
Subject: Re: Q: How complete is the pid namespace in mainline
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 23:09:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sukadev@us.ibm.com writes:

> 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.

Sure, and that make sense.

> | 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.

Yes. I'm trying to get out as many simple little bug fixes
as I can.

Sorry for missing the fact you guys had generated some patches
to address this. Still I think mine is a little more comprehensive
and shorter ;)

That bug is on my list of really nasty bugs I want to avoid.

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

I really don't mind a handful of little bugs, it would be surprising if something hadn't slipped through at this point.

As long as everyone is aware that it is going to take a bit to find everything and stabilizing it all and everyone keeps looking we should be fine.

Oh. Do you know if there was a good reason for forcing the tty, session, and process group of a the first process in a pid namespace?

Eric

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