

2006

BACKUP AND ARCHIVING
AN END-USER PERSPECTIVE

Prepared By: Farid Neema, Peripheral Concepts, Inc
Tom Coughlin, Coughlin Associates

© COPYRIGHT February 2006, Peripheral Concepts, Inc. and Coughlin Associates

Backup and Archiving Report is published by:

Coughlin Associates

9460 Carmel Road
Atascadero, CA 93422
Phone: (408) 871-8808
Fax: (408) 370-4609
www.tomcoughlin.com

Peripheral Concepts, Inc.

351 Hitchcock Way, B-200
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
Phone: (805) 563-9491
Fax: (805) 563-6020
www.periconcepts.com

All rights reserved. No portion of this report may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission from the publisher. Information included in this report is believed to be reliable but can not be guaranteed complete or correct.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	10
Objectives	10
Survey Methodology	10
Special Thanks	11
More Data.....	11
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	13
Site Profiles.....	13
Storage and Data Protection Management Issues	18
Backup.....	21
Archive	23
Tape vs. Disk.....	28
SITE PROFILES	30
STORAGE AND DATA PROTECTION MANAGEMENT	64
BACKUP MANAGEMENT	76
ARCHIVE	87
TAPE VS. DISK	120
SURVEY QUESTIONS.....	132
AUTHOR PROFILES.....	136
PERIPHERAL CONCEPTS PROFILE.....	137
COUGHLIN ASSOCIATES PROFILE.....	139

List of Figures

0- Executive Summary

Site Profiles

Figure 0-1.	Screener Survey Company Annual Revenue	14
Figure 0-2.	Full Survey Company Annual Revenue	14
Figure 0-3.	Screening Survey, Raw Disk Storage	15
Figure 0-4.	Full Survey, Raw Disk Storage	15
Figure 0-5.	Full Survey, Growth Rate of Raw Disk Capacity for all Data Centers	16
Figure 0-6.	Screener Survey, Approximately, what is the Ratio of On-Line Tape to Disk Capacity?	16
Figure 0-7.	Full Survey, Total On-line Tape Capacity for all Data Centers	17
Figure 0-8.	Full Survey, Total Off-line Tape Capacity	17

Storage and Data Protection Management Issues

Figure 0-9.	Full Survey, Most Significant Data Protection Related Problem	19
Figure 0-10.	Full Survey, What is your Recovery Time Objective (RTO)	19
Figure 0-11.	Full Survey, What is your Recovery Point Objective (RPO)	20
Figure 0-12.	Full Survey, What are the Major Impediments to acquiring the Data Protection you need	20

Backup

Figure 0-13.	Full Survey, What Window do you Require for a Full Backup?	22
Figure 0-14.	Full Survey, What Percent of Unsuccessful Backup at First Attempt do you Experience?	22
Figure 0-15.	Full Survey, Is Archiving Treated Separately from Backup Today, Or do you Plan to Treat it Differently in the Next Two Years	24
Figure 0-16.	Full Survey, Goal for Retrieving from Archive an Individual File	24
Figure 0-17.	Full Survey, Do you have a Policy for Destroying Expired Archived Data?	25
Figure 0-18.	Full Survey, What Requirements or Policies Guide Your Archiving Needs?	25
Figure 0-19.	Full Survey, Media Used for Archiving	26
Figure 0-20.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes	26
Figure 0-21.	Full Survey, Application Archive Status and Plans	27
Figure 0-22.	Full Survey, What are Your Data Format Plans for Archiving Data?	27

Archive

Figure 0-23. Full Survey, Would you Like to Get Rid of all Tape Libraries In Favor of Disk Systems in the Long Term?	29
Figure 0-24. Full Survey, Tape Library/Silo Make or Vendor	29

