Re: Hard Drive Replacement

Source:
http://www.tech−archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.general/2007−12/msg00352.html

- *From*: Devalzadvok8 <Devalzadvok8@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 11:16:01 −0800

Am back. Sorry for 'lag', but have been distracted by other things.

All you gentlemen's points are well taken. However, I 'harken' from a period back.

When I replaced my IBM−PC with a PC−XT, a bit more than 25 years ago, I thought that the 10 meg disk drive would never fill up. I quickly learned that not only would it do so, but that my backups on 5 1/4" floppy discs rapidly exceeded the number I could deal with, and did it in very slow fashion, to boot. As a result I employed a partitioning system [C,D,E] that would allow me to back up my own 'data' more quickly and with fewer floppies involved.

Over the years I have developed a two−computer philosophy, with the older computer backing up the newer. When technology passed me [and my 'B' machine] by so far that I was forced to get a new computer I would salvage my 'B' machine and make my previous 'A' machine now become the 'new' 'B' machine.

Each one has a duplicate C,D,E hard drive setup and/or equivalent. Every program that I buy and have a CD−ROM for I put on my 'E' drive. All operating system and 'downloaded' [only] programs go on my 'C[' partition. I do not use ethernet to transfer files, on the not−so−outside chance that a virus on the newer computer could transfer to the older. This, by the way, is the obvious reason I don't use a 'RAID' setup. And, in the viruses I've received over the years only once has a virus put anything out on a non−'C' drive − actually, the most recent one at that − a virused "Mplayer.com" on my 'D' drive. The other progams infected, by the way, included: Windows Explorer, IExplorer, Java, MPlayer, Windows Media Player, System32 directory, and about another half−dozen places − some I can't find at all.

Yes, copying out [my D, E] on CD−ROMs and loading them into the 'old' computer is cumbersome, but gives me additional backup [and consequent peace of mind]. Further, more than once, I have swapped out my data/application program hard disk drives off of an old computer and mounted them to a new computer to process them there. The application programs have to be reloaded, yes, but there are almost always 'variable' files associated that the new 'loadings' don't destroy and I can continue to capitalize on their

contents.

I realize that you all must think this as 'foolish', but I believe that this particular methodology, plus others I employ, have enabled me to not lose a database since I entered the on−line computer game, some 48 years ago. That's not a bad record to have, I believe.

My original problem, getting rid of the virus and 'reversing' the two disk drives turns out to be difficult − at least for me. And, as an aside, the 15,000 rpm 18 gig SCSI drive was the survivor of two such drives − the first one crashing a couple of years ago. Fortunately, the 'crashed' drive was just my 'C' drive and all my valuable data was on the second SCSI drive. I replaced the 'dead' drive with a non−SCSI IDE 80 gig hard drive. The reason, then, that I didn't assign the 'fast' drive as my primary drive was due to my worry that it just might die not long after my first such drive. The original drive was an IBM, but the second drive arrived later [after IBM sold their disk drive division to Seagate]. At the time of the 'crash' the succeeding 80 gig IDE drive seemed so large that I just assigned the SCSI Seagate as a 'backup' drive, that would reside in 'sleep' mode most of the time [to hopefully make it last longer].

The difficulty in any 'easy' drive switch is that the SCSI information is on the IDE primary drive and I also have no real idea of how to 'switch' the base Registry data over [which was Microsoft's original intent to forstall in the beginning]. Also, I have no documentation on the motherboard that would allow me to determine whether drive assignments go by cable end location, drive 'pin' 0/1, master/slave location, or programmatic assignment − or some combination of all. The local 'builder' of my computer has long since gone out of business.

I have spent far too much time in trying to resolve this − a most impractical expenditure − but I have never been defeated by a computer problem before and I stubbornly struggled to keep my record 'clean'. Mistake on my part, I guess.

My 'A' machine is over 6 years old, now, and the 'B' approaching 9 years. I have discovered great difficulties in trying to find 'upgrade' parts for techology long obsoleted. As a result I have gone out and purchased a new HP n6230a which 'seemed' to have the right specs I desired. To my horror I discovered that [under Vista] it ran slower than my 6 year old Win2000 'A' machine!

My 'A' machine is in a good case with good peripherals. Virtually none of the motherboard components can be readily upgraded in this 'modern' age as their 'formats' are no longer manufactured. I have determined that for approx. $360 I could buy a 800 Mhz buss speed motherboard, dual core processor [AMD], and a Seagate 500 gig SATA drive, plus a couple of gig of RAM. This is about as far as I want to go in trying to make my 'old' machine as similar to the new machine as possible. With luck, I should be able to carry this combination forward for another 2−3 years before I have to scratch my head and think about next replacements.

The dual−core processor was an odd requirement, but I have been experimenting with 'Skype' and Logitec's PRO−9000 web camera, which, as I have found out, turns out to be a horrible combination to run under Vista − it is so slow. Under my wife's old WinXP machine it runs both faster and clearer. 'Skype' indicates that the 'dual−core processor' is one of their webcam interface requirements [and, as it turns out, it really isn't].

What kills it, speed−wise, I believe is the 'graphics' associated with HP's built−in GeForce 6150 graphics chip and 19" flat screen monitor. I bypassed that by procuring a GeForce 8500GT graphics card at reasonable cost. This 'helped', but not enough. Have now reduced the resolution from 1440x900 [for the 19" flat screen] down to 1280x800. This helps a lot, too, but there is still 'motion lag' and the resulting graphics resolution from the web camera [with Zeiss lens, yet] is still as poor as before.

