Subject: task_session() and task->signal->session
Posted by Sukadev Bhattiprolu on Wed, 15 Nov 2006 23:46:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I am trying to understand the diff between task_session() and
task->signal-session and why we have the two notions of session.
Are we just phasing out one of them ?

In general each process has a single session id. The only exception
being a process that unshares its pid ns. Such process will have
exactly two session ids, one for each pid ns. No ?

Thanks,

Suka

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

Subject: Re: task_session() and task->signal->session
Posted by serue on Thu, 16 Nov 2006 16:17:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Looking at fork, it seems that task->group_leader is a thread grp
leader. If you fork without the CLONE_THREAD flag, then
task->group_leader is set to task itself. If with CLONE_THREAD flag,
then task->group_leader is set to the parent->group_leader.

The signal->session presumably is what we think of as process session.
At fork it is always set to parent->signal->session, and see
kernel/sys.c for where it gets tweaked.

-serge

Quoting Sukadev Bhattiprolu (sukadev@us.ibm.com):
>
> I am trying to understand the diff between task_session() and
> task->signal-session and why we have the two notions of session.
> Are we just phasing out one of them ?
>
> In general each process has a single session id. The only exception
> being a process that unshares its pid ns. Such process will have
> exactly two session ids, one for each pid ns. No ?
>
> Thanks,
>

> Suka
> _____
> Containers mailing list
> Containers@lists.osdl.org
> https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

Subject: Re: task_session() and task->signal->session
Posted by ebiederm on Thu, 16 Nov 2006 23:46:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> writes:

> I am trying to understand the diff between task_session() and
> task->signal-session and why we have the two notions of session.
> Are we just phasing out one of them ?

Yes.

> In general each process has a single session id. The only exception
> being a process that unshares its pid ns. Such process will have
> exactly two session ids, one for each pid ns. No ?

Each process has a single session.

That session can potentially have a different session id in each
pid namespace.

So for internal tests we want to compare the struct pid pointers
instead of the numbers visible to user space.

Eric

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers

Subject: Re: task_session() and task->signal->session
Posted by Sukadev Bhattiprolu on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 18:15:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks.

Eric W. Biederman [ebiederm@xmission.com] wrote:
| Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> writes:
|
| > I am trying to understand the diff between task_session() and
| > task->signal-session and why we have the two notions of session.
| > Are we just phasing out one of them ?
|
| Yes.

I guess we are phasing out task->signal->session.

|
| > In general each process has a single session id. The only exception
| > being a process that unshares its pid ns. Such process will have
| > exactly two session ids, one for each pid ns. No ?
|
| Each process has a single session.
|
| That session can potentially have a different session id in each
| pid namespace.

both of us used the word "have" above. But do we actually store (in some
data structure) the multiple session ids ? Or will the following work:

Each task refers to another task (possibly itself) as its session
leader (we find this using task_session()).

The session leader, like any other task, has multiple process ids,
one in each namespace.

So to find the session id of a task, we find its session leader
and find the appropriate process id of the session leader

i.e we don't actually store the multiple sids a task

|
| So for internal tests we want to compare the struct pid pointers
| instead of the numbers visible to user space.
|
| Eric

Subject: Re: task_session() and task->signal->session
Posted by ebiederm on Fri, 17 Nov 2006 18:41:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> writes:

> Thanks.
>
> Eric W. Biederman [ebiederm@xmission.com] wrote:
> | Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> writes:
> |
> | > I am trying to understand the diff between task_session() and
> | > task->signal-session and why we have the two notions of session.
> | > Are we just phasing out one of them ?
> |
> | Yes.
>
> I guess we are phasing out task->signal->session.

Largely. There are a couple of cases where it makes sense to
optimize queries from the current pid namespace. Keeping
some of the pid_t values around for that case helps.

> |
> | > In general each process has a single session id. The only exception
> | > being a process that unshares its pid ns. Such process will have
> | > exactly two session ids, one for each pid ns. No ?
> |
> | Each process has a single session.
> |
> | That session can potentially have a different session id in each
> | pid namespace.
>
> both of us used the word "have" above. But do we actually store (in some
> data structure) the multiple session ids ? Or will the following work:
>
> Each task refers to another task (possibly itself) as its session
> leader (we find this using task_session()).
>
> The session leader, like any other task, has multiple process ids,
> one in each namespace.
>
> So to find the session id of a task, we find its session leader
> and find the appropriate process id of the session leader
>
> i.e we don't actually store the multiple sids a task

struct pid is that data structure. It just needs to be extended
a little to handle multiple pid namespaces.

Eric

_____

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers