Subject: Re: Q: How complete is the pid namespace in mainline Posted by Sukadev Bhattiprolu on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 21:29:59 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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

sukadev@us.ibm.com writes:

>

- > Dave had suggested we print a warning the first time a container-init forks()
- > without a handler for a fatal signal. I was planning on adding that as
- > patch 4 of the signal patch set and get some feedback.

Yes. How to cleanly handle signalling of container init is a tricky one. It does sound like you have made a reasonable start there.

| Suka it is a lot more then that. How much more I'm not certain | of. I suspect the only way to find the rest of the cases is | just go through the code with a fine tooth come and read and look.

I agree. I did not mean to ignore the kthread conversions and was only referring to the core pid namespace clone stuff.

So far doing that it has not at all hard for me to find either bugs or places where the implementation can be improved.

Currently we have little things like kill(-1,...) signalling the wrong set of processes, and a couple of proc bugs.

I just realized the fix for this is in the signal patchset I was referring to.

https://lists.linux-foundation.org/pipermail/containers/2007-August/006987.html

I notice that you have sent a patch for the kill -1.

The proc_mnt bug Linus found seems to have slipped through when merging Pavel's and my patches.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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