
Subject: Re: Re: [PATCH 1/3] Signal semantics for /sbin/init
Posted by [Daniel Pittman](#) on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 10:16:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oleg Nesterov <oleg@tv-sign.ru> writes:

> On 09/13, Cedric Le Goater wrote:

>> Oleg Nesterov wrote:

[...]

>> To respect the current init semantic,

>

> The current init semantic is broken in many ways ;)

Yup. They sure are, but they are pretty set in stone by now. :)

>> shouldn't we discard any unblockable signal (STOP and KILL) sent by a

>> process to its pid namespace init process ? Then, all other signals

>> should be handled appropriately by the pid namespace init.

>

> Yes, I think you are probably right, this should be enough in

> practice. After all, only root can send the signal to /sbin/init. On

> my machine, /proc/1/status shows that init doesn't have a handler for

> non-ignored SIGUNUSED == 31, though.

>

> But who knows? The kernel promises some guarantees, it is not good to

> break them. Perhaps some strange non-standard environment may suffer.

In this case "strange non-standard environments" would mean anyone running the 'upstart' daemon from recent Ubuntu -- it depends on the current kernel semantics.

Regards,

Daniel

--

Daniel Pittman <daniel@cybersource.com.au> Phone: 03 9621 2377

Level 4, 10 Queen St, Melbourne Web: <http://www.cyber.com.au>

Cybersource: Australia's Leading Linux and Open Source Solutions Company

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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