
Subject: Re: Re: [PATCH 1/3] Signal semantics for /sbin/init
Posted by [Oleg Nesterov](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 15:22:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 09/14, Daniel Pittman wrote:

>
> Oleg Nesterov <oleg@tv-sign.ru> writes:
> > On 09/13, Cedric Le Goater wrote:
> >> Oleg Nesterov wrote:
>
> [...]
>
> >> To respect the current init semantic,
> >
> > The current init semantic is broken in many ways ;)
>
> Yup. They sure are, but they are pretty set in stone by now. :)
>
> >> shouldn't we discard any unblockable signal (STOP and KILL) sent by a
> >> process to its pid namespace init process ? Then, all other signals
> >> should be handled appropriately by the pid namespace init.
> >
> > Yes, I think you are probably right, this should be enough in
> > practice. After all, only root can send the signal to /sbin/init. On
> > my machine, /proc/1/status shows that init doesn't have a handler for
> > non-ignored SIGUNUSED == 31, though.
> >
> > But who knows? The kernel promises some guarantees, it is not good to
> > break them. Perhaps some strange non-standard environment may suffer.
>
> In this case "strange non-standard environments" would mean anyone
> running the 'upstart' daemon from recent Ubuntu -- it depends on the
> current kernel semantics.

Just curious, could you tell more? What "current kernel semantics" do you mean?

Do you mean that the 'upstart' daemon sends the unhandled signal to init?

Oleg.

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