

# RE: Large discrepancy in reported disk usage on USR partition

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/questions/2008-10/msg01960.html>

---

- *From:* "Brendan Hart" <[brendanh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:brendanh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 30 Oct 2008 12:11:58 +1030
- 

Hi,

The space reserved as minfree does not appear to have been changed from the default setting of 8%. Is your suggestion that I should change it to a larger value? I don't understand how modifying it now could fix the situation, but I could be missing something.

The output of "tunefs -p /usr" is as follows:

```
#: tunefs -p /usr
tunefs: ACLs: (-a) disabled
tunefs: MAC multilabel: (-l) disabled
tunefs: soft updates: (-n) enabled
tunefs: maximum blocks per file in a cylinder group: (-e) 2048
tunefs: average file size: (-f) 16384
tunefs: average number of files in a directory: (-s) 64
tunefs: minimum percentage of free space: (-m) 8%
tunefs: optimization preference: (-o) time
tunefs: volume label: (-L)
```

I have not observed the problem on any of the other ~dozen FreeBSD servers in our data centre.

Could the "missing" space be an indication of hardware disk issues i.e. physical blocks marked as bad?

Is it possible on UFS2 for disk space to be allocated but hidden somehow? (although I have been running the commands such as "du -x" as superuser) Similarly, is it possible on UFS2 for disk space to be allocated in "lost cluster chains" ?

Best Regards,  
Brendan Hart

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeremy Chadwick [<mailto:koitsu@xxxxxxxxxx>]  
Sent: Thursday, 30 October 2008 11:50 AM  
To: Brendan Hart

RE: Large discrepancy in reported disk usage on USR partition

Cc: freebsd-questions@xxxxxxxxxxxx

Subject: Re: Large discrepancy in reported disk usage on USR partition

On Thu, Oct 30, 2008 at 11:12:32AM +1030, Brendan Hart wrote:

I have inherited some servers running various releases of FreeBSD and I am having some trouble with the /usr partition on one of these boxes.

The problem is that there appears to be far more space used on the USR partition than there are actual files on the partition. The utility "df

-h"

reports 25GB used (i.e. nearly the whole partition), but "du -x /usr" reports only 7.6GB of files.

Have you tried playing with tunefs(8), -m flag?

I can't reproduce this behaviour on any of our systems.

```
icarus# df -k /usr
Filesystem 1024-blocks Used Avail Capacity Mounted on
/dev/ad12s1f 167879968 1973344 152476228 1% /usr
icarus# du -sx /usr
1973344 /usr
```

```
eos# df -k /usr
Filesystem 1024-blocks Used Avail Capacity Mounted on
/dev/ad0s1f 32494668 2261670 27633426 8% /usr
eos# du -sx /usr
2261670 /usr
```

```
anubis# df -k /usr
Filesystem 1024-blocks Used Avail Capacity Mounted on
/dev/ad4s1f 80010344 1809620 71799898 2% /usr
anubis# du -sx /usr
1809620 /usr
```

```
horus# df -k /usr
Filesystem 1024-blocks Used Avail Capacity Mounted on
/dev/ad4s1f 32494668 1608458 28286638 5% /usr
horus# du -sx /usr
1608458 /usr
```

—  
| Jeremy Chadwick jdc at parodius.com |  
| Parodius Networking <http://www.parodius.com/> |  
| UNIX Systems Administrator Mountain View, CA, USA |  
| Making life hard for others since 1977. PGP: 4BD6C0CB |

RE: Large discrepancy in reported disk usage on USB partition

\_\_\_\_\_ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature  
database 3567 (20081029) \_\_\_\_\_

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

\_\_\_\_\_ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature  
database 3567 (20081029) \_\_\_\_\_

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

---

freebsd-questions@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list

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

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-questions-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"

RE: Large discrepancy in reported disk usage on USB partition