
Subject: Re: Re: [patch 05/10] add "permit user mounts in new namespace" clone flag

Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Wed, 18 Apr 2007 09:19:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> > Allowing this and other flags to NOT be propagated just makes it
> > possible to have a set of shared mounts with asymmetric properties,
> > which may actually be desirable.
>
> The shared mount feature was designed to ensure that the mount remained
> identical at all the locations.

OK, so remount not propagating mount flags is a bug then?

> Now designing features to make it un-identical but still naming it
> shared, will break its original purpose. Slave mounts were designed
> to make it asymmetric.

What if I want to modify flags in a master mount, but not the slave mount? Would I be screwed? For example: mount is read-only in both master and slave. I want to mark it read-write in master but not in slave. What do I do?

> Whatever feature that is desired to be exploited; can that be exploited
> with the current set of semantics that we have? Is there a real need to
> make the mounts asymmetric but at the same time name them as shared?
> Maybe I don't understand what the desired application is?

I do think this question of propagating mount flags is totally independent of user mounts.

As it stands, currently remount doesn't propagate mount flags, and I don't see any compelling reasons why it should.

The patchset introduces a new mount flag "allowusermnt", but I don't see any compelling reason to propagate this flag _either_.

Please say so if you do have such a reason. As I've explained, having this flag set differently in parts of a propagation tree does not interfere with or break propagation in any way.

Miklos
