Subject: Re: [PATCH] Allow signalling container-init Posted by Sukadev Bhattiprolu on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 00:48:12 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Pavel Emelianov [xemul@openvz.org] wrote:
Oleg Nesterov wrote:
 >On 08/09, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:
 >>Oleg Nesterov [oleg@tv-sign.ru] wrote:
 >>| On 08/08, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:
 >>| >
 >>| > From: Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com>
 >>| > Subject: [PATCH] Allow signalling container-init
 >>| >
 >>| > Only the global-init process must be special - any other
 >>container-init
 >>| > process must be killable to prevent run-away processes in the system.
 >> I think you are right, but....
 >>|
 >>| > --- lx26-23-rc1-mm1.orig/kernel/signal.c 2007-08-07
 >>13:52:12.00000000 -0700
 >>| > +++ lx26-23-rc1-mm1/kernel/signal.c 2007-08-08
 >>15:09:27.000000000 -0700
 >>| > @ @ -1861,11 +1861,9 @ @ relock:
 >>| >
       continue:
 >>| >
 >>| > /*
 >>| > - * Init of a pid space gets no signals it doesn't
 >>want from
 >>| > - * within that pid space. It can of course get
 >>signals from
 >>| > - * its parent pid space.
 >>| > + * Global init gets no signals it doesn't want.
 >>| > - if (current == task_child_reaper(current))
 >>| > + if (is global init(current->group leader))
 >>| >
         continue:
 >>|
 >>| ...this breaks exec() from /sbin/init. Note that de_thread() kills other
 >>| sub-threads with SIGKILL. With this patch de thread() will hang waiting
 >>| for other threads to die.
 >>Again for threaded-init I guess :-(
 >>
 >>Well, we discussed last week about allowing non-root users to clone their
 >>pid namespace. The user can then create a container-init and this
 >>process would become immune to signal even by a root user?
>
```

| Well, I agree with Oleg. I think that we should keep the patches | without the signal handling until this set is in (at least) -mm. | init pid namespace will work without it as used to do, and we'll | develop a better signal handling and fix existing BUGs.

I know that this creates a hole for creating unkillable process, but since this is for root user only (CAP_SYS_ADMIN) this is OK.

But I think there is a difference bw what you are saying and what Oleg is saying.

Oleg pls correct me if I am wrong, but from what I understand, we just need modify my earlier fix so we can still terminate the container from a parent namespace but preserve the existing behavior w.r.t threaded-inits.

Here is the modified patch for this.

Suka

From: Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> Subject: [PATCH] Allow signalling container-init

Only the global-init process must be special - any other container-init process must be killable to prevent run-away processes in the system.

TODO: Ideally we should allow killing the container-init only from parent container and prevent it being killed from within the container. But that is a more complex change and will be addressed by a follow-on patch. For now allow the container-init to be terminated by any process with sufficient privileges.

Signed-off-by: Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com>

```
kernel/signal.c |
                 6 ++----
1 file changed, 2 insertions(+), 4 deletions(-)
Index: lx26-23-rc1-mm1/kernel/signal.c
_____
--- lx26-23-rc1-mm1.orig/kernel/signal.c 2007-08-07 13:52:12.000000000 -0700
+++ lx26-23-rc1-mm1/kernel/signal.c 2007-08-09 17:22:19.000000000 -0700
@@ -1861,11 +1861,9 @@ relock:
  continue:
  * Init of a pid space gets no signals it doesn't want from
  * within that pid space. It can of course get signals from
  * its parent pid space.
  * Global init gets no signals it doesn't want.
- if (current == task_child_reaper(current))
+ if (is_global_init(current))
  continue;
 if (sig_kernel_stop(signr)) {
Containers mailing list
```

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