

## Re: Exchange 2007 – multiple RAID controllers

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Exchange/microsoft.public.exchange.setup/2008-02/msg00047.html>

---

- *From:* "Rui Silva [MVP]" <tjms1808(nospam4me)@hotmail.com>
  - *Date:* Mon, 4 Feb 2008 17:23:00 -0000
- 

For resiliency keep databases and logs on different physical volumes.  
For performance, you could use different controllers.

If you're planning to install Exchange 2007 and don't have any special needs regarding high-availability I would say that you can go ahead with just one controller.

—

Rui Silva  
MVP Windows Server System – Exchange Server  
Blog "subject: exchange", <http://msmvps.com/ehlo>

"Fred Bulger" <Fred.Bulger@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:ehccDrzZIHA.5792@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:ehccDrzZIHA.5792@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Traditionally, for Exchange, it was advised to keep database and log files on separate physical volumes. Many people also recommended using different RAID controllers for each. Now it seems that vendors such as HP and Dell don't support a configuration with multiple RAID controllers – except for high-end servers. The entry-level and mid-level systems support a single SAS RAID controller. The reps maintain that secondary controllers are not required in today's configurations. I'm not sure how the current technology removes the benefit provided by redundant controllers!?

I'm wondering what opinions are on this. Should we still keep log files and databases on different controllers? I've looked for Microsoft's recommendations regarding this. If such a document exists, please point me in the right direction.

Regards...

–Fred.