Tape vs. Disk

1- Site Profiles

Figure 1-1. Screener Survey Company Revenue	31
Figure 1-2. Full Survey Company Revenue	32
Figure 1-3. Full Survey, Company Revenue vs. Industry	33
Figure 1-4. Full Survey, Company Revenue vs. Industry Capacity Tier	34
Figure 1-5. Full Survey, Weighted Average Company Revenue vs. Capacity Tier	35
Figure 1-6. Screener Survey, Number of Employees	36
Figure 1-7. Full Survey, Number of Employees	37
Figure 1-8. Full Survey, Number of Employees vs. Capacity Tier	38
Figure 1-9. Screening Survey, Industry	39
Figure 1-10. Full Survey, Industry	40
Figure 1-11. Screener Survey, Industry vs. Raw Disk Capacity	41
Figure 1-12. Full Survey, Industry vs. Weighted Average Raw Disk Capacity	42
Figure 1-13. Screening Survey, Areas of Responsibility	43
Figure 1-14. Full Survey, Respondent Responsibility	44
Figure 1-15. Full Survey, Number of Servers	45
Figure 1-16. Screener Survey, Raw Disk Storage	46
Figure 1-17. Full Survey, Raw Disk Storage Tiers	47
Figure 1-18. Screener Survey, Percentage Disk Capacity Attached To Mainframe Only	48
Figure 1-19. Screener Survey, Percentage Disk Capacity Connected To Open Systems	49
Figure 1-20. Full Survey, Percentage Disk Capacity Connected To Open Systems	50
Figure 1-21. Full Survey, Growth Rate of Raw Disk Capacity for all Data Centers	51
Figure 1-22. Full Survey, Weighted Average Growth Rate of Raw Disk Capacity for Each Capacity Tier	52
Figure 1-23. Full Survey, Growth Rate of Raw Disk Capacity vs. Capacity Tier	53
Figure 1-24. Screener Survey, Ratio of On-line Tape to Disk Capacity Capacity Tier	54
Figure 1-25. Screener Survey, Ratio of On-line Tape to Disk Capacity vs. Capacity Tier	55

Figure 1-26. Full Survey, Total On-line Tape Capacity for all Data Centers (in Terabytes)	56
Figure 1-27. Full Survey, Annual Growth Rate of On-line Tape Capacity for All Data Centers	57
Figure 1-28. Full Survey, Total off-line (on the shelf on-site, off-site and in vault) Tape Capacity (in Terabytes)	58
Figure 1-29. Full Survey, Annual Growth Rate Tape Off-line Capacity (on the shelf on-site, off-site and in vault)	59
Figure 1-30. Full Survey, Disk Storage Vendor Used	60
Figure 1-31. Full Survey, Total On-line Optical Disk Capacity for all Data Centers (in Terabytes)	61
Figure 1-32. Full Survey, Total On-line Optical Disk Capacity for all Data Centers (in Terabytes) vs. Capacity Tier	62
Figure 1-33. Full Survey, Annual Growth Rate of Optical Capacity	63

2- Storage and Data Protection Management

Figure 2-1. Screener Survey, What are the Key Challenges in Managing Your Storage Environment?	65
Figure 2-2. Full Survey, What are the Key Challenges in Managing Your Storage Environment?	66
Figure 2-3. Full Survey, What are the Key Challenges in Managing Your Storage Environment? Vs. Capacity Tier	67
Figure 2-4. Full Survey, What are the Key Challenges in Managing your Storage Environment vs. Company Revenue	68
Figure 2-5. Full Survey, Most Significant Data Protection Related Problem	69
Figure 2-6. Full Survey, Second Most Significant Data Protection Related Problem	70
Figure 2-7. Full Survey, What is your Recovery Time Objective	71
Figure 2-8. Full Survey, What is your Recovery Point Objective	72
Figure 2-9. Full Survey, What are the Major Impediments to acquiring the Data Protection you need? (Rating of 4 and 5 on a scale of 5)	73
Figure 2-10. Full Survey, What are the Major Impediments to acquiring the Data Protection you need? (Weighted Average)	74
Figure 2-11. Full Survey, What is your Major Problem in the Backup or Archive Process Today?	75

