

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] Signal semantics for /sbin/init  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Tue, 30 Oct 2007 18:09:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dave Hansen <haveblue@us.ibm.com> writes:

> On Mon, 2007-10-29 at 19:24 -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:  
>>  
>> When sending a signal to init. The presence of a signal handler  
>> that is neither SIG\_IGN nor SIG\_DFL allows the signal to be sent to  
>> init. If the signal is not sent it is silently dropped, without  
>> becoming pending. Further if init specifies it's signal handler as  
>> SIG\_IGN or SIG\_DFL all pending signals will be dropped.  
>  
> Does this mean that container-init processes are specially treated when  
> signalled from `_outside_` the container for which they are the init?

My proof of concept patch still needs the extra logic from sukas  
follow on patch.

The result is that container\_init processes will `_not_` be treated  
specially when signaled from outside the container. They will  
be treated like normal processes.

This becomes straight forward to do because we move all of the  
decision logic for dropping signals into the sender.

To maintain backwards compatibility we need only drop signals that  
have a signal handler of SIG\_DFL, not SIG\_IGN (oops).

Eric

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---