Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] Devices visibility container Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Tue, 25 Sep 2007 07:48:03 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

| Eric W. Biederman wrote: |
|--|
| > Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> writes:</xemul@openvz.org> |
| > |
| >> Hi. |
| >> |
| >> At KS we have pointed out the need in some container, that allows >> to limit the visibility of some devices to task within it. I.e. >> allow for /dev/null, /dev/zero etc, but disable (by default) some >> IDE devices or SCSI discs and so on. |
| |
| > NAK |
| > We do not work a control may be and out to be |
| > We do not want a control group subsystem for this. |
| > For the short term we can just drop CAP_SYS_MKNOD. |
| , , |
| > For the long term we need a device namespace for application > migration, so they can continue to use devices with the same > major+minor number pair after the migration event. Things like |
| Oh! Can you provide us an example when after the migration some device's major+minor pair change on the same device? |
| ensuring a call to stat on a given file before and after the migration return the exact same information sounds compelling. So I don't think this is even strictly limited to virtual devices anymore. How many applications are there out there that memorize the stat data on a file and so they can detect if it has changed? |
| If we need something between those two it may make sense to enhance the LSM or perhaps introduce an alternate set security hooks. Still if we are going to need a full device namespace that may be a little |

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

> much.

> Eric