

## Re: How long does DD take? 180GB?

**Source:** <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.setup/2003-10/0419.html>

---

**From:** Frank Burns (*frankburnz\_at\_hotmail.com*)

**Date:** 10/09/03

Date: 8 Oct 2003 17:41:54 -0700

> *Ohh. \*OUCH\*, that sucks. Couldn't you buy or borrow another RAID  
> controller to speed this process?*

Okay here is the status & other problems:

I used this command (after I enabled DMA (3.47MB/sec vs 47.9MB/sec))

```
dd if=/dev/hda of=/dev/hdb bs=32M
```

it said:

```
171705+1 records in  
171705+1 records out  
180,045,766,656 bytes  
35822.125322 seconds (I think it was about 2 hours in reality, it  
can't add right)  
5,025,105 bytes/sec
```

(notice the records are different, for identical drives)

Now I didn't think I could use another RAID controller, (can I???)

Whenever I try to reboot on the Old RAID it says "Raid Offline" so I  
can get into it, can I? If I get another raid controller, can I  
install my new raid on my motherboard, the old raid on the controller  
and copy the old raid to the new raid?

This is an entire 1 partition WinXP SP1 Partition NTFS 5.1, (I know, I  
know) on this computer.

I copied the two drives, and remember I did get an error message when  
I copied the first drive, I put them back in, and they didn't work.

The RAID bios said the two drives were FREE and not in an array. So  
does DD not copy everything? the raid info is stored on the HDD, not  
the raid bios. Do I need to go to a DATA restorer guy and see if I can  
use a physical HDD copier?

Help!

comp.os.linux.setup: Re: How long does DD take? 180GB?

Raid sucks. I dislike raid 0 for obvious reasons, but it is so noticeably faster. I dislike raid 1 because if one OS goes south, you're screwed, twice over. But it's better. I guess RAID 0,1 or 5 is best. but I'm not made of money... maybe I should be.