

---

Subject: Re: Attaching PID 0 to a cgroup  
Posted by [Andrea Righi](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2008 21:48:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Li Zefan wrote:

> CC: Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com>

>

> Dhaval Giani wrote:

>> [put in the wrong alias for containers list correcting it.]

>>

>> On Tue, Jul 01, 2008 at 03:15:45PM +0530, Dhaval Giani wrote:

>>> Hi Paul,

>>>

>>> Attaching PID 0 to a cgroup caused the current task to be attached to

>>> the cgroup. Looking at the code,

>>>

>

> [...]

>

>>> I was wondering, why this was done. It seems to be unexpected behavior.

>>> Wouldn't something like the following be a better response? (I've used

>>> EINVAL, but I can change it to ESRCH if that is better.)

>>>

>

> Why is it unexpected? it follows the behavior of cpuset, so this patch will

> break backward compatibility of cpuset.

>

> But it's better to document this.

>

> -----

>

> Document the following cgroup usage:

> # echo 0 > /dev/cgroup/tasks

>

> Signed-off-by: Li Zefan <lizf@cn.fujitsu.com>

> ---

> cgroups.txt | 4 ++++

> 1 file changed, 4 insertions(+)

>

> diff --git a/Documentation/cgroups.txt b/Documentation/cgroups.txt

> index 824fc02..213f533 100644

> --- a/Documentation/cgroups.txt

> +++ b/Documentation/cgroups.txt

> @@ -390,6 +390,10 @@ If you have several tasks to attach, you have to do it one after another:

> ...

> # /bin/echo PIDn > tasks

>

```
> +You can attach the current task by echoing 0:  
> +  
> +# /bin/echo 0 > tasks  
> +  
> 3. Kernel API  
> =====
```

Wouldn't be more meaningful to specify the bash's builtin echo here even if it doesn't opportunely handle write() errors?

Using /bin/echo would attach /bin/echo itself to the cgroup, that just exists, so it seems like a kind of noop, isn't it?

-Andrea

---

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

---