

Re: Tape vs HDD vs NAS (speed considerations and size etc)..

## Re: Tape vs HDD vs NAS (speed considerations and size etc)..

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2007-01/msg00999.html>

---

- *From:* "markm75" <[markm75c@xxxxxxx](mailto:markm75c@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 7 Jan 2007 19:13:30 -0800
- 

Leythos wrote:

In article <1168180181.996230.30150@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, markm75c@xxxxxxx says...

Anna Clark (remove this) wrote:

Hi Leythos:

The OP was talking about as much as a \$10K tape solutions, which is why I chimed in with duplicate NAS's.

<http://www.cdw.com/shop/products/default.aspx?EDC=933011>

Buffalo TeraStation Pro 2TB Network Attached Storage with Serial ATA Drive  
2TB NAS with Gigabit Ethernet, RAID5, and Serial ATA Drives, Features  
Microsoft Active Directory and an LCD display with pertinent information and warning/error messages.  
MFG#: TS-2.0TGL/R5

\$1399.00

Anna

"Leythos" <void@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:MPG.200a3e8e104e7ee4989728@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:MPG.200a3e8e104e7ee4989728@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In article <uTPxNggMHHA.5064@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, "Anna Clark"

Re: Tape vs HDD vs NAS (speed considerations and size etc)..

<anna.clark(remove this)@verizon.net>  
says...

Hi Leythos:

Not sure of what you speak.  
One could have one or more  
external USB

drives,

or one could have one or  
more NAS devices, or one  
could have one or more

of

each or both. I believe there  
are NAS devices small  
enough to carry.

Or maybe I don't understand  
the terminology, which is  
entirely possible,  
even probable.

I don't consider a USB/Firewire device to be  
a NAS, it's just another  
drive on the server, there is no "network"  
part of a USB external drive.

A NAS is something that has a network  
adapter built into it.

Most people that have a NAS solution can't  
afford a second NAS device.

--

spam999free@xxxxxxxxxxx  
remove 999 in order to email me

Yeah our budget is roughly a max of 10k.. we have about 40 users.. two  
servers with 400gb/500gb backup drives (dual)..

So NAS could be one option, but maybe tape would still be the way to  
go.. but are there any tape units that could do 40+ MB/s (comparable to  
sataII).. I wouldnt think so...

Re: Tape vs HDD vs NAS (speed considerations and size etc)..

I'd also think that for this size of data, even with 400gb tapes.. a backup set for a given week to take offsite would be kludgy.. like say 5 tapes per week cycling on and offsite at the end of each week (not to mention more expensive per tape)...

Just my thoughts on this though...

I do backup to disk, USB 2.0, at one customer, using SBS, and they backup 60GB in about 3 hours (sorry, didn't do the math). With that said, they also backup to tape, but only about 20GB of vital data.

I have a couple LTO-3 drives and LTO-2 drives in customers system, and they've worked well, but, the tapes are not cheap, unless you consider the cost of replacing the data on them. Have you considered LTO-3 for backups? 400/800GB?

You could also consider the Magnum 1x7 LTO Tape Autoloader, about \$5000 retail.

---

spam999free@xxxxxxxxxxx  
remove 999 in order to email me

Yeah LTO-3 is what I was considering.. but the cost per tape, I believe was kinda high, considering the number of them we'd need for a full backup set (two of them to alternate offsite each week, etc).

I'm pretty sure our 350gb backup that we do runs about 10 hours or more to SATAII's.. I forget, but I think the specs on some LTO's were only around 20MB/s, so that would take 2x as long if so.

.