

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] Do not set /proc inode->pid for non-pid-related inodes  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2007 17:24:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

> The way I'm testing pidspace right now is  
>  
> ns\_exec -c -p /usr/sbin/sshd -p 9999  
>  
> in which case sshd is pid1. Works fine...  
>  
> Would it be very limiting to have the first process have to stick  
> around? (I'm asking, not criticizing - it's \*my\* preference that we  
> allow pid==1 to exit, but if that's really not advantageous then  
> maybe it's not worth fixing the ugly pieces that require it right  
> now -afaik right now that's only the fact that PROC\_INODE(/proc)->pid  
> points to the struct pid for pidnr==1)

The /proc part is easy to fix. All I want to see there is that we do the right thing with pid related files. When the pid namespace is empty.

The practical reason for only allowing a pid namespace while pid == 1 exists, is something much more simple.

pid == 1 must exist today. We get into an extension of the semantics if we allow the case where pid == 1 exists. Semantic extensions can be very tricky, and we are way too early to see what the impact of such a semantic extension would be.

Therefore I request that we get a correct and work pid namespace before we try and extend things.

I also request that until questions like this are settled we leave the whole thing CONFIG\_EXPERIMENTAL.

I have yet to see how we are going to implement things such as kill -1. And the other changes. There are huge chunks of functionality that we haven't gotten to yet.

Eric

---

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

---