
Subject: Re: [patch] unprivileged mounts update
Posted by [serue](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2007 19:42:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quoting Miklos Szeredi (miklos@szereadi.hu):

> > So then as far as you're concerned, the patches which were in -mm will
> > remain unchanged?
>
> Basically yes. I've merged the update patch, which was not yet added
> to -mm, did some cosmetic code changes, and updated the patch headers.
>
> There's one open point, that I think we haven't really explored, and
> that is the propagation semantics. I think you had the idea, that a
> propagated mount should inherit ownership from the parent into which
> it was propagated.

Don't think that was me. I stayed out of those early discussions
because I wasn't comfortable guessing at the proper semantics yet.

But really, I, as admin, have to set up both propagation and user mounts
for a particular subtree, so why would I *not* want user mounts to be
propagated?

So, in my own situation, I have done

```
make / rshared
mount --bind /share /share
make /share unbindable
for u in $users; do
    mount --rbind / /share/$u/root
    make /share/$u/root rslave
    make /share/$u/root rshared
    mount --bind -o user=$u /share/$u/root/home/$u /share/$u/root/home/$u
done
```

All users get chrooted into /share/\$USER/root, some also get their own
namespace. Clearly if a user in a new namespace does

```
mount --bind -o user=me ~/somedir ~/otherdir
```

then logs out, and logs back in, I want the ~/otherdir in the new
namespace (and the one in the 'init' namespace) to also be owned by
'me'.

> That sounds good if everyone agrees?

I've shown where I think propagating the mount owner is useful. Can you
detail a scenario where doing so would be bad? Then we can work toward

semantics that make sense...

-serge

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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