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## 1. Introduction

Computer manufacturers were recently sued over the apparent misadvertisement of hard drive capacities. The purpose of this white paper is to examine the mathematics behind the hard drive capacity claims and understand the information which modern operating systems report on drive and file capacities.

Quoting from the Reuters news story:
"The lawsuit, which seeks class action status, was filed earlier this week in Los Angeles Superior Court against Apple Computer Inc., Dell Inc., Gateway Inc., Hewlett-Packard Co., IBM, Sharp Corp., Sony Corp., and Toshiba Corp.
"The lawsuit brought by Los Angeles residents Lanchau Dan, Adam Selkowitz, Tim Swan and John Zahabian centers around the way that computer hard drives are described by manufacturers.

These issues occur whenever the size of a hard drive is advertised at a particular size yet shows up in the operating system with a lower capacity. (For example, a drive advertised with a capacity of 120 GB shows up with a capacity of 115 GB in the operating system.)

Why does this apparent mis-statement occur? The answer lies within an analysis of the mathematics of the drive capacity, as expressed first by the drive manufacturer, and then by the operating system vendor.

## 2. Mathematics behind hard drive capacity claims

### 2.1 Examining a common 120GB hard drive

Hitachi (formerly IBM) is one of the largest manufacturers of hard drives in the world, and for the purposes of this white paper, we will examine in depth the very popular 120GB hard drive, part number 07N9214, model IC35L120AVV207-0. This drive has been 'original equipment' on many different computer systems, and has also been the drive of choice for external storage manufacturers as well, because of its high reliability and high performance.

The very first surprise in this drive is the IBM does not claim a capacity of 120GB. IBM actually claims a capacity of 123.5 GB ! Users will find that different drive manufacturers have different capacity claims for competing 120GB drives. As a result, the savvy consumer may discover that one manufacturer's 120 GB drive truly does have more capacity than another manufacturer's 120 GB drive.

### 2.2 The capacity of the hard drive as stated by the manufacturer

The label of the Hitachi drive states that the capacity is 123.5 GB ; the label also states that the enigmatic LBA value is 241.254 .720 sectors. This value (which looks remotely like a warped http:// URL address) is in fact a straight decimal number, which indicates the total number of Logical Block Address (LBA) which the drive contains. Each individual LBA location may be thought of as a sector or even as an individual tiny folder, with a capacity of exactly 512 bytes per LBA/sector/folder. (These numbers are all conventional base 10 arithmetic, of which you are very familiar with, especially if you paid attention in math class.)

By multiplying the number of sectors with the number of bytes per sector, we can calculate the true total capacity of the hard drive. Here's our first mathematical equation:

## Sectors $x$ Bytes per sector $=$ total capacity of the drive

## - or -

$241,254,720 \times 512=123,522,416,640=123.5$ GigaBytes
The mathematics behind the label is consistent; the drive's claim of 123.5 GB is verified with this simple mathematical formula.

Without going into details as to how it's done, it is easily possible to write a program that will read and write to each and every sector location on the hard drive, demonstrating and verifying the hard drive manufacturer's claim that the drive has 123.5 GB , as expressed in decimal arithmetic.

### 2.3 The capacity of the hard drive as stated by the computer system

Our next step is to install the hard drive either in the computer system or in an external storage enclosure. We will then use the operating system to examine the capacity of the hard drive once again.

Using Windows XP, we receive the following General Properties report for a freshly formatted NTFS 123.5GB volume:

| Used Space: | $71,344,128$ | 68.0 MB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free Space: | $123,439,427,584$ | 114 GB |
| Capacity: | $123,510,771,712$ | 115 GB |

The same kind of arithmetic applies to the Macintosh operating environment. Using Macintosh OS X Drive Utility, we receive the following capacity information on the same drive:

Total Capacity: $123,522,415,614 \quad 115.04 \mathrm{~GB}$
Both of these operating systems (Windows XP and Mac OS X) are reporting values which roughly match the information derived from the drive's label of approximately $123,500,000,000$ bytes. (The slight variations between these numbers is insignificant from a percentage basis but explored in somewhat greater depth in the Observation section of this white paper.) However, the number which follows (of either 115GB or more precisely, 115.04 GB ) is the number which has historically been reported by older operating systems and which has caused all of the confusion.

