
Subject: Re: Naming the "Task containers" framework

Posted by [serue](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 15:09:21 GMT

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

Quoting Cedric Le Goater (clg@fr.ibm.com):

> 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 :)

It works pretty well :)

> Now that LWN has announced the name rebrand in the article :
>
> <http://lwn.net/Articles/249080/>
>
> I hope we can close the topic.

Sure *now* you tell me. You had to wait until I provided yet one more
example of how my own preferences can be taken as a reliable indicator
of the inverse of the group consensus :)

-serge

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