

Zero-consistency root emulation for unprivileged container image build

REID PRIEDHORSKY, MICHAEL JENNINGS, and MEGAN PHINNEY, Los Alamos National Laboratory, USA

Do Linux distribution package managers need the privileged operations they request to actually happen? Apparently not, at least for building container images for HPC applications. We use this observation to implement a root emulation mode using a Linux seccomp filter that intercepts some privileged system calls, does nothing, and returns success to the calling program. This approach provides no consistency whatsoever but appears sufficient to build all Dockerfiles we examined, simplifying fully-unprivileged workflows needed for HPC application containers.

ACM Reference Format:

Reid Priedhorsky, Michael Jennings, and Megan Phinney. 2024. Zero-consistency root emulation for unprivileged container image build. 1, 1 (May 2024), 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Scientific software for high performance computing (HPC) is increasingly deployed using Linux containers, which is a technology to package an application along with all its dependencies as a single unit called an *image*. A critical requirement for many HPC centers, including Los Alamos, is that user workflows must be fully unprivileged [16]; i.e., HPC users cannot be given elevated access of any kind to production resources. Within an unprivileged container, processes can have an effective user ID (EUID) of 0 (i.e., root) in a container and/or arbitrary capabilities, as well as access to some normally-privileged system calls, but this greater privilege is an illusion. Only unprivileged operations are actually available.

HPC container performance and reliability are typically best served by building images on the same supercomputer(s) targeted for deployment, due to their tightly specified architectures. This demands that building images, not just running them, must be fully unprivileged. However, build almost always uses traditional Linux distribution package managers such as `dpkg(8)`¹ or `rpm(8)` that assume they are running privileged, an assumption that has held for many years. While future package managers may relax this assumption, a build solution is needed for current distributions, which are in use now and may persist well beyond end-of-support when containerized.

One way to bridge this gap is *root emulation*, which replaces key privileged operations (e.g. `chown(2)` to change file ownership) with similar-enough unprivileged ones, thus fooling package managers into believing they are privileged. Existing approaches try to provide a consistent root-emulated environment. For example, record each `chown(2)` call and adjust the `struct stat` returned by later `stat(2)` calls so the process sees the same (fake) ownership that it set

¹Notation `foo(n)` indicates the thing named `foo` in man pages section `n`. `$1` is user shell commands, and `$2` is system calls, `$8` is administrator commands [9].

Authors' address: Reid Priedhorsky, reidpr@lanl.gov; Michael Jennings; Megan Phinney, High Performance Computing Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, USA.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

Manuscript submitted to ACM

<pre> 1 \$ cat Dockerfile 2 FROM alpine:3.19 3 RUN apk add sl 4 \$ ch-image build -t win --force=none . 5 2. RUN.N apk add sl 6 updating existing image ... 7 fetch https://dl-cdn.alpinelinux.org/alpine/v3.19/m 8 fetch https://dl-cdn.alpinelinux.org/alpine/v3.19/c 9 (1/3) Installing ncurses-terminfo-base (6.4_p202311 10 (2/3) Installing libncursesw (6.4_p20231125-r0) 11 (3/3) Installing sl (5.02-r1) 12 Executing busybox-1.36.1-r15.trigger 13 OK: 8 MiB in 18 packages 14 grown in 2 instructions: win </pre>	<pre> 1 \$ cat Dockerfile.c7 2 FROM centos:7 3 RUN yum install -y openssh 4 \$ ch-image build -t win --force=none . 5 1* FROM centos:7 6 2. RUN.N yum install -y openssh 7 [...] 8 Installing : openssh-7.4p1-23.el7_9.x86_64 3/3 9 Error unpacking rpm package openssh-7.4p1-23.el7_9. 10 error: unpacking [...] failed [...]: cpio: chown 11 [...] 12 something went wrong, rolling back ... 13 [...] 14 error: build failed: RUN command exited with 1 </pre>
--	--

Fig. 1. Example Dockerfiles built with a Type III (fully unprivileged) implementation and no root emulation. (a) succeeded because no privileged system calls were used, while (b) failed because rpm(8) tried to change a file's owner, a privileged operation.

earlier. These tools must be either installed or bind-mounted into the container, and they add complexity and overhead while reducing compatibility.

