

Re: ?????SATA or SCSI????

Re: ?????SATA or SCSI????

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2006-11/msg00234.html>

- *From:* "Les Connor [SBS Community Member – SBS MVP]" <les.connor@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 1 Nov 2006 13:43:59 –0600
-

Nah, I only discount SATA because of their lineage. Whether founded or not, I perceive SATA as having a higher failure rate than SCSI in a server application. That comes from the experience of others, a lot of it exposed in this very newsgroup. At the same time, my experience with SCSI has been good.

AFAIK, the only reason one would select SATA over SCSI is price. At the time of purchase, it's fun to see how much you can get for how little, but on the first failure the savings are all gone, plus some. Just not worth the risk, IMHO. And as we all know, customers try and save money on initial purchases only because it's the only thing they know how to do, at that point in time. Once their SBS is in production and they start to realize the benefits, investing in technology becomes *so* much easier for them. Suddenly, cost is not the only thing they know ;-).

I took a chance on the SAS drives, but not without research. I'd have been quite happy to have used SCSI; that would be my safe choice – but the word on SAS is that it replaces SCSI. SATA doesn't claim that.

That's the only reason SATA wasn't considered. The disk subsystem is fundamental to the reliability of the box, and as such it's not the place to look for cost reductions.

The fact that a drive failed has no significance at this point, other than I'm on guard. Whenever a drive fails in a new server, one has to consider the possibility of a manufacturing batch failure ;-). I'm double on guard because SAS is fairly new. Fortunately, every array has fault tolerance, and a global hotspare provides yet another layer. I may not have gone quite that far with SCSI.

—
Les Connor [SBS Community Member – SBS MVP]

SBS Rocks !

"Tell me and I'll forget. Show me and I'll remember. Involve me and I'll understand." – Confucius

Re: ?????SATA or SCSI????

Re: ?????SATA or SCSI????

"Gregg Hill" <bogus@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:O8x8zfe\\$GHA.3380@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:O8x8zfe$GHA.3380@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Les,

The reason I asked it that way is that people tend to discount errors in a product or technology that they like, and they tend to focus on the errors in a product that they do not like, or with which they are unfamiliar.

A classic example is Japanese vs. domestic cars. I had friends with Fords and friends with Hondas who had problems with their radiators. Specifically, after 110,000 miles, the radiator on my Ford Bronco II started to leak. My wife's friend had a Honda Civic with 45,000 miles with the same problem. Her friend said my Ford was a piece of junk because of the leak, but when her Honda started leaking a week after my truck did, she said it "was just a fluke."

Ford even did testing with Japanese car owners, and they said they had no problems with their cars. Then Ford asked specific questions, such as questions targeted at brakes, A/C, and electrical, and they found that the people had the same problems as Ford and other domestic makes, but their ****perception**** was that it was no big deal.

Equal problems, but since they ****perceived**** their Japanese cars with favor, they felt the problems were minor, when in fact they were the same as domestic makers' cars.

So, the question was absolutely fair. You never considered SATA, which indicated you do not like it (yet?), and that ****could**** bias your opinion of the drive failure as being insignificant in a technology that you like, but it may have been perceived as a major failure if it had been SATA that you do not like. That was the point of the question.

Gregg Hill

"Les Connor [SBS Community Member – SBS MVP]" <les.connor@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message [news:u\\$4n1Ke\\$GHA.4592@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:u$4n1Ke$GHA.4592@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

That's not a fair question ;-). I suppose it could be more statistically significant (but outside my experience) if only because I think we hear of more SATA failures than SCSI failures. I haven't yet deployed a server with SATA drives and I'd rather not take a chance. SAS is new technology, I haven't heard a lot of complaints about reliability, but then again I have no idea what percentage of servers are being deployed with SAS either.

Manufacturing defects do tend to show up fairly quickly, sometimes stuff

Re: ?????SATA or SCSI????

Re: ???SATA or SCSI???

is even just DOA. I still subscribe to the burn-in theory, and like to run a new server for a week or so before putting it into production, if possible.

--
Les Connor [SBS Community Member – SBS MVP]

SBS Rocks !

"Tell me and I'll forget. Show me and I'll remember. Involve me and I'll understand." – Confucius

"Gregg Hill" <bogus@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:OOgWI7d\$GHA.2192@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Les,

If the drives had been SATA and one had failed in a week, would you still be of the opinion that it is not significant?

Gregg Hill

"Les Connor [SBS Community Member – SBS MVP]" <les.connor@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:OXncd5d\$GHA.4604@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I just deployed a server with SAS drives. I'm hoping the technology is reliable – it's certainly fast :-). The choice was between SCSI or SAS, SATA wasn't considered. The SAS drives/raid controllers offer a degree of configuration flexibility not previously available – and as SAS is touted as the technology that will replace SCIS, the choice was made.

I did have 1 of 8 drives fail within a week, but obviously that can't be considered significant at this early stage.

--
Les Connor [SBS Community Member – SBS MVP]

SBS Rocks !

Re: ????SATA or SCSI????

"Tell me and I'll forget. Show me and I'll
remember. Involve me and
I'll understand." – Confucius

"SimonR" <Simon@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
[news:uzT7abd\\$GHA.5068@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:uzT7abd$GHA.5068@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

SCSI

IDE/SATA is fine for
TOYS!!

The drives are NOT
designed for 24/7 x 365 use
and they are slow
(7200RPM)

Western Digital produce
RAPTOR drives – these are
FASTER 10K RPM
(speed) and designed for
24/7 x 365

I always recommend SCSI –
having said that my Server
uses IDE – but
its a TOY!

If budget is low just use 2
drive in Mirror (RAID-1)
setup

and finally – TAPE backup
don't use USB HDD
for what they cost I replace
tapes every year – the old
ones get used
for MONTH END backup

*** You can't have too
many backups ***

"Michael Tovey"
<michael.spamtovey@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in
message

Re: ????SATA or SCSI????

Re: ????SATA or SCSI????

news:2676FC05-A260-490F-8166-7BEC5833068D@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hello,

I have just
had another
SATA
HDD crash
on me in
my SBS-
2003 STD
server and
I was
wondering!

Have any
other people
had
problems
with SATA
when used
to hold data
in their
SBS server.

I have been
told by a
firm that
we
sometime
use when I
get a bit
tight on
time that
SATA is
NO good to
be used on
Data servers
and that we
NEED
SCSI
Raid 5!

We have
about 10GB
MAX on
the disks
and only
about 12
people
accessing,

Re: ????SATA or SCSI????

Re: ???SATA or SCSI???

and
maybe only
5 at the
same time!

What do
you all
think?????

--

SBS 2003 –
Admin
SVR 2003
– Admin
SQL 2005 –
Admin