

# Is it technically practical to have...

---



[Aidil](#) 1 posts since

Jun 16, 2008

Reason being, if possible we want static data's like webpages etc to be stored in NAS and we would also want to leverage on our existing NAS. Due to the fuel hike, some companies want to cut down on spending as much as possible. We need to know whether VMWARE is rigid or flexible when it comes to this sort of request.

Appreciate to those who can help in this matter.

Tags: network, attached, storage, storage, area, network



[Ramprasad Padala](#) 4 posts since

Is it technically practical to have...

Jun 10, 2008 1. **Re: Is it technically practical to have vmware running partly in SAN and in NAS?** Jun 17, 2008 5:02 AM

Yes , you mount the static drive form NAS (datastore)

Ram



[astueve](#) 7 posts since

Sep 10, 2007 2. **Re: Is it technically practical to have vmware running partly in SAN and in NAS?** Jul 30, 2008 10:40 AM

We do it all the time. We have 2 type of storage volumes on the ESX, one NAS and one FC SAN.

We have base .vmdk as a NAS mount. Then, we add a SAN based vmdk as the client requires.

-Andrew

Is it technically practical to have...



[lhedrick](#) 5 posts since

Sep 10, 2007 3. **Re: Is it technically practical to have vmware running partly in SAN and in NAS?** Aug 1, 2008 6:17 AM

Yes, that is one way you can reduce costs as well as present different levels of service.