Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] Do not set /proc inode->pid for non-pid-related inodes
Posted by ebiederm on Tue, 20 Mar 2007 22:11:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Serge E. Hallyn" <serue@us.ibm.com> writes:

>> >
>> > Except that unless we mandate that pid1 in any namespace can't exit, and
>> > put that feature off until later, we can't not address it.
>>
>> What if we mandate that pid1 is the last process to exit?
>
> I think people have complained about that in the past for application
> containers, but I really don't see where it hurts anything.
>
> Cedric, Herbert, did one of you think it would be bad?

Sure. As an extension I don't have a problem with the notion, of
allowing pid1 to exit before others. But if it makes things harder
on us I don't want to support it, at least not initially.

Eric

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