

---

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

Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Wed, 18 Apr 2007 19:14:21 GMT

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

---

> As I said earlier, I see a case where two mounts that are peers of each  
> other can become un-identical if we dont propagate the "allowusermnt".  
>  
> As a practical example.  
>  
> /tmp and /mnt are peers of each other.  
> /tmp has its "allowusermnt" flag set, which has not been propagated  
> to /mnt.  
>  
> now a normal-user mounts an ext2 file system under /tmp at /tmp/1  
>  
> unfortunately the mount wont appear under /mnt/1

Argh, that is not true. That's what I've been trying to explain to  
you all along.

The propagation will be done regardless of the flag. The flag is  
only checked for the parent of the requested mount. If it is  
allowed there, the mount, including any propagations are allowed. If  
it's denied, then obviously it's denied everywhere.

> and in case if you allow the mount to appear under /mnt/1, you will  
> break unprivileged mounts semantics which promises: a normal user will  
> not be able to mount at a location that does not allow user-mounts.

No, it does not promise that. The flag just promises, that the user  
cannot request a mount on the parent mount.

Miklos

---

---

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

Posted by [Ram Pai](#) on Wed, 18 Apr 2007 19:41:07 GMT

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

---

On Wed, 2007-04-18 at 21:14 +0200, Miklos Szeredi wrote:

> > As I said earlier, I see a case where two mounts that are peers of each  
> > other can become un-identical if we dont propagate the "allowusermnt".  
> >  
> > As a practical example.  
> >  
> > /tmp and /mnt are peers of each other.

> > /tmp has its "allowusermnt" flag set, which has not been propagated  
> > to /mnt.  
> >  
> > now a normal-user mounts an ext2 file system under /tmp at /tmp/1  
> >  
> > unfortunately the mount wont appear under /mnt/1  
>  
> Argh, that is not true. That's what I've been trying to explain to  
> you all along.

I now realize you did, but I failed to catch it. sorry :-(

>  
> The propagation will be done regardless of the flag. The flag is  
> only checked for the parent of the requested mount. If it is  
> allowed there, the mount, including any propagations are allowed. If  
> it's denied, then obviously it's denied everywhere.  
>  
> > and in case if you allow the mount to appear under /mnt/1, you will  
> > break unprivileged mounts semantics which promises: a normal user will  
> > not be able to mount at a location that does not allow user-mounts.  
>  
> No, it does not promise that. The flag just promises, that the user  
> cannot request a mount on the parent mount.

ok. if the ability for a normal user to mount something *\*indirectly\**  
under a mount that has its 'allowusermnt flag' unset,  
is acceptable under the definition of 'allowusermnt', i guess my only  
choice is to accept it. :-)

RP

>  
> Miklos

---

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

Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Thu, 19 Apr 2007 08:36:15 GMT

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

---

> > > As I said earlier, I see a case where two mounts that are peers of each  
> > > other can become un-identical if we dont propagate the "allowusermnt".  
> > >  
> > > As a practical example.  
> > >  
> > > /tmp and /mnt are peers of each other.  
> > > /tmp has its "allowusermnt" flag set, which has not been propagated

> > > to /mnt.  
> > >  
> > > now a normal-user mounts an ext2 file system under /tmp at /tmp/1  
> > >  
> > > unfortunately the mount wont appear under /mnt/1  
> >  
> > Argh, that is not true. That's what I've been trying to explain to  
> > you all along.  
>  
> I now realize you did, but I failed to catch it. sorry :-)

It is my fault also. I will add better description to the patch headers.

> > The propagation will be done regardless of the flag. The flag is  
> > only checked for the parent of the requested mount. If it is  
> > allowed there, the mount, including any propagations are allowed. If  
> > it's denied, then obviously it's denied everywhere.  
> >  
> > > and in case if you allow the mount to appear under /mnt/1, you will  
> > > break unprivilege mounts semantics which promises: a normal user will  
> > > not be able to mount at a location that does not allow user-mounts.  
> >  
> > No, it does not promise that. The flag just promises, that the user  
> > cannot request a mount on the parent mount.  
>  
> ok. if the ability for a normal user to mount something *indirectly*  
> under a mount that has its 'allowusermnt flag' unset,  
> is acceptable under the definition of 'allowusermnt', i guess my only  
> choice is to accept it. :-)

It is the only "sane" way I think.

Maybe the MS\_SETFLAGS/MS\_CLEARFLAGS mount operation could have an option for propagating the given flag(s). Then it's really up to the sysadmin, to determine in each case what the desired behavior is.

Yes, you are right, that most of the time propagating the "allowusermnt" between peers may be the right thing to do. But for example propagating it from master to slave may not be a good thing at all. So it shouldn't be for the kernel to decide.

Thanks,  
Miklos

---