

## Re: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2005-04/msg03358.html>

---

- *From:* "Marshall Lai" <[marshall\\_lai@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:marshall_lai@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 12 Apr 2005 14:53:39 +0800
- 

Thanks for the suggestion. Thought of that before but performance probably is a bit slower than internal harddisks.  
Except if you are talking about 3.5" external enclosures of course. But then those things are very bulky. Not to mention there is no redundancy.....

"Godfrey Nicholson" <[godfrey@ofektech.com](mailto:godfrey@ofektech.com)> wrote in message [news:363C3A60-3C15-449F-AB64-9D1F210282F2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:363C3A60-3C15-449F-AB64-9D1F210282F2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> Marshall:

>

> Another possibility you might want to consider is to back up onto an external USB drive. It is a cheap, very fast option. I use it

>

> Godfrey

>

> "Marshall Lai" wrote:

>

>> I am contemplating adding some hard disks for backing up my SBS2003 server.

>> Should I go for RAID 5 or RAID 1?

>> Any consensus here? The array will be used ONLY for backup and restore purposes and nothing else.

>>

>> Any insight will be much appreciated.

>>

>> Marshall

>>

>>

>>

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ [\*Re: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?\*](#)

Re: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?

◇ *From:* Andrew H

• **References:**

◆ **RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?**

◇ *From:* Marshall Lai

◆ **RE: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?**

◇ *From:* Godfrey Nicholson

• Prev by Date: **Re: OWA Premium Client Page not loading completely.**

• Next by Date: **Re: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?**

• Previous by thread: **Re: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?**

• Next by thread: **Re: RAID for backup. RAID 5 or RAID 1?**

• Index(es):

◆ **Date**

◆ **Thread**