

---

Subject: Re: Re: [PATCH 1/3] Signal semantics for /sbin/init  
Posted by [Oleg Nesterov](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 15:22:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 09/14, Daniel Pittman wrote:

>  
> Oleg Nesterov <[oleg@tv-sign.ru](mailto: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.

Just curious, could you tell more? What "current kernel semantics" do you mean?

Do you mean that the 'upstart' daemon sends the unhandled signal to init?

Oleg.

---

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

---