3- Backup Management

Figure 3-1. Full Survey, What Window do you Require for a Full Backup?	77
Figure 3-2. 2004 Survey, Time Required for Full Backups	78
Figure 3-3. Full Survey, What Weighted Average Backup Window do you Presently Require? Vs. Capacity Tiers	79

Figure 3-4.	Full Survey, Do you need to improve your backup window?	80
Figure 3-5.	2004 Survey, Do You Need to Improve Full Backup Time?	81
Figure 3-6.	Full Survey, What Percent of Unsuccessful Backups at First Attempt do you Experience?	82
Figure 3-7.	Full Survey, What percent of Unsuccessful Restores do you Experience?	83
Figure 3-8.	2004 Survey, Percent Unsuccessful Backups and Restores	84
Figure 3-9.	Full Survey, How Often Do you perform a Full Backup	85
Figure 3-10.	2004 Survey, How Often Do you Perform Full Backup?	86

4- Archive

Figure 4-1.	Full Survey, Is Archiving Treated Separately from Backup Today, or do you plan to treat it Differently in the Next Two Years?	88
Figure 4-2.	Full Survey, Goal for Retrieving from Archive an Individual File	89
Figure 4-3.	Full Survey, What is your Data Retention Time Policy, Average for the Three Most Critical Applications?	90
Figure 4-4.	2004 Survey, What is Your Data Retention Policy, Average For Three Most Critical Applications?	91
Figure 4-5.	Full Survey, Do you have a Policy for Destroying Expired Archived Data?	92
Figure 4-6.	Full Survey, What Requirements or Policies Guide your Archiving Needs?	93
Figure 4-7.	Full Survey, What Requirements or Policies Guide your Archiving Needs?	94
Figure 4-8.	2004 Survey, What Requirements or Policies Guide Your Archiving Needs?	95
Figure 4-9.	Full Survey, Do you Use or Plan to Use, in the Next Year, an Application-Specific Tool for Archiving E-mails?	96
Figure 4-10.	Full Survey, Volume of Data Archived	97
Figure 4-11.	2004 Survey, Volume of Data Archived Nearline	98
Figure 4-12.	Full Survey, Media Used for Archiving	99
Figure 4-13.	2004 Survey, Archiving Media Solutions Used	100
Figure 4-14.	Full Survey, Criteria for Archive Media Selection	101
Figure 4-15.	2004 Survey, Criteria for Archiving Media Choice	102
Figure 4-16.	Full Survey, Most Important Criteria for Archive Media Selection	103
Figure 4-17.	Full Survey, On Average How Much do you Reuse Archive or Backup Media	104
Figure 4-18.	Full Survey, Do you Follow Recommended Practices for Long Term Preservation of your Archived Media?	105
Figure 4-19.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes	106
Figure 4-20.	2004 Survey, Criteria for Selecting and Archive Solution	107
Figure 4-21.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—High Capacity	108
Figure 4-22.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by	

	Capacity Tier—High Reliability in Archive Environment	109
Figure 4-23.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—Inexpensive (\$/GB)	110
Figure 2-24.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—Long Archival Retention	111
Figure 4-25.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—Scalability	112
Figure 4-26.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—Timely Access to Archived Data to Meet Regulatory Compliance	113
Figure 4-27.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—Transportability to Off-site Location	114
Figure 4-28.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—Forward Media Compatibility	115
Figure 4-29.	Full Survey, Rank Relative Importance of Archive Attributes by Capacity Tier—WORM Capability	116
Figure 4-30.	Application Archive Status and Plans	117
Figure 4-31.	2004 Survey, Policies for Archiving Applications Now and in Next 2 Years	118
Figure 4-32.	Full Survey, What are your Data Format Plans for Archived Data?	119

