Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!
Posted by Paul Menage on Thu, 08 Mar 2007 02:57:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On 3/7/07, Sam Vilain <sam@vilain.net> wrote:
>
> Sorry, I didn't realise I was talking with somebody qualified enough to
> speak on behalf of the Generally Established Principles of Computer Science.

I made sure to check

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Namespace
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Namespace_%28computer_science%29

when this argument started ... :-)

>
> This is the classic terminology problem between substance and function.
> ie, some things share characteristics but does that mean they are the
> same thing?

Aren't you arguing my side here? My point is that what I'm trying to add with "containers" (or whatever name we end up using) can't easily be subsumed into the "namespace" concept, and you're arguing that they should go into nsproxy because they share some characteristics.

>
> Look, I already agreed in the earlier thread that the term "namespace"
> was being stretched beyond belief, yet instead of trying to be useful
> about this you still insist on calling this sub-system specific stuff
> the "container",

Uh, no. I'm trying to call a *grouping* of processes a container.

> and then go screaming that I am wrong and you are right
> on terminology.

Actually I asked if you/Eric had better suggestions.

Paul

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [PATCH 0/2] resource control file system - aka containers on top of nsproxy!
Posted by Sam Vilain on Thu, 08 Mar 2007 03:32:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Paul Menage wrote:
> I made sure to check [...]wikipedia.org[...] when this argument started ... :-)
>

Wikipedia?! That's not a referen[...]

oh bugger it. I've vented enough today and we're on the same page now I think.

>> This is the classic terminology problem between substance and function.
>> ie, some things share characteristics but does that mean they are the
>> same thing?
>>
>
> Aren't you arguing my side here? My point is that what I'm trying to
> add with "containers" (or whatever name we end up using) can't easily
> be subsumed into the "namespace" concept, and you're arguing that they
> should go into nsproxy because they share some characteristics.
>

Ok, they share this characteristic with namespaces: that they group processes. So, they conceptually hang off task_struct. But we put them on ns_proxy because we've got this vague notion that things might be better that way.

>> about this you still insist on calling this sub-system specific stuff
>> the "container",
>>
> Uh, no. I'm trying to call a *grouping* of processes a container.
>

Ok, so is this going to supplant the namespaces too?

>> and then go screaming that I am wrong and you are right
>> on terminology.
>>
>
> Actually I asked if you/Eric had better suggestions.
>

Cool, let's review them.

Me, 07921311:38+12:
> This would suggesting re-write this patchset, part 2 as a "CPUSet

> namespace", part 4 as a "CPU scheduling namespace", parts 5 and 6 as
> "Resource Limits Namespace" (drop this "BeanCounter" brand), and of
> course part 7 falls away.
Me, 07022110:58+12:
> Did you like the names I came up with in my original reply?
> - CPUset namespace for CPU partitioning
> - Resource namespaces:
>   - cpusched namespace for CPU
>   - ulimit namespace for memory
>   - quota namespace for disk space
>   - io namespace for disk activity
>   - etc

Ok, there's nothing original or useful there; I'm obviously quite deliberately still punting on the issue.

Eric, 07030718:32-07:
> Pretty much. For most of the other cases I think we are safe referring
> to them as resource controls or resource limits.   I know that roughly
> covers what cpusets and beancounters and ckrm currently do.

Let's go back in time to the thread I referred to:

Me, 06032209:08+12 and nearby posts
> - "vserver" spelt in full
> - family
> - container
> - jail
> - task_ns (sort for namespace)
> Using the term "box" and ID term "boxid":
> create_space - creates a new space and "hashes" it

Kirill, 06032418:36+03:
> 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".

Right. So, now I'll also throw into the mix:

- supply chains (think supply and demand)
- accounting classes

Do any of those sound remotely close? If not, your turn :)

And do we bother changing IPC namespaces or let that one slide?

Sam.

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers