
Subject: Re: Q: hardcoded parameters and restrictions

Posted by [ldv](#) on Thu, 24 Aug 2006 20:56:23 GMT

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

Hi,

On Thu, Aug 24, 2006 at 03:30:38PM +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> Dmitry V. Levin wrote:

> > On Tue, Aug 22, 2006 at 03:06:56PM +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

[...]

> >>> In particular, I mean HOME and PATH environment variables,

> >>

> >> do you mean HOME and PATH which are provided to VPS init?

> >

> > Yes, I mean VPS init, vzctl exec and vzctl enter.

> >

> >> mmm, probably can be made configurable from vps.conf

> >> do you think it is required?

> >

> > I think this is required since each distro has own PATH policy.

> from kernel init/main.c:

> static char * argv_init[MAX_INIT_ARGS+2] = { "init", NULL, };

> char * envp_init[MAX_INIT_ENVS+2] = { "HOME=/", "TERM=linux", NULL, };

>

> i.e. each init is run almost w/o any environment.

> the same for VE.

I agree, lets leave "init" case unchanged.

> on VE enter bash initializes PATH, HOME according to it's scripts.

> So the only "bad" case I see is vzctl exec, right?

Not only "exec", but also "enter", because bash does its initialization depending on \$HOME.

[...]

> > Unfortunately, /proc is notorious to had security-related bugs in the past,

> > including arbitrary code execution in kernel space. Since I'm not sure

> > that all such bugs are fixed, and since not all tasks require /proc to be

> > mounted, I'd like to be able to disable /procfs on per-VPS basis.

> Modern glibc (at least version from FC5) even doesn't work w/o /proc.

> We had a bug with cp due to this :/

No, that was a bug in FC5 coreutils package, fixed in their coreutils-5.96-1.1 update.

> But in general I don't mind to make everything configurable.

>

> How do you see it? via the same "features" mask as done with sysfs?

To make just procfs configurable like sysfs, features mask should be enough.

> any other features? I think it is better to create a set of

> env_create functions allowing vzctl to control which features are initialized

> in VE.

It depends on how much features will be made configurable.

> >>>Also, it seems to be no way to disable devices listed in

> >>>default_minor_perms.

> >>

> >>applications do not work w/o /dev/null and others at all :)

> >

> >Yes, /dev/null and /dev/zero are not an issue.

> >I care about /dev/random; how to deal with potential lack of randomness

> >in the system?

> Good point.

> let's move this into vzctl?

> let's start from this one.

> http://bugzilla.openvz.org/show_bug.cgi?id=241

OK

--

ldv
