

---

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

---