested, there are a couple that (to me) stand out as good options:

- control groups
- task sets

The former (coined by Eric during a brainstorming session yesterday) seems to capture the enforcement aspect of the framework (sysadmin can use it to control the behaviour of processes, processes can't escape from groups), without suggesting that it can only be used for resource controllers (as some alternative names such as "resource groups" imply) and would be a choice that I could be happy with.

Does anyone have strong views on other alternative names (or even the idea of keeping "task containers")?

Paul

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