

---

Subject: Re: [patch 0/8] unprivileged mount syscall  
Posted by [serue](#) on Wed, 11 Apr 2007 14:26:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quoting Ian Kent (raven@themaw.net):

> On Wed, 2007-04-11 at 12:48 +0200, Miklos Szeredi wrote:  
> > > > >  
> > > > > - users can use bind mounts without having to pre-configure them in  
> > > > > /etc/fstab  
> > > > >  
> > > >  
> > > > This is by far the biggest concern I see. I think the security  
> > > > implication of allowing anyone to do bind mounts are poorly understood.  
> > >  
> > > And especially so since there is no way for a filesystem module to veto  
> > > such requests.  
> >  
> > The filesystem can't veto initial mounts based on destination either.  
> > I don't think it's up to the filesystem to police bind/move mounts in  
> > any way.  
>  
> But if a filesystem can't or the developer thinks that it shouldn't for  
> some reason, support bind/move mounts then there should be a way for the

Can you list some valid reasons why an fs could care where it is mounted? The only thing I could think of is a stackable fs, but it shouldn't care whether it is overlay-mounted or not.

thanks,  
-serge

> filesystem to tell the kernel that.  
>  
> Surely a filesystem is in a good position to be able to decide if a  
> mount request "for it" should be allowed to continue based on it's "own  
> situation and capabilities".  
>  
> Ian  
>  
>  
>  
> -  
> To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-fsdevel" in  
> the body of a message to majordomo@vger.kernel.org  
> More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

