
Subject: Re: Re: [PATCH] Hookup group-scheduler with task container infrastructure

Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 18:38:10 GMT

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

On 9/10/07, Srivatsa Vaddagiri <vatsa@linux.vnet.ibm.com> wrote:

>

> Unless folks have strong objection to it, I prefer "cptctlr", the way it is.

>

By definition any container (about to be renamed control group) subsystem is some kind of "controller" so that bit seems a bit redundant.

Any reason not to just call it "cpu" or "cpu_sched"

Paul

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
