

Re: RAID timeout parameter accessibility request

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2007-12/msg09708.html>

- *From:* Jose de la Mancha <hidalgoj@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:54:52 +0100
-

Thanks guys for your answers (please remember to keep CCing me).

Robert Hancock wrote:

This always seemed a strange use case to me. If the drive is getting read errors, either it's dying and needs to be replaced, or it has a sporadic bad sector as a result of a power failure during write, etc. in which case the drive should be resynchronized. In either case the drive should be dropped from the array and require manual intervention. It doesn't seem logical to me to just read the data from another drive and carry on in our merry way without any warning.

--> A warning message is OK, but dropping the drive from the array is excessive IMHO. And anyway, this should be user-configurable, so that it becomes each user's responsibility to choose if the drive shall be dropped or not. Currently we don't have any choice.

Jan Engelhardt wrote:

Not sure about Debian, but perhaps `/sys/block/md0/md/safe_mode_delay` does something?

--> I'll check that out. Does someone know about how this "safe mode delay" works ?

Thanasis wrote:

WD 2500YS
price same as an IDE or SATA

--> All RAID edition drives are more expensive than their equivalent "desktop edition" drives (same model on "desktop edition"). Just take a look at newegg for instance. Besides, trying to find an affordable "RAID edition" model is not a solution to this technical timeout issue, just a workaround (a bad one IMHO). Thanks anyway.

Re: RAID timeout parameter accessibility request

To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in the body of a message to majordomo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

Please read the FAQ at <http://www.tux.org/lkml/>