Our insight is that usually *consistency is not actually required* for building HPC application images. We can tell processes simple lies instead of complex ones. This paper describes a lightweight, non-consistent root emulation mode based on seccomp filters recently introduced in Charliecloud, LANL's lightweight, fully unprivileged container implementation for HPC applications [17].² We install a seccomp kernel filter that simply intercepts privileged system calls and returns success, without invoking the syscall or any user-space emulation of it. This remarkably unsophisticated root emulation appears workable for all images we tried; it is compatible with all distributions and libc's as well as statically linked binaries; and it has no dependencies beyond a C compiler and the Linux kernel, not even libseccomp [15].

2 FULLY UNPRIVILEGED (TYPE III) IMAGE BUILD WITHOUT ROOT EMULATION?

We previously proposed a tripartite classification of container implementations, based on the Linux namespaces used [10, 11] and level of privilege needed to set up the container [16]:

- **Type I** containers are the bare minimum, using the mount namespace but not the user namespace.³ They require privileged setup (root or CAP_SYS_ADMIN).
- **Type II** containers use mount and privileged user namespaces. They also require privileged setup (root or CAP_SETUID and CAP_SETGID). Many implementations call this type *rootless* because the main container processes are unprivileged, but we believe this is a misnomer because privileged helper programs (typically `newuidmap(1)` and `newgidmap(1)`) are needed to set up the container namespaces.
- **Type III** containers use mount and unprivileged user namespaces; setup is unprivileged. *Only Type III containers are fully unprivileged throughout the container lifetime.* The benefit of Type II over Type III is greater flexibility of users and groups within the container.

It would be convenient for HPC if images could be built in a Type III container naïvely, with no root emulation or other special measures. This does sometimes work. Figure 1a shows an example Dockerfile that builds with no root emulation; `apk(8)` can install `sl(1)` [sic] with no privileged system calls. On the other hand, in Figure 1b, `rpm(8)` tried

²All authors are members of the Charliecloud team, and our arguments should be considered in that context.

³The other namespaces do not affect our classification.

to change a file’s ownership with `chown(2)`, a privileged operation disallowed in an unprivileged container despite being container root.

This is why we need root emulation. What if `chown(2)` was not really `chown(2)` but rather an unprivileged substitute?

3 RELATED WORK

Charliecloud is not the first to implement root emulation, whether complex or simple. However, to our knowledge, in the context of container image builders, it was the first to provide complex emulation in 2020 [16], and it is now the first to provide simple emulation in 2023. This section details existing root emulation work, with a focus on image build.

3.1 fakeroot(1)

`fakeroot(1)` is a program to run a command in a root-emulated environment. It is not a perfect simulation but rather just enough to work for its intended purpose, which is building distribution packages, allowing “users to create archives (tar, ar, .deb etc.) with files in them with root permissions/ownership” [5]. There are at least three `fakeroot(1)` implementations [16, Table 1] that hook processes in two different ways. `LD_PRELOAD` is a userspace mechanism that lets `fakeroot(1)` intercept shared library function calls (not syscalls); this is architecture-independent but cannot wrap statically linked executables. `ptrace(2)` is a kernel mechanism that can intercept system calls (and do many other things). It is architecture-dependent but can wrap statically linked executables. All `fakeroot(s)`s maintain state in order to provide a consistent emulated environment (e.g., so `stat(2)` is consistent with prior `chown(2)`), with a daemon and/or disk files.

Charliecloud was the first to implement `fakeroot(1)` injection into container image builds, as detailed in [16]. It does this by installing `fakeroot(1)` into the image from package repositories of the containerized distribution, which requires detailed configuration for each supported distribution.

Singularity [13], like Charliecloud, is a container implementation targeting HPC applications. It also supports image build, though via “definition files” rather than the de facto standard Dockerfile [4]. The project forked in 2021 [3, 20]. One of the forks, Apptainer, also supports root emulation via `fakeroot(1)`, based on Charliecloud with but with a key difference: the host’s `fakeroot(1)` is bind-mounted into the container [8]. This trades the need to install it in the image for tighter dependence between the host and container libc, but it does not address the other drawbacks of `fakeroot(1)`.