What gripes me is that my 'other' web cam associate and test 'subject' [a front end software programmer] is using an old laptop w/built−in webcam and his pictures come in far clearer than mine. Am beginning to think this webcam business is just one big 'experiment'. If I had read all the problem reports on Logitec's webcam board first I doubt if I would have attempted to 'give' this camera setup to my wife as a Christmas present. Well, that's how it goes, I guess.

I want to thank all of you for your inputs. And, 'yes', I will continue to be as 'inefficient' as before until someone comes by with unrefutable reasons as to why I should do different<g>. Hey, it works for me. . . . . .

Cheers & thanx,

Dev

"John John" wrote:

> nesredep egrob wrote:
>
> > On Wed, 26 Dec 2007 23:01:02 −0400, John John <audetweld@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> >
> > > nesredep egrob wrote:
> > >
> > > > On Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:06:40 −0400, John John <audetweld@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

See in−line replies.

Devalzadvok8 wrote:

> My problem is somewhat similar to Norm's. I have two hard drives, the first ,currently, an 80 Gig IDE 'C' drive that also has 'D' and 'E' partitions. All my system software, Windows, etc. is on my 'C' drive. All my data files are on my 'D' partition. All my application programs are on my 'E' partition.

There is practically no advantage to having the applications on a separate partition.

Oh dear me − should not have written that.

> There is a massive improvement if you are clever enough to use Acronis for backups.

I do use Acronis and what massive improvements does having the programs on a separate drive make? What does this have to do with anything? Installing programs on a different drive makes absolutely no difference whatsoever in performance, none, zero, zilch! What massive improvements are you talking about? Do you mean that when you do a backup or create an image it will take about four minutes more time to do a larger OS image? And what about the programs drive? Don't you have to image that too? So now instead of having everything on one image you have to create two different images every time you want to back things up and if you want to restore you have to restore two images, I can't see what good that does.

John

Most people have an idea where the fault in the disk lies. Just like a TV, even my apprentices would not start messing with the linetimebase if the sound was missing and the picture was OK.

Likewise if some program is missing but the system seems to work I would be sad to have to troll through the whole computer and reset the lot. Remember even after a couple of days your backup is that much behind present time and having system and programs together makes for the whole lot being a given time behind what the computer was like today.

Each to his own of course but should my system go, I would prefer not to have to also have the programs set back to the last time I did the backup. Programs are often changed or updated for a better one − system is often left just as it was when installed, therefore why have the lot bundled together.

Excuse me but I beg to differ. First of all we are talking about an 18GB SCSI drive, not a big 300+ GB drive. As for the system not being changed often, or left just as it was when installed then I suppose you never tweak the operating system to your likings, not to mention that you don't do any security updates, even if only a few times a year.

As for the programs changing often, then by the very nature of modern applications all but the smallest of them write to many different places in the registry so if you change these often and do a restore of an old OS image then much of your programs are going to be missing registry entries and they won't work properly. If the programs develop errors and you then think that you can fix them by restoring an image of the "Programs" partition only then you are not restoring any registry entries associated with the programs, because, as we all know, there are no registry files in the programs folder, the registry files are in the System32 folder. You also forget that some programs put some dll's and other support files in some of the Operating System's folders.

If a single program fails then one of the most common and easy fix is to reinstall the application, that restores the program files and the associated registry entries. If all your programs fail then the problem is deeper and you may have to reinstall or restore the Operating System. Restoring the programs folder without restoring the associated registry entries fixes nothing and restoring an old OS image that doesn't contain up to date registry information for the applications won't fix anything either. In short, the Operating System files, the Registry and the Applications need to be sync together.

People don't restore images all that often, for most problems it is easier to find the problem and do a targeted fix. When thing really go south then people pull out the images and start doing restores, doing restores of "out of sync" components will leave you with a fine mess. No one should expect to restore one or both of the operating system side or the applications side of the system with files that are severely out of date with each other and expect the restore to work properly. When you back these up you have to back them up together and keep them synchronized to each other if you want to have reliable backups. You can't say: "I changed a lot of programs so I am going to backup only the programs folder for disaster recovery", you have to back up the Operating System along with the programs files if you want reliable backups that can get you back up and running quickly.

The strategy that you propose requires users to create two images or backups every time that they do their system backups, one for the operating system and another one for the programs. It is difficult enough to get some people to do one (System) backup on a regular basis, let alone having them do two of them. In the event of a disaster recovery your strategy also requires users to do two separate restore operations, one for the operating system and one for the programs, thus practically doubling the effort and time required to bring the system

back up, maybe not a big deal on a home computer but a hassle nonetheless, in a corporate environment an absolute no−no, the quicker the system can be brought back up to working state the better. Add mismatched or severely out of date/out of sync system and programs backup sets to the pressure of bringing downed systems back up and you have nothing short of self inflicted misery!

As you say, "to each his own", but I cannot see the logic in the backup method that you propose and it is definitely not one that I would use. I maintain that there is little to no useful purpose to having the operating system and the program files on separate partitions. The backup scenario that you propose does not give weight to the argument in favour of separate partitions, to the contrary it reinforces the reasons to have them on a single partition.

John

.