

Re: NIS or NIS + setup

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.security/2003-01/0390.html>

From: Chris Cox (ccox_nopenotthis@airmail.net)

Date: 01/15/03

From: Chris Cox <ccox_nopenotthis@airmail.net>

Date: Tue, 14 Jan 2003 17:09:05 -0600

Nico Kadel-Garcia wrote:

> "Chris Cox" <ccox_nopenotthis@airmail.net> wrote in message
> news:413FCADDE080BAE6.46A16F699C362ABD.6C119970466EEB0F@lp.airnews.net...

>

>>Nico Kadel-Garcia wrote:

>>

>>>"sandra" <sandra@ccuec.unicamp.br> wrote in message

>>>news:3E1C60D3.601E72A9@ccuec.unicamp.br...

>>>

>>>

>>>>Hi ALL,

>>>>

>>>> I wonder if NIS+ development on Linux is really stopped. And if
>>>>someone out there has any clue to give me about athoner software
>>>>that could substitute NIS/NIS+ function.

>>>> Thanks a lot.

>>>

>>>

>>>>Only if we're lucky: NIS has had a lot of issues for a long time, and
>>>>they've never gotten better, only more complicated.

>>

>>You need to be more specific. My guess is that you are referring
>>to weaknesses in the security. NIS isn't great, NIS+ isn't great
>>either (but makes you think it is). There are some automounter
>>limitations with Linux, but in general, nothing you just have
>>to have. NFS (not NIS) performance still needs some improvement,
>>but it does seem to function reasonably.

>

>

> NIS=No Internal Security

> NFS=No Fucking Security

>

> In particular, NFS in most configurations allows the user to become root
> locally, then su to become the other use and gain access to that user's
> files.

>

> NIS has horrid issues with poor implementations and subtle incompatibilities

comp.os.linux.security: Re: NIS or NIS + setup

- > *between systems breaking things at awkward moments. (Linux, Tru64, SunOS and*
- > *Solaris [which really were distinct operating systems due to the large*
- > *differences in fundamental packages between them]: cross-platform has been*
- > *fun, and convincing stodgy old-timers to use the more flexible and*
- > *compatible Linux servers was non-trivial)*

I operate a network consisting of all the platforms mentioned (plus many more... 100's of hosts). The ones you mentioned have no major difficulties with NIS. However, I did have the "pleasure" of working on an NCR host recently. Though it is SVR4 based, the NIS was a throw back to yesteryear in that it could only work via broadcast. Therefore, we were forced to configure it as an NIS slave since it sits in a different net segment. That was probably the most difficult thing I've had to do recently with regards to NIS.

- >
- >
- >>>*LDAP is your friend.*
- >>>
- >>>
- >>>
- >>>*Lack of management interfaces and numerous interoperability issues*
- >>>*make cross platform LDAP a bit difficult currently, but we all*
- >>>*believe that will get better with time. I haven't seen too*
- >>>*many cross platform signon systems using LDAP that weren't*
- >>>*difficult to setup and maintain.*
- >
- >
- > *As opposed to maintaining the cross-platform support for NIS or NFS to our*
- > *dreaded Windows colleagues, or getting group. And I genuinely challenge you*
- > *to name good management interface for NIS.*

YaST setup tool is pretty good for managing server/slave/client setup.
useradd/make for users.
groupadd/make for groups.
vi/make for the rest.

Unlike LDAP, a good percentage of what you administer in NIS is using formats that already exist (just add the make typically done in /var/yp on the master). Choose your favorite user add tool... just slap a make onto the end to push it out (for example).

- >
- >
- >>>*If you want to include Windows 2000 (and the Windows clients),*
- >>>*I'd have Windows 2000 manage the users and use samba*
- >>>*and pam_smb for authentication (together with NIS on Linux).*
- >
- >
- > *I've proposed it and done test cases. Unfortunately, getting some*
- > *proprietary Windows compatible tools to deal with Samba as a PDC was*

> *non-trivial. *Japanese* Windoze was a deal breaker, bloody Unicode based*
> *login tools with proprietary keyboard interfaces that *LIE* about what*
> *they're sending.....*

Again, I wasn't referring to a Samba based PDC, but merely authenticating the Unix hosts through the Windoze PDC. I agree that Windows really doesn't like anything but Windows. Unix hosts are pretty easy about integrating with Windows.. the opposite is definitely anything but true. I use Samba to point to the PDC (Windoze) Password Server and use pam_smb for PAM enabled services.

Using this technique, Windows users can neighborhood to their NIS home directory (which could be NFS mounted via the automounter) from their Windoze client. Likewise, they can log into the *ix host using their Windows password. Not quite as good as some sort of floating credential (as far as ease of use goes), but keeps the account management primarily centralized on one host... even if it's Windoze. Many services will require that a password be intialized on the *ix side (NIS) for the users... but that should be a secure password since the users will simply use their Domain password.

>
>
>>*This will work across Solaris, HPUX, Linux and AIX (Note: AIX*
>>*4 requires a special modified pam_smb that works with its pluggable*
>>*authentication framework). This way accounts only have*
>>*to be created/destroyed under Windows (the NIS ones will*
>>*only operate if there is a valid user under the Windows*
>>*domain). Note: I'm not talking about using winbindd.*
>>
>>*I'd also avoid cross posting to so many newsgroups .. hint.*
>
>
> *I was following up. Feel free to reset Follup-to....*
>
>

Sorry... really meant for the OP.