

## Re: Two "expert" issues I must solve before upgading

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.newusers/2004-09/1008.html>

---

**From:** Jeff W (*msnews\_at\_Kwcpa.com*)

**Date:** 09/09/04

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 2004 11:25:35 -0400

Good thoughts all Vanguardx – a few comments:

1) I think backups are different than the other fluff you suggest – more in the 'safety and security' class than in extra functions like FTP. Perhaps if they put a good, easy-to-use disaster-recovery program in windows, home users WOULD use it, and they'd have fewer windows-haters out there who had a disk crash and had to start from scratch.

2) I think your point is that it's hard to extract a single file from a disk image? So i should continue weekly fulls, daily incrementals, and, honestly, weekly disk images (I believe that trying to restore more than a week of incrementals can start to get ugly – incrementals can't track files deleted, etc). That's a lot of backing up.....(sigh) Still – it means i can do everything with just NTBACKUP and something like IFW

3) I agree that if I ever start mucking with multiple O/Ses, or 'power-user' partition swapping tricks then I need a more industrial strength solution, but if i don't, I won't.

4) I have cloned drives using XCOPY in WIN98SE. My theory was that for XP you can do the same, if you also do some special extra steps (like fixmbr). A lot of FUD about this, but not a lot of clear proof it won't work if I'm otherwise keeping things simple 8-}

Thanks again

/j

Vanguardx wrote:

> "Jeff W" <msnews@kwcpa.com>

> wrote in news:OU2z0YiEHA.3496@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl:

>> Hi Sharon – thanks for the response –

>>

>> First – I'm not against imaging programs – I've heard good things

>> about Image-for-Windows. However, my concern with them is this – if

microsoft.public.windowsxp.newusers: Re: Two "expert" issues I must solve before upgading

>> *I need an imaging program for my full backups, don't I also need*

>> *imaging for my incrementals? Is there nothing I could I do*

>> *"mid-week" to render my last full image backup out of date?*

>

>*No. Don't consider disk images as file backup. They are hardware*

>*backup, or for disaster recovery. In your case, consider saving a disk*

>*image when you are planning to perform a major change. If you are*

>*upgrading, er, migrating from Windows 98 to Windows XP, save a disk*

>*image of your current Windows 98 OS partition. Then if things go awry*

>*with the migration, you can restore the disk image and get back quickly*

>*to the Windows 98 that was working for you before and then rethink how*

>*to successfully redo the migration. If you are going to make hardware*

>*changes then save a disk image. Before you install a major application,*

>*like MS Office, then save a disk image. Before you install a Service*

>*Pack, save a disk image.*

>

>*Keep doing your monthly full, weekly incremental, and daily incremental*

>*(grandfather-father-son) backups. Then when you need to recover from a*

>*disaster, use the disk image followed by only those backups that you did*

>*after you saved the disk image (so date the disk image media or use*

>*folder/filenames that let you know when the disk image got created so*

>*you know after what date to restore from logical backups). You can*

>*still use your backups as before, even restoring an older dated version*

>*of a file rather than restoring a newer one that you know doesn't have*

>*what you want (i.e., the revised version is the bad one). The disk*

>*images provide snapshots which act like walking down a long hallway with*

>*a door at each snapshot. If there aren't any doors, you end up slammed*

>*all the way at the start of the hallway and have to rebuild everything*

>*again to reach the other end. If you keep closing a door along the way*

>*where you make critical or signigicant changes (i.e., make a snapshot*

>*before taking the risk), you only get pushed back to that last closed*

>*door and can rebuild from there.*

>

>> *Also - your response, though similar to others I've seen many places,*

>> *is a bit frustating to an old 98/DOS hacker like myself. There's*

>> *sort of a religion out there that you can't capture everything by*

>> *copying just files and folders.*

>

>*Very true. Those that think using XCOPY to clone a drive don't realize*

>*that inuse files don't get copies (which includes the registry files for*

>*the account under which they are currently logged into) and files for*

>*which they don't have read permission (something you still have to note*

>*when doing backups) or were locked out by the system or other processes*

>*won't get copied. XCOPY does not support shadow copying. Disk imaging*

>*(actually partition imaging) doesn't care about account permissions,*

>*security, policies, EFS, or inuse files because you are not running the*

>*OS when creating the image.*

>

>> *Msoft puts "special stuff" out there*

>> *on the disk, outside of the MBR, that can only be captured by a disk*

>> *image. I'll accept this more easily if someone could tell me what*

Re: Two "expert" issues I must solve before upgading

>> *that information is. You say "You cannot simply sys an XP drive and  
>> toss data onto it." I have to use an imaging program. Ok, I'll accept  
>> this, but must I do so blindly 8-}*

>

>*Some disk imaging software does not include the MBR along with the  
>partition's image fileset. That's because it can bite you hard. I use  
>DriveImage 2002 (haven't upgraded yet) and there is no option to save  
>the MBR or to restore it; however, you can download Powerquest's freebie  
>MBR save/restore utility (one version runs in DOS and the other under  
>Windows). Following exemplifies why backing up and restoring old copies  
>of the MBR is considered an advanced restore function.*