5- Tape vs. Disk

Figure 5-1.	Full Survey, Would you Like to Get Rid of all Tape Libraries In Favor of Disk Systems in the Long Term?	121
Figure 5-2.	Full Survey, Would you Like to Get Rid of all Tape Libraries In Favor of Disk Systems in the Long Term? Vs. Capacity Tier	122
Figure 5-3.	Full Survey, Would you Like to Get Rid of all Tape Libraries In Favor of Disk Systems in the Long Term? Vs. Industry	123
Figure 5-4.	Full Survey, How Often do you Refresh your Tapes?	124
Figure 5-5.	Full Survey, How Much of a Man-Load Does Refreshing Tapes Represent?	125
Figure 5-6.	Full Survey, How often do you Need to Convert your Tape Media to a Different Format?	126
Figure 5-7.	Full Survey, How much Time is involved in Converting Tape?	127
Figure 5-8.	Full Survey, Percent of Libraries/Silos in a SAN Configuration	128
Figure 5-9.	Tape Library/Silo Make or Vendor	129
Figure 5-10.	2004 Survey, Make of Tape Library/Silo	130
Figure 5-11.	Full Survey, Is the Library Shared among Multiple Platforms of Various Operating Systems?	131

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

The survey targeted over one hundred IT managers having storage management or data protection responsibilities for IT operations that store a minimum of one terabyte (TB) of raw disk storage. Out of 15,000 managers contacted, over 2,000 qualified managers (Referred to as the “Screening Survey”) answered the full screening survey of less than 10 questions. We selected over two hundred individuals representing sites relatively evenly distributed among the disk capacity ranges, with an attempt to include a sufficient number of representatives from each of nine targeted industries. We submitted them to the full survey of over 50 questions. We received 135 reliable responses. They are referred to as the “Full Survey” or “Selected population”.

The Screening Survey population was questioned on their storage configuration as well as their acquisition plans. For the selected population of 135 sites, this survey provides statistics on practices related to Automated Tiered Storage and media used for different storage tiers. The report ranks issues and needs, and analyzes trends and acquisition intents.

Nine industries were targeted in this report: Finance/banking, Health, Manufacturing, Retail Distribution, Government, Education, Consulting, Computers and IT, and Telecommunications. The survey reveals interesting peculiarities in each industry practices and requirements.

Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to determine the acceptance of newer techniques and media for backup and archiving, as well as user needs, goals and complaints.

Survey Methodology

To qualify for the survey, the respondent had to be an IT administrator or manager with storage related responsibilities and one terabyte of total disk capacity most of which connected to open systems.

- We developed a questionnaire in collaboration with a number of industry executives
- We tested the questionnaire in interviews with industry experts and storage vendors
- We asked several thousands IT managers a limited set of questions to determine if they qualified for the survey. Over 2000 completed these questions.

- We selected about 200 of these screening survey respondents to complete the full survey. We targeted 70% of the population in the small and medium business category.
- We sent a detailed questionnaire of over 50 questions to the selected respondents
- We received over 120 good responses. We compiled and analyzed the results, and compared with results obtained in our 2003 and 2004 surveys
- We also included comments resulting from the many contacts we have throughout the year with IT managers.

Special Thanks

We wish to express our appreciation to the participating respondents for the time they were willing to spare in answering our questions and also those companies that helped in developing the questions in this survey.

More Data

In compiling this report, we have gathered substantial amounts of data not all of which could be included in this report. If you have questions or require additional data, please contact us. We will be happy to supply any data we have or develop new data on a project basis

AUTHOR PROFILES

**Section 7
Author Profiles**

PERIPHERAL CONCEPTS PROFILE

PERIPHERAL CONCEPTS, INC. - was formed in 1991. It specializes in market research and consulting in the industries related to Computer Mass Storage and Storage Management, with emphasis on the systems, the applications and the end user requirements. Its services include:

- Market Research, Studies, and Analysis
- Market, Strategic, and Business Planning
- Product and Market Development
- Analysis of End-User Applications and Solutions
- Competitive Analysis

PUBLICATIONS:

- Cost of Managing Storage in the PC LAN Environment
- Enterprise Data Management
- Backup and Archive in the PC LAN and UNIX Environments
- Cost of Managing Storage in the Midrange Environment
- Managing Network Storage
- Intelligent Storage Arrays
- SAN and NAS- Infrastructure, Products, and Market Opportunity

CONFERENCES: Peripheral Concepts, Inc. sponsors the "Network Storage" annual conference in California

