

And if resources are not nested like this, than it is a PLAIN container structure.

Kirill

> In particular, the following scenario should be perfectly valid:

```
>
> Machine 1           Machine 2
> Xen VM1.1           Xen VM2.1
>   vserv 1.1.1        vserv2.1.1
>     cont1.1.1.1      cont2.1.1.1
>     cont1.1.1.2      cont2.1.1.2
>     cont1.1.1.n      cont2.1.1.n
>   vserv 1.1.2        vserv2.1.2
>     cont1.1.2.1      cont2.1.2.1
>     cont1.1.2.2      cont2.1.2.2
>     cont1.1.2.n      cont2.1.2.n
> Xen VM1.2           Xen VM2.2
>   vserv 1.2.1        vserv2.2.1
>     cont1.2.1.1      cont2.2.1.1
>     cont1.2.1.2      cont2.2.1.2
>     cont1.2.1.n      cont2.2.1.n
>   vserv 1.2.2        vserv2.2.2
>     cont1.2.2.1      cont2.2.2.1
>     cont1.2.2.2      cont2.2.2.2
>     cont1.2.2.n      cont2.2.2.n
```

> where containers are used for each virtual server and each container,
> so that we can migrate entire VMs, entire virtual servers, or any
> container.

>>>>> Perhaps we can get a ruling from core team on this one, as it's
>>>>> aesthetics :-).

>> I propose to use "namespace" naming.

>> 1. This is already used in fs.

>> 2. This is what IMHO suites at least OpenVZ/Eric

>> 3. it has good acronym "ns".

> I agree.

> -serge