

Re: format question

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.setup_deployment/2004-08/2291.html

From: Pegasus \ (MVP\) (I.can_at_fly.com)

Date: 08/22/04

Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2004 10:28:46 +1000

"JKR" <jkr@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:908fi091tmrt4f0827gt9c86fs1qbmercg@4ax.com...

> "Pegasus \ (MVP\)" <I.can@fly.com> wrote:

>

>>

>> "JKR" <jkr@nospam.com> wrote in message

>>> news:goldi01rjt9vri444iqmj4ebr1r26jfgtu@4ax.com...

>>> "Pegasus \ (MVP\)" <I.can@fly.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> >If you intend to use a 3rd party boot manager then you should
>>>>> consider having ALL files for each OS reside in the same partition
>>>>> as the OS itself, i.e. make the partition self-contained. This would
>>>>> make for a truly modular configuration. Having the boot files on
>>>>> one drive and the rest of the OS elsewhere is messy and is likely
>>>>> to cause problems in the long run, because it will greatly reduce
>>>>> your flexibility.

>>>>>

>>>>> I was under the impression that when you load Win98 or XP, they will
>>>>> load a few files (i.e. system files) into C:\ whether you want them to
>>>>> or not. ? Therefore I was going to make C:\ FAT16, Active and Primary,
>>>>> but only about 10MB and load DOS there as well. (Might even put a
couple

>>>>> old DOS games for antiquity sake.) :)

>>>>>

>>>>> The OS's will be installed in D:\ and E:\ (FAT32, Logical drives). But
>>>>> like I said, from what I understand, they will load a few hundred kb of
>>>>> system files in the C:\ root no matter what.

>>>>>

>>>>> That's not your understanding?

>>>>>

>>>>> (And I learned I have to load Win98 first or it will "stomp all over
the

>>>>> XP boot files" all of which, again, will get stuck in C:\).

>

> First to clarify my own post: the OS's will load system files into the

- > C:\ drive *IF* C:\ is set as the Active Primary Partition, and the OS's
- > are being loaded into [their own] logical partitions. Like so:
- >
- > c: DOS OS FAT16 Primary – Active
- > d: Win98 FAT32 Logical \
- > e: XP FAT32 Logical \ Extended DOS Partition
- > f: applications FAT32 Logical /
- > g: data FAT32 Logical /
- >
- > There are pros and cons to every setup. A benefit here is that you can
- > always get your system to boot no matter what happens to your OS's, as
- > DOS is pretty reliable. ;) Also, you don't have Win98 or XP in C:\ which
- > is a security benefit. Too, you can see all volumes and manipulate all
- > files from any OS b/c it is all in FAT32/16. (NOTE: If you wanted XP
- > NTFS, you should make it G:\ and move back the apps and data drives to
- > E: and F: b/c Win98 won't see the NTFS drive. This way both XP and Win98
- > would "point" to the same drive letters for apps and data.)
- >
- > What you propose [and what many others do] is to make the first three
- > partitions each primary. Then make one at a time active and the others,
- > hidden. Installing the OS into its own primary, active partition in this
- > way will make each load all systems files etc into it's own partition
- > and each partition will be seen as "C:\", [when active] with the other
- > primary partitions, invisible/inactive. With this setup data and
- > application partitions are configured as logical drives, available at
- > all times to all OS's, no matter which OS is active. Like so:
- >
- > c: DOS FAT16 Primary C: when active
- > d: WIN98 FAT32 Primary C: when active
- > e: XP NTFS or FAT32 Primary C: when active
- > f: apps FAT32 Logical D: (seen as...)
- > g: data FAT32 Logical E: (seen as...)
- >
- > With this setup the OS is always available in C:\ (less secure, some
- > would say) and you cannot access the other OS's with a file manager,
- > because those volumes will be hidden. However you can use NTFS and there
- > *is* an elegance about this setup.
- >
- > The reason I didn't want to do this, is that I don't like having the
- > other volumes hidden when I'm in an OS. I like opening 'file manager'
- > and seeing a tree of all drives, and being able to go copy a file
- > quickly or check something in any of the other drives.
- >
- > >It depends on your boot loader. My preferred boot loader lets
- > >me load any OS into its own partition: Boot files, system files,
- > everything.
- >
- > It is my understanding a boot loader only passes you to one OS or
- > another. But system files (when you install an OS) will load into the
- > active C:\ root no matter what... so it depends on the setup [i.e. which
- > partition is active and primary and if your OS is being loaded into that

> drive or into a logical drive].
>
> >Each OS is therefore completely independent of every other OS,
> >and can be moved about any way I like (which becomes important
> >when discarding old OSs in future and loading new ones).
>
> Good point... and this would be the case with scenario #2 above... A
> "pro" to that scenario.
>
> >I would never use your proposed setup, for these reasons.
> >- An OS installed in drive D: must always reside in drive D: - it
> > cannot be moved.
>
> What reasons do you have for moving an OS around? (Not challenging --
> curiously asking to see if it might apply to me or not.) ;) In the case
> above, (the first scenario) if I eventually wanted to ride myself of
> Win98, I would simply delete the OS and its few system files residing in
> C:\. I could then use that volume for some other OS or anything else.
>
> >- Your drive C: must always be a FAT32 partition, because of Win98.
>
> But the drive C:\ would only be for DOS and a few system files, and
> would be created very small, (10MB would be more than enough, but if you
> wanted to play DOS games, even 100MB would be plenty) so why would that
> matter? The big advantage with this again, is that you can always boot
> to C:\. (Some of us who have been around since the 80s don't like
> letting our DOS options go, dontcha know?) ;)
>
> >- You must Win98 first, then WinXP.
>
> ? A boot loader would let me load whatever I want. My system would boot,
> and a screen would appear (XOSL for instance) and I would choose which
> OS I wanted to boot into -- DOS, Win98, or XP.
>
> >I don't like any of these restrictions.
> >
> >I use XOSL as a boot loader. It's free. What do you use?
>
> I haven't set this up yet -- am still deciding how I want to partition
> the drive. But I looked at several boot loaders to see what I might use,
> and liked the look of XOSL best. ;)
>
> I have read extensively on the Web, many people's opinions on setups.
> Everyone has their own reasons why they like their setup or would do it
> different. There is of course no wrong or right way. And there *are*
> pros and cons to each. I'm still in the air about it... which is why I
> haven't formatted my 120 yet!!
>
> JKR

You have obviously given the matter a good deal of thought. As always in such cases, there are several ways of configuring a multi-boot machine, depending on your preferences.

My point of not wanting to install OSs in a drive other than C: comes from dealing with quite a few posts in this forum. In each case the OP had an original setup like you propose, and he subsequently wanted to get rid of some OS and move the other ones to a different drive. This is not possible with Windows OSs: Once installed on drive D: (for example), they must always reside on drive D:.

Note that XOSL offers the additional advantage of installing an OS (complete with all its boot files) on ANY partition (primary or logical) on ANY drive (master, slave, primary, secondary). There aren't many boot managers that can do this.

Good luck!