3.2 PRoot

Another stand-alone root emulator is PRoot, which uses `ptrace(2)` to intercept system calls [22], avoiding libc compatibility issues and allowing the tool to wrap static executables [21]. PRoot can in fact use seccomp filters, but for a different purpose than Charliecloud: it is a performance optimization that lets PRoot avoid being notified about system calls it doesn’t need to intercept. However, the fundamental constraint of a complex, state-maintaining tool remain.

The other fork of Singularity, SingularityCE [20], bind-mounts the host’s `proot(1)` to provide root emulation for image build, building on the lessons of `fakeroot(1)` by Charliecloud and Apptainer [21] for an arguably better implementation of complex root emulation.

3.3 fakechroot(1)

Like some implementations of `fakeroot(1)`, `fakechroot(1)` uses `LD_PRELOAD` to intercept `libc` function calls, the main goal being to provide an unprivileged `chroot(2)` [18]. It also provides a simple root emulation by substituting `/bin/true` for a configurable set of executables. This is sufficient to e.g. bootstrap a Debian distribution, but this emulation surface of executables only isn’t broad enough for general image building.

4 SECCOMP (FILTER MODE)

In this paper we are concerned with the “filter mode” `seccomp`,⁴ introduced in Linux 3.5 in 2012 [12]. This lets a process install a filter to manipulate the system calls of itself and its children. This filter is a Berkeley Packet Filter (BPF)⁵ program run by a kernel, and once installed it cannot be removed, i.e., it binds program children whether they like it or not. Notably, BPF does not have loops, so it can be verified for completion by the kernel.

The BPF filter is run by the kernel upon each system call. It has four inputs: (1) the system call number (not name!), which varies by architecture; (2) the syscall’s arguments, (3) the current architecture (which can vary even within a process), and (4) the instruction pointer. An important limitation is that BPF filters cannot dereference pointers. After its computation, the filter returns the disposition of the system call, which falls into three classes:

- (1) **Do not execute the syscall**, and one of (a) kill the thread (Linux 3.5), (b) kill the process (4.14), (c) send `SIGSYS` to the thread (3.5), or (d) return a specified `errno` (3.5).
- (2) **Execute the syscall**, and (e) log it first (4.14) or simply (f) execute it normally (3.5).
- (3) **Delete the decision to a userspace process**, either with (g) `ptrace(2)` (3.5) or (h) a file descriptor (5.0), which then chooses disposition a–f.

Several container implementations use `seccomp` filters. Docker and Podman/Buildah have a filter specification feature, apparently intended as a simple allow/denylist for syscalls [7]. `distrobuilder` (part of the LXC/LXD package) has a filter configuration language that could likely create root emulation like Charliecloud’s, but because users “must be root in order to run the `distrobuilder` tool” [6], that potential capability is moot. `Firejail` is a tool to sandbox processes using container-like technologies such as namespaces; it does filter system calls using `seccomp` but not for root emulation [1]. `NsJail` is a “light-weight process isolation tool” that uses namespaces [19].⁶ It provides a `seccomp` configuration language that appears flexible enough to implement root emulation, but we are unaware of anyone having done so. Finally and notably, `Enroot` is a small container runtime that *does* provide a lightweight root-emulation `seccomp` filter with the same approach as Charliecloud’s: “[w]e use a `seccomp` filter to trap all `setuid`-related syscalls, to make them succeed” [2]. However, the filter is less complete than Charliecloud’s, and `Enroot` does not provide a build capability, which is where the main root emulation challenge lies.

5 CHARLIECLOUD’S SECCOMP FILTER

Charliecloud zero-consistency root emulation installs a `seccomp` filter to intercept certain privileged system calls and fake their success. In pseudocode, our filter is:

```

1 if (privileged system call):
2     do nothing
3     return success

```

⁴`Seccomp` is short for *secure computing*, though its scope has expanded considerably since naming.

⁵As the name implies, BPF was originally designed to manipulate network packets but likewise has been expanded in scope.

