

---

Subject: Re: namespaces compatibility list

Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Tue, 06 Nov 2007 17:09:01 GMT

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

---

Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Cedric Le Goater <clg@fr.ibm.com> writes:

>> right. I think we can address Ulrich concerns first because we have

>> a solution for it (which looks like unsharing all namespaces at once,

>> here comes back the container object story :)

>

> It doesn't work because we can't create a fresh mount namespace.

>

> We need to create all new mounts (and deny access to the old ones)

> if we want to prevent all possibility of user space goof ups.

>

> While that is easy enough to build an application to do we can't

> easily enforce that in the kernel. Currently this is all

> CAP\_SYS\_ADMIN so only root can do this anyway. So we can easily

> say don't do that then.

>

> Clone flag consistency checking should only be used to enforce

> cases where the kernel side cannot support correctly. Currently

> the kernel has no problems with the current mix and match possibilities

> short of implementation deficiencies. So I do not see us

> addressing Ulrich's concerns with clone flags.

ACK :) Since this all is CAP\_SYS\_ADMIN-ed we can do with just a warning.

> Eric

>

---

Containers mailing list

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

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

---