Re: New Disk storage − Change drive letters

Source:
http://www.tech−archive.net/Archive/Exchange/microsoft.public.exchange.admin/2005−03/3368.html

---

From: Mark Arnold [MVP] (*mark_at_mvps.org*)
Date: 03/22/05

```
Date: Tue, 22 Mar 2005 18:59:41 +0000
```

On Tue, 22 Mar 2005 10:45:01 −0800, "mark"
<mark@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote:

>Hi,
>
>I'm planning on adding a new SAN to our Exchange system (Active/Passive 2
>node cluster) and this has been connected to the Exchange cluster nodes and
>is accessible as shared disk storage.

Is this an existing cluster that has got a new SAN connected and new
shared storage configured as a resource or is this a standalone
service you want to convert to a cluster?

>
>But that isn't the question I've got, basically the mail stores are
>currently located on a Powervault (Drive S:) and I need to present a plan for
>moving this data (14 databases) onto the SAN storage, I can see two options
>Option1) Use the ESM to migrate databases to new drive letter
>1. Use exmerge to export all email to PST files (and ensure backup)
>2. use the ESM utility to change the database & storage group paths onto the
>SAN storage

Use ESM yes, but just change the directory locations and automatically
move the databases
http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en−us;q257184 is of
help here.

>
>Option 2) Manually copy the files onto the new disk storage
>1) use exmerge to export all email (and ensure backup)
>2) Take all Exchange servicfes offline
>3) File Copy all Exchange files from the S: drive onto the new SAN disk
>4) Change disk drive letter storage for the previous disk and the new SAN
>attached (i.e, SAN attached becomes S:)
>5) Bring Exchange back on−line, it should now look to the new S: drive for
>data storage.

That doesn't actually make any practical sense so it's best to
disregard this one.

>
>I believe that Option (1) offers a more reliable solution with less downtime
>(only when migrating user's storage group/database_ however the rollback
>option would be more difficult.
>Option (2) would require more downtime, I believe it carries more risk but
>may offer a better rollback solution.
>
>Has anyone out there tried a similar practice and what method/pointers do
>they have
>
>Thanks for any help
>
>Mark

What worries me is your description of the SAN and the clustering. Can
you confirm that the Cluster is pre−existing and you have simply added
a new SAN to the existing fabric and are simply seeing the new SAN as
a valid drive letter?