

Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.general/2005-12/msg00074.html>

- *From:* "Snarky Parker" <sparker9@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 2 Dec 2005 06:00:11 -0500
-

FWIW, I think you'll find that the space taken up by the Master Boot Record is minimal.

I also think you'll find no dishonesty involved in WD statements about drive capacity and you'll be happy to know that Windows uses the binary system for abbreviated measurement of files and drive capacity.

BTW, it's now 45 degrees outside where I live. That's an honest statement. Question: Is it cold or hot outside? You don't know for sure unless you know whether I'm referring to the Centigrade or Fahrenheit scale.

"nesredepegrob" <borge@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:npavo1942f0teham1f0ahj5u8euofnl6lr@xxxxxxxxxxxxx

| On Fri, 02 Dec 2005 08:49:26 +0800, nesredepegrob <borge@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

|

| >On Thu, 1 Dec 2005 14:58:48 -0500, "Snarky Parker" <sparker9@xxxxxxx> wrote:

| >

| >>There is no loss real involved, it's how the capacity is being measured, using

| >>either the binary system or the decimal system. Read this FAQ for details:

| >>

| >>Why is my drive displaying a smaller than expected capacity than the indicated

| >>size on the drive label?

|

>>http://wdc.custhelp.com/cgi-bin/wdc.cfg/php/enduser/std_adp.php?p_faqid=615&p_created=1034613413&p_sid=Q1rPf-Vh&p_lva=&p_sp=cF9zcmNoPSZwX3NvcnRfYnk9JnBfZ3JpZH

NvcnQ9JnBfcm93X2NudD04MTMmcf9wcm9kcZ0mcF9jYXRzPSZwX3B2PSZwX2N2PSZwX3BhZ2U9MQ**&p_li=&p_topview=1

| >>

| >>A drive that's rated as 160 GB (160,000,000,000 bytes) by the manufacturer is

| >>using the decimal system to convert bytes to gigabytes. In Windows, this would

| >>show up as 149 GB and 160,000,000,000 bytes in the Properties.

| >>

| >>Your 200 GB drive should read approximately as 186 GB in Windows.

Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000

|>>
|>>It's similar to temperature readings done in Centigrade vs.
Fahrenheit....the
|>>numbers may be different but the actual temperature remains the same.
|>>
|>At one time when my German Shepherd was a pup and I took long walks with her,
I
|>was forced to think things through and I came to the conclusion that a disk
has
|>to be formatted. Formatting would mean creating an index just like in a book.
|>Now imagine the size of a book index if there was an entry for every 2000 th
|>character rather than for each chapter.
|>
|>In NTFS you have a system where the smallest file is 2kb. Therefore a disk of
2
|>MB would have 1000 entries and 2 GB 1million entries therefore 200 gb would
be
|>10million entries.
|>
|>For each such entry I fancied there would be a 64bit address. I am not sure
how
|>much that would come to and not even sure that such a simple system is what
|>formatting does. However as the system is binary, we cannot work decimals for
an
|>index so the index would have to be multiplied with some figure to arrive at
a
|>binary numbered index. Indeed the addresses would have to be 64bit as
mentioned
|>and together, I suppose we very quickly would arrive at a figure of about
15GB
|>which is the difference between a manufacturers quote of 200GB and the actual
|>185GB available.
|>
|>This of course falls far from the truth if manufacturers are quoting a figure
|>for a fomatted disk but that is hardly likely as they would want to present
is
|>as big as advertising legally allowed.
|>
|>>"nesredepegrob" <borge@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
|>><news:1spto114hdi7v2vs8caqvbj9h277nh0t@xxxxxxxxxxx>
|>>| On Wed, 30 Nov 2005 17:15:02 -0800, man <man@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:
|>>|
|>>|>Thanks all first
|>>|>
|>>|>Since it still show 137G now after modify the registry, is it just format
|>>|>the D: in disk management then it will become 160G ?
|>>|
|>>| There will be some loss. My 200 Gb Drive is partitioned but when you add
up
|>>|the

Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000

| >>| individual partitions you will find that I have only got 185GB available
for
| >>| programs and data. You must reckon on losing 15–20 gb for the drive index.
| >>| 23 gb for a 160gb disk seems a bit too much.
| >>|
| >>| Borge
| >>| >
| As you will notice, I am not related to Bill Gates. I never thought that
anyone
| could be as dishonest as to measure anything in decimals when talking of
| computers.
| However I have read the article from Western Digital and I am sorry to see
that
| they also are involved in this mess.
|
| Hard to find any honesty anywhere. A bit hard to believe that bytes are now
| measured in digital – but it seems to be so. Therefore as we need an index we
| are in for even lesser storage area.
|
| I think therefore that disks should be measured in a standard way and that
would
| be binary and indeed in actual storage area after the formatting has been
done.
|
| Borge

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
◇ From: nesredep egrob

• **References:**

- ◆ **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
◇ From: nesredep egrob
- ◆ **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
◇ From: Snarky Parker
- ◆ **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
◇ From: nesredep egrob
- ◆ **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
◇ From: nesredep egrob

- Prev by Date: **Re: Always maximize**
- Next by Date: **Re: Performance Monitor**
- Previous by thread: **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
- Next by thread: **Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**

Re: 48-Bit LBA Support for ATAPI Disk Drives in Windows 2000

◆ *Thread*