

Re: newfs and mount vs. half-baked disks

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/arch/2003-11/0047.html>

From: Poul-Henning Kamp (*phk_at_phk.freebsd.dk*)

Date: 11/12/03

To: Bruce Evans <bde@zeta.org.au>
Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2003 09:56:14 +0100

In message <20031108191433.J608@gamplex.bde.org>, Bruce Evans writes:

*>I don't use GEOM, so the label won't be going away for me. Anyway, there
>is no dependency (the label is just one of the things that one might
>examine to recover a crashed disk), and any overaul by GEOM would have
>to duplicate the functionality of storing metadata about the superblocks
>somewhere outside the superblocks.*

This is a very good example of where it is important to get your terminology straight: No sane "overhaul by GEOM" would implement this in GEOM. It could be hacked into various existing classes or even done cleanly in its own class which is almost as silly.

*> (I actually store metadata about file
>systems in (backups of) disk files in /var/backups. Normal backups
>provide inadequate backups of metadata.)*

This is probably a much better idea than anything you said until now on the subject.

It might not be a bad idea to store the relevant magics in a /etc/ufs.conf file, but there are some details about device vs. media/filesystem identification in particular in context of dynamic devices to that must be worked out.

--

Poul-Henning Kamp | UNIX since Zilog Zeus 3.20
phk@FreeBSD.ORG | TCP/IP since RFC 956
FreeBSD committer | BSD since 4.3-tahoe
Never attribute to malice what can adequately be explained by incompetence.

freebsd-arch@freebsd.org mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-arch>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-arch-unsubscribe@freebsd.org"