⁶Though it resides in Google’s GitHub organization, `NsJail`’s readme states that it “is NOT an official Google product” [emphasis in original].

```

1 $ cat Dockerfile
2 FROM centos:7
3 RUN yum install -y openssh
4 $ ch-image build -t win -f Dockerfile.c7 .
5 1* FROM centos:7
6 2. RUN.S yum install -y openssh
7 [...]
8 Installing : openssh-7.4p1-23.el7_9.x86_64 3/3
9 [...]
10 Complete!
11 --force=seccomp: modified 0 RUN instructions
12 grown in 2 instructions: win

```

Fig. 2. Successful seccomp root-emulation build of the Dockerfile in Figure 1b above.

That is, from the point of view of a filtered process, these system calls always succeed, but if the process does anything to verify the actions requested, it will see that nothing happened.

The 29 privileged syscalls we filter fall into four classes:

- (1) **File ownership** (7 syscalls): `chown(2)`, `fchownat(2)`, etc.
- (2) **User/group/capability manipulation** (19): `setresuid(2)`, `capset(2)`, etc.
- (3) **`mknod(2)` and `mknodat(2)`** (2): These two syscalls can be privileged or not. We must examine the file type argument before faking success (device file) or allowing the syscall (other types).
- (4) **Self-test** (1): `kexec_load(2)` reboots into a new kernel and is unlikely to ever be needed by HPC applications, so we use it to validate the filter after installation.

Charliecloud’s source code has a table listing the numbers for each syscall on each of the six supported architectures,⁷ and we translate this into a BPF program and install it with two C functions totalling about 150 lines of code including comments. Figure 2 shows a successful Charliecloud build using the zero-consistency root emulation mode of the Dockerfile introduced earlier in Figure 1b.

An exception to the assumption that package managers don’t care about consistency is Debian’s `apt(8)`, which by default drops privileges for downloading packages over HTTP(S) and also *verifies that they were dropped correctly*. This validation fails under our seccomp filter. We work around the problem awkwardly by detecting `apt(8)` and `apt-get(8)` in RUN instructions and injecting `-o APT::Sandbox::User=root` into their command lines, which disables privilege dropping for download.

6 DISCUSSION

This paper presents a novel root emulation mode based on the principle that distribution package managers and similar tools do not need their privileged requests to be actually carried out, but rather are satisfied to be simply told what they want to hear (for the purpose of container image build at least). That is, we have implemented a seccomp filter for some privileged system calls that, instead of executing the syscall, does nothing and returns success to the userspace program. While limited to identity and files, this simple, zero-consistency root emulation is sufficient to build almost all the container images we tried. (Known exceptions are builds that call `unminimize(8)` or trigger certain systemd scripts, and these both seem to be implementation hassles rather than something fundamental about our approach.)

⁷Some syscalls are not implemented on all architectures; for example, arm64 lacks `chown(2)`, relying on user-space code to translate its calls to `fchownat(2)` instead.

Alternately, one can use a complex, consistent root emulation using `fakeroot(1)` or `proot(1)`. Simple and complex both allow image build with a fully unprivileged Type III container implementation, a critical requirement for HPC application containers. In our assessment, however, the simple, inconsistent `seccomp` method of root emulation has a number of advantages:

- (1) **Overhead.** The `seccomp` method imposes a relatively light overhead [14, 23] of its filter on every system call (not just those filtered), while the consistent method requires user-space emulation of system calls, making an extra program and possibly its shared libraries available to the container build, and state maintenance using a daemon process.
- (2) **Simplicity.** The `seccomp` method has no user-space component and does nothing to actually emulate any system calls; further, “emulation” is complete once the filter is installed (though see `apt(8)` workaround above). Also, because it does not maintain state, the `seccomp` method also intercepts fewer system calls.
- (3) **Compatibility.** The `seccomp` method is agnostic to `libc` and static/dynamic linking, and mostly agnostic to distribution, the exception being `apt(8)` above, though these properties are shared by `PRoot` and `fakeroot(1)` implementations based on `ptrace(2)`. Fewer intercepted system calls and no syscalls actually emulated has compatibility benefit as well.

Importantly, however, the complex emulation is consistent on dimensions relevant to package management; a process under emulation can make changes to identity or privileged file metadata and have the emulated changes reflected back later. This seems to usually not matter for image build, but sometimes it does, e.g., `apt(1)` above.

