
Subject: Re: Mounts--bind, issue or limitation?

Posted by [3molo](#) on Mon, 07 May 2007 11:28:18 GMT

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

On the hardware node the disks was usable and I could see their capacity with df. Now df claims them to be 250MB filesystems which is NOT the case. Is shows me nothing, although these are the very disks that are mount binded into the vps. How and why, I dont know. It's a very weird situation. There can be nothing Im reading wrong, since I have one 18gb scsi + 9gb scsi + 2x 500 gb ide disks. Also they worked on the HN when I first mounted them, then I discovered the missinformation you can see below, and of course the many mounts. The mount binds the owner of the vps did was from(inside his VE) /site/dataone/{1,2,3} + /site/datatwo/{4,5,6} into /site/dataone/ftpd/ftp/site/.

Clearly not true information here:

```
hardwarenode:~# df -h
/dev/mapper/dataone 250M 97M 140M 41% /data1
/dev/mapper/datatwo 250M 97M 140M 41% /data2
```

```
hardwarenode:~# mount
/dev/mapper/dataone on /data1 type ext3 (rw)
/dev/mapper/datatwo on /data2 type ext3 (rw)
/data1/midimiliz on /vz/root/105/site/dataone type none (rw,bind)
/data2/midimiliz on /vz/root/105/site/datatwo type none (rw,bind)
```

```
hardwarenode:~# ls -la /data{1,2}
/data1:
total 2
drwxr-xr-x 2 root root 1024 2007-04-27 14:16 .
drwxr-xr-x 25 root root 1024 2007-04-27 14:40 ..
```

```
/data2:
total 2
drwxr-xr-x 2 root root 1024 2007-04-18 13:04 .
drwxr-xr-x 25 root root 1024 2007-04-27 14:40 ..
```

```
hardwarenode:~# du -sh /vz/root/105/site/data{one,two}
37G    /vz/root/105/site/dataone
8.0G   /vz/root/105/site/datatwo
```

```
somevps:~# df -h
ext3      459G 29G 407G 7% /site/dataone
ext3      459G 8.2G 428G 2% /site/datatwo
```

So only way for me to read or seek the disks on th HN is by using the mount point /vz/root/105/site/data{one,two}. Im pretty sure that without the many mount binds inside the vps, there would be no problem. But I would really like to know why and what to do before umounting

their structure!

Hope I made the problem more clear
