
Subject: Re: Naming the "Task containers" framework
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 15:04:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul Menage wrote:

> On 9/11/07, Serge E. Hallyn <serue@us.ibm.com> wrote:
>> Quoting Paul Menage (menage@google.com):
>>> 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")?
>> Purely subjectively I prefer control groups, but task sets is more
>> descriptive about the implementation.
>
> I described it as "control groups" during the kernel summit
> presentation and no-one seemed to object to that name.
>
> As far as I can tell, the general mood seems to be in favour of
> "control groups" - no-one else has expressed a preference for "task
> sets".
>
> I think it's more important to express the overall intention of the
> feature rather than the implementation. Ted T'so (I think) asked at
> the summit whether things other than tasks could be first-class
> members of control groups - I said that currently they can't, but

> people may find interesting ways to conveniently make non-task objects
> first-class members in the future (rather than just holding reference
> counts the way pages do currently).
>
>> So I'd have to vote for task sets.
>>
>> I like 'task containers', but it really is a pain trying to keep clear
>> which containers I'm talking about from one sentence to the next.
>
> Right, enough people have said this to me now, and I've seen the
> awkwardness that it entails - I don't want to add a subsystem to the
> kernel that's forever referred to as "Paul's containers" :-)

That's how I've been calling them for a while :)

Now that LWN has announced the name rebrand in the article :

<http://lwn.net/Articles/249080/>

I hope we can close the topic.

C.

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