Future work includes (1) an optional wider set of emulated syscalls, such as `setxattr(2)`, which may allow `systemd` to be installed;⁸ (2) evaluate adding *just a little* consistency, for user and groups IDs only, to remove the workaround for `apt(8)` explained above; and (3) performance testing.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2015. Features. <https://firejail.wordpress.com/features-3>
- [2] Felix Abecassis and Jonathan Calmels. 2020. Distributed HPC applications with unprivileged containers. https://archive.fosdem.org/2020/schedule/event/containers_hpc_unprivileged/
- [3] Apptainer project. 2021. Community announcement. <https://apptainer.org/news/community-announcement-20211130/>
- [4] Apptainer project. 2023. Apptainer user guide. <https://apptainer.org/docs/user/main/security.html#>
- [5] J.H.M. Dassen, Joost Witteveen, and Clint Adams. 2021. *fakeroot(1)*. Man page. <https://manpages.debian.org/bullseye/fakeroot/fakeroot.1.en.html>
- [6] distrobuilder contributors. 2023. distrobuilder documentation. <https://linuxcontainers.org/distrobuilder/docs/latest/>
- [7] Docker Inc. 2023. Seccomp security profiles for Docker. <https://docs.docker.com/engine/security/seccomp/>
- [8] Dave Dykstra. 2022. Apptainer without Setuid. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2208.12106> arXiv:2208.12106 [cs]
- [9] John W. Eaton, Rik Faith, G. Willford, Fabrizio Polacco, and Colin Waton. 2023. *man(1)*. Man page. <https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man1/man.1.html>
- [10] Michael Kerrisk. 2013. Namespaces in operation, part 1: Namespaces overview. *Linux Weekly News* (Jan. 2013). <https://lwn.net/Articles/531114/>
- [11] Michael Kerrisk. 2013. Namespaces in operation, part 5: User namespaces. *Linux Weekly News* (Feb. 2013). <https://lwn.net/Articles/532593/>
- [12] Michael Kerrisk. 2024. Seccomp. https://man7.org/training/download/splc_seccomp_slides-mkerrisk-man7.org.pdf
- [13] Gregory M. Kurtzer, Vanessa Sochat, and Michael W. Bauer. 2017. Singularity: Scientific containers for mobility of compute. *PLOS ONE* 12, 5 (May 2017). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177459>
- [14] Michael Larabel. 2020. Seccomp filters get a very nice speed-up with Linux 5.11. <https://www.phoronix.com/news/Linux-5.11-SECCOMP-Performance>
- [15] Paul Moore and others. 2024. libseccomp. The libseccomp Project. <https://github.com/seccomp/libseccomp>
- [16] Reid Priedhorsky, R. Shane Canon, Timothy Randles, and Andrew J. Younge. 2021. Minimizing privilege for building HPC containers. In *Proc. SC*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458817.3476187>

⁸You might ask: “Why do I want `systemd` in my containers?” Indeed, you probably don’t, but it tends to be pulled in as a dependency.

- [17] Reid Priedhorsky and Tim Randles. 2017. Charliecloud: Unprivileged containers for user-defined software stacks in HPC. In *Supercomputing*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3126908.3126925>
- [18] Piotr Roszatycki. 2019. fakechroot. <https://github.com/dex4er/fakechroot/blob/2.20.1/man/fakechroot.pod>
- [19] Robert Swiecki et al. 2024. nsjail. <https://github.com/google/nsjail>
- [20] Sylabs Inc. 2022. SingularityCE is Singularity. <https://sylabs.io/2022/06/singularityce-is-singularity/>
- [21] Dave Trudgian. 2022. proot based non-root / non -fakeroot builds. <https://github.com/sylabs/singularity/issues/880>
- [22] Cédric Vincent et al. 2022. PRoot — chroot, mount -bind, and binfmt_misc without privilege/setup. <https://proot-me.github.io/>
- [23] Zatoichi. 2017. Zatoichi's Engineering Blog. <https://zatoichi-engineer.github.io/2017/11/06/seccomp-bpf.html>