Users can get upset when a drive which was advertised as 120 GB (or 123.5 GB ) shows up as a 115 GB drive on their computer's desktop. How did 120 GB become equivalent to 115 GB ? Or more correctly, how did 123.5 GB become 115 GB ? (Similar questions include: How did my 120GB drive become a 111 GB drive? How did my 80 GB drive become a 74GB drive....) Where did the missing GB's go?
[If you find this paragraph confusing, just skip it!] An easy answer is to claim that the difference is due to Operating System overhead - in other words, capacity is removed from the drive in order to support file tables. This claim is simply grossly inaccurate. As reported by Windows XP, the "Used Space" is approximately $71,000,000$ bytes. This is the space which has been removed from the drive by the operating system. $71,000,000$ is roughly equivalent to .07 GB , or less than $1 / 10^{\text {th }}$ of one GigaByte. As a result, the reduction in size is nearly irrelevant in comparison to the lost 8.5 GigaBytes. (It does, however, provide a good explanation in the difference in drive capacity reported between Capacity and Free Space in Windows XP. A similar condition exists for Macintosh operating systems as well, but is not reported by the operating system).

The exact answer to the question of the missing GigaBytes (123.5GB $==115 \mathrm{~GB}$ ?) is determined by analyzing the drive capacity utilizing binary (base 2 ) arithmetic. A brief primer on binary arithmetic allows this to be easily done.

Consider the following table, which steps the reader through the process of raising two to ascending values from 1 to 10 :
$2 \times 1=2\left(2^{1}=2\right)($ anything raised to the power of one is equivalent to itself)

$$
\begin{gathered}
2 \times 2=4\left(2^{2}=4\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2=8\left(2^{3}=8\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=16\left(2^{4}=16\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=32\left(2^{5}=32\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=64\left(2^{6}=64\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=128\left(2^{7}=128\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=256\left(2^{8}=256\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=512\left(2^{9}=512\right) \\
2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=1024\left(2^{10}=1024\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

The last line shows the value of a kilobyte, which has a decimal value of 1024. This begins to hint at a source of confusion, because 1024 (a true kilobyte) is definitely not equal to 1000 . The fact that a kilobyte is very similar in value to the decimal value of 1000 is, in fact, a mathematical curiousity. It is so, but it is also kind of weird that a kilobyte (which is in fact a binary number) happens to be close in value to a decimal number. As a result, mathematical confusion has occurred when using the term 'kilobyte'. Does it represent 1024, or does it represent 1000 ?

At this point, it is wise to digress from the mathematics and acknowledge the following fact:

- Drive manufacturers have always used Base 10 arithmetic to describe drive capacity. They've always counted up their bytes just like nature intended, using all 10 fingers and sticking with standard arithmetic. They've had every right to count their drive capacity in this manner.
- Operating system developers such as Microsoft and Apple have historically used Base 2 arithmetic, converted for presentation purposes into what the author considers a Base 10 shorthand.

Now, let's get back to the mathematical analysis.
The drive which we've been analyzing which has a capacity of 123.5 GB , is reported by the operating system with a capacity of 115 GB . Where did the missing 8.5 GB go?

If we take $123,522,415,614$ bytes, and divide by 1024 , instead of 1,000 , we arrive at a value of approximately $120,627,359$. This clearly does not provide the correct explanation as to the 'lost' capacity. In other words, 120.6 GB is not the binary capacity of the drive.

The final mathematical trick is to realize what a binary GigaByte really is.

