

---

Subject: Re: [patch -mm 1/5] mqueue namespace : add struct mq\_namespace  
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Thu, 04 Oct 2007 13:12:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

> Eric W. Biederman [ebiederm@xmission.com] wrote:

> | sukadev@us.ibm.com writes:

> |

> | > Cedric Le Goater [clg@fr.ibm.com] wrote:

> | > | > I think you and Eric (and I) are disagreeing about those limitations.

> | > | > You take it for granted that a sibling pidns is off limits for signals.

> | > | > But the signal wasn't sent using a pid, but using a file (in SIGIO

> | > | > case). So since the fs was shared, the signal should be sent. An

> | > | > event happened, and the receiver wants to know about it.

> | > |

> | > | seen that way I agree.

> | > |

> | > | si\_code is set to SI\_MESGQ, but what do we put in si\_pid ? 0 ?

> | > |

> | > | we could use the si\_errno to pass extra info, like the sending process

> | > | lives in a // world ...

> | > |

> | > | Does the receiver need to know that sender is in a // world ?

probably not. it would mean that the user is container aware. bad idea.

> | What is a // world ?

>

> Parallel world/universe :-)

>

> I am assuming Cedric used that to refer to a sibling pid ns.

yes :)

Thanks !

C.

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

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

---