

---

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

Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Wed, 18 Apr 2007 15:06:33 GMT

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

---

> > > Don't forget that almost all mount flags are per-superblock. How are you  
> > > planning on dealing with the case that one user mounts a filesystem  
> > > read-only, while another is trying to mount the same one read-write?  
> >  
> > Yeah, I forgot, the per-mount read-only patches are not yet in.  
> >  
> > That doesn't really change my argument though. \_If\_ the flag is per  
> > mount, then it makes sense to be able to change it on a master and not  
> > on a slave. If mount flags are propagated, this is not possible.  
>  
> Read-only isn't the only issue. On something like NFS, there are flags  
> to set the security flavour, turn on/off encryption etc.  
>  
> If I mount your home directory using no encryption in my namespace, for  
> instance, then neither you nor the administrator will be able to turn it  
> on afterwards in yours without first unmounting it from mine so that the  
> superblock is destroyed.

OK, that's interesting, but I fail to grasp the relevance of this to unprivileged mounts.

Or are you thinking of unprivileged NFS mounts? Well, think again, because that involves \_much\_ more than it seems at first glance.

Miklos

---

Containers mailing list  
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---