CLIENTS: Adaptec, ADIC, Computer Associates, EMC, Exabyte, Groupe Bull, Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Intel, Legato, LSI, MTI, Quantum, Sony, StorageTek, Sun, Unis

FARID J. NEEMA founder and president of **PERIPHERAL CONCEPTS, INC.**, has over thirty years of experience in the computer industry, half of which in the peripherals and the peripheral subsystems. He has held technical and management positions in the U.S. and in Europe. He was Chief Engineer at Honeywell Information Systems, Director of Product and Strategic Planning at Corporate Groupe Bull, and President and CEO of Bull Peripheral Corporation. As a representative to the Commission of the European Community in Brussels, Belgium, he chaired several Executive Strategic Committees and has consulted for the Commission as an expert on Peripheral Systems. He holds a Masters degree in Mechanical Engineering from Ecole Centrale de Paris, and a Masters Degree in Electronic and Telecommunication Engineering from Ecole Superieure d'Electricite in Paris, France.



COUGHLIN ASSOCIATES PROFILE



Thomas M. Coughlin

9460 Carmel Road
Atascadero, CA 93422
408-871-8808 (phone)
tom@tomcoughlin.com

www.tomcoughlin.com

Thomas M. Coughlin is President of Coughlin Associates, a data storage consulting firm specializing in data storage components, systems, and software used in consumer electronic, enterprise, and entertainment applications. He has over 25 years of industrial experience in data storage engineering, product development, program management, and market and technology assessment. His consulting work has included clients such as Seagate Technology, Ampex, Raychem, Network Appliance, PriceWaterhouseCoopers, several start-ups, as well as Venture Capitalist and financial clients. Tom has over 50 articles, reports, and technical presentations to his credit and 6 granted patents.

Tom has been writing market and technology reports with Peripheral Research Corporation, Peripheral Concepts, and Coughlin Associates for several years. His latest projects include the 2005 North American Entertainment and Digital Media Storage Report available to order on his web site. He has been active with IDEMA where he is chairman or a member of several committees, including overall Standards Chairman. He is a senior member of the IEEE (member for over 24 years), was publicity chairman of the 1992, 1996, 2002 and 2004 TMRC conferences and is the current treasurer of the Santa Clara Valley IEEE Section as well as Program Chair of the SCV IEEE Consumer Elec. Soc. He was also chairman of the Santa Clara Valley IEEE Magnetics Society in the early 1990s and 2002-2003. He organized magnetic recording Symposia for IIST from 1997-2002 at Santa Clara University.

Tom is the organizer of the annual Storage Visions Conference (www.storagevisions.com), which focuses on data storage and the digital content value chain. He is also a co-organizer with Farid Neema of the Network Storage Conference. He is a founding member of the Server Blade Trade Association and also a member of SNIA, IDEMA, ACM, APS, and AVS. The company website is www.tomcoughlin.com and his email address is tom@tomcoughlin.com

ORDER FORM
2006 Backup and Archive Report
Fax 408-370-4609

NAME: _____

TITLE: _____

COMPANY: _____

STREET ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

Country _____

TELEPHONE: _____ FAX: _____

E-MAIL: _____

PDF version with one-site license \$2,650 -----

Unlimited license rights for distribution within the company – Add \$1,000 -----

Complete raw basic material in Excel form (no company names) - Add \$1,500 -----

TOTAL -----

Check Enclosed or PO Number:

Charge to Visa, or MasterCard

No. Expires

Order now more than one report and save Other

Other Reports:

Tiered Storage

Continuous Data Protection

NAS and NAS Virtualization

Two basic reports for \$4,500 instead of \$5,300 – A 15% discount

Three basic reports for \$6,360 instead of \$7,950 – A 20% discount

SIGNATURE @: _____

Make checks payable to: Coughlin Associates
Mail to: 1665 Willowmont Ave., San Jose, CA 95124
Fax 408-370-4609
Email: tom@tomcoughlin.com or fneema@periconcepts.com
Telephone: 408-871-8808