>

>*You image a partition. This is the first primary partition on your  
>drive containing Windows XP and which occupies half of it. With that  
>image you save the MBR which includes the bootstrap program, disk  
>signature, bytes, the partition table, and a couple other items I don't  
>recall right now. There is also another 2nd FAT32 partition using up  
>the remainder of the drive and which contains Windows 98 (you really  
>like your old games, or you need to test your product across all  
>supported platforms). You decide to add Linux or some other OS using  
>whatever file system is appropriate for it in another primary partition  
>but all the disk space has been used up in the 2 partitions already  
>there. You resize the 2nd primary partition since there is lots of  
>unused space in it. This leaves unallocated space on the hard drive for  
>your new 3rd partition. However, for reasons you only know, you decide  
>you want the new 3rd partition to follow after the first partition and  
>the old 2nd partition to be last, so the physical order will be: old  
>NTFS primary partition #1, new other-file-system primary partition #3,  
>and then the old FAT32 primary partition #2. That means you not only  
>have to resize old partition #2 but you also have to slide it to the end  
>of the disk. Then you can create the new partition in the middle. Well  
>guess what happened to the partition table in the MBR? If you later  
>restore the image for partition 1 and include the MBR that got saved  
>with it, you will also restore a partition table in that old copy of the  
>MBR which no longer matches your current partition setup. The old MBR  
>copy shows 2 primary partitions where the first one is an NTFS type  
>partition occupying half the disk and the second is a FAT32 type  
>partition occupying the other half of the disk. That's okay for your  
>old NTFS primary partition #1 but will screw up your new  
>other-file-system primary partition #3 and the resized and moved old  
>FAT32 primary partition #2. You can recover from this blunder by using  
>a partition table editor (another freebie download from Powerquest's FTP  
>site) but you are doing more hazardous editing of your system setup than  
>even when editing the registry.*

>

>> *PS – another mini rant. – What I want (a way to do good, proactive  
>> backups that protect me from a disk crash, without spending a fortune  
>> on 3rd party software), seems like something MICROSOFT would be very  
>> supportive of – yet they apparently don't offer any easy way to do  
>> it???? (sigh)*

>

>But you are forgetting that the NT Backup program wasn't written by  
>Microsoft. It is a crippled version of Veritas' Backup Exec Desktop.  
>Microsoft provided a minimal and crippled solution (which is actually  
>fluff if all you really wanted was just the OS) which is still palatable  
>by many low-volume, normal octane users (and YOU chose to reduce the  
>octane further by going with XP Home instead of XP Pro). The  
>defragmenter included in Windows XP is a crippled version of Diskeeper.  
>The Disk Cleanup utility is a crippled version of CleanSweep. Don't  
>know about you, but I haven't used Wordpad since, well, I can't remember  
>when I last used it so it's been years. EFS is good for securing the  
>content of your files but it isn't meant to compete against more robust  
>security solutions (I haven't tried SafeBoot or DriveCrypt but they  
>appear to implement better drive encryption security). Windows XP Pro  
>comes with the Fax Service and it is usable but not for high-volume  
>business use (alas, Symantec let WinFax die after they bought it from  
>Delrina). If you FTP a lot, do you use the DOS-mode ftp.exe program or  
>try FTP'ing through Internet Explorer, or do you get FileZilla or some  
>other real FTP client? If you care about securely erasing files, are  
>you going to rely on deleting the file, emptying the Recycle Bin, and  
>running defrag hoping that the now unused space gets overwritten, or do  
>you head on over to <http://www.heidi.ie/eraser/> to get the decent and  
>freebie Eraser utility? Do you rely on the Bayesian filtering in  
>Outlook 2003 to get rid of spam, or do you get a better solution that  
>includes Bayesian filtering, DNS blacklists of known spam sources, block  
>by country of origin, HTML filtering and weighting, URL checking, and  
>other anti-spam methods that are far superior and might even be rolled  
>into one product, like SpamPal (which is free, by the way)?  
>  
>There is a lot of fluff in Windows that is NOT part of an operating  
>system but is good marketing for Microsoft to keep their users happy by  
>giving them just enough to shut them up. You got something, it's  
>passable, but it's not a strong solution. Basically they are still just  
>selling an operating system. Users already complain about the cost of  
>Windows. Are you going to pay more to have Microsoft include whatever  
>is the most potent backup program available along with whatever is the  
>most potent disk imaging software? Why not also demand they include MS  
>Office Pro in place of WordPad, Spinrite6 in place of CHKDSK, and  
>PhotoShop in place of Paint? Rather than make Windows even more  
>expensive, I'd like to get a much cheaper and less fluffy version of  
>Windows and add software for the critical or wanted functions that \*I\*  
>want to include.  
>  
>  
>