Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] Do not set /proc inode->pid for non-pid-related inodes Posted by ebjederm on Wed, 21 Mar 2007 16:57:24 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Cedric Le Goater <clg@fr.ibm.com> writes:

- > Eric W. Biederman wrote:
- >> "Serge E. Hallyn" <serue@us.ibm.com> writes:

>>

- >>> So how do you see us enforcing pid1's existance? Somehow keep it from
- >>> fully exiting, or just kill all the processes in it's namespace if it
- >>> exits?

>

- > what about a kthread that would be spawned when a task is cloned in an
- > unshared pid namespace? This is an extra cost in term of tasks.

If you use kernel_thread this can happen. (Die kernel_thread). If you use the kthread interface keventd will be the parent process and we won't have problems. Thus most users of kernel_thread need to be fixed to use the kthread interface.

Thanks for the reminder of this one, I had forgotten that bit of reasoning for updating kernel_thread users.

- >> Killing all other processes in the namespace when pid1 exits is what
- >> I implemented last time around.

>

> this looks like a sane thing to do.

Eric

Containers mailing list

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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