## Subject: Re: [patch 0/8] unprivileged mount syscall Posted by lan Kent on Wed, 11 Apr 2007 14:27:12 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Wed, 2007-04-11 at 09:26 -0500, Serge E. Hallyn wrote:
> 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.
For my part, autofs and autofs4.
Moving or binding isn't valid.
I tried to design that limitation out version 5 but wasn't able to.
In time I probably can but couldn't continue to support older versions.
>
> 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".
> >
> > lan
> >
> >
> >
```

>>-

- > > 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

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