A decimal GigaByte is $1,000,000,000$, which is equivalent to:

$$
1,000 \times 1,000 \times 1,000=1,000,000,000=1 \text { GB. (base } 10)
$$

A binary GigaByte is calculated in the following fashion:

Simply by dividing the total capacity of the drive (in ordinary decimal math) with this new definition of a GigaByte ( $1,073,741,824$ ), we can determine the capacity of the drive in binary GigaBytes. Here's the equation:

$$
123,522,415,614 / 1,073,741,824=115.0392141 \mathrm{~GB}=115.04 \mathrm{~GB}=115 \mathrm{~GB}
$$

We've finally determined the math used by the operating system, which has converted our drive from a capacity of 123.5 GB to a capacity of 115.04 GB . The mystery is solved. This handy formula may be used by anyone for converting decimal GigaBytes to binary GigaBytes (with decimal representation). The mathematical conversion works the other way around as well, as shown below:
115.GB x 1,073,741,824 = 123,522,415,614 decimal bytes (assuming all digits of precision are used in the 115 GB ). (This allows conversion from operating system GigaBytes to Hard Drive Manufacturer GigaBytes).

## 3. Observations

Here are some pertinent observations, a couple of which are fairly subtle:
3.1 Hard Drive Manufacturers use Decimal Math. The Hard Drive Manufacturers have always reported the capacity of the drive using easily understandable arithmetic. They've given the total capacity using numbers which are direct and easily understandable.
3.2 Slight Capacity Variations occur between Hard Drive Capacity decimal calculations and Operating System decimal calculations. In other words, if the hard drive has a capacity of $123,522,416,640$ bytes (from the drive label calculations), and the operating system reports a capacity of either $123,510,771,712$ bytes (this value is from Windows XP, as discussed earlier) or $123,522,415,614$ bytes (this value is from Macintosh OS X, also as discussed earlier), what accounts for this slight variation? In the case of Windows, we've lost 11,644,928 bytes. In the case of Macintosh, we've lost 1026 bytes of reported total drive capacity. The author has no explanation for these variations. Although significant, the loss of capacity is slight compared to the overall size of the drive.
3.3 Operating System Overhead uses a negligible amount of drive space. We note that operating systems take a portion of drive capacity for use as file tables. A typical drive utilizes 70 MegaBytes for this function, which is not significant on a drive with a capacity of 120 GB . ( 0.07 GB out of a total capacity of 120 GB ).
3.4 Capacity Understatement. In a surprising development, we see that many IBM / Hitachi drives are marketed with capacities of 120GB when their true capacity is much higher ( 123.5 GB ). Other manufacturers sell 120GB drives which have lower true capacities, in comparison.
3.5 Operating System developers (Windows; Macintosh and perhaps others) use Binary Math. We've seen that gross variation between binary and decimal GigaByte reported capacities is due to the utilization of base 2 arithmetic converted to a base 10 representation. We've been able to determine that decimal 123.5 GB is directly equivalent to binary 115 GB , using a mathematical transformation.
3.6 Did this confusion have to be this way? In a word, no. The operating system manufacturers historically did not historically appear to document that the reported GigaBytes were a decimal representation of a binary number. More recently, they are including decimal and binary representations of drive and file capacities, as demonstrated in Windows XP and with Macintosh OS X. These representations appear to be shown without explanation of the background mathematics.
3.7 Was the consumer ever cheated as a result? Here's the most surprising answer of all - the consumer always had all the capacity he was promised. Even if the drive capacity was reported as 115 GB , the reality is that the drive was always storing all 123.5 GB of (decimal based) capacity, as indicated by the drive manufacturer.
3.8 Is a movement underway to clarify the mathematical differences between a GigaByte $(\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}, 000,000)$ and a GigaByte $(1,073,741,824)$ ? Yes. The author has recently heard about a naming convention that will attempt to clarify these terms, including confusion on kilobytes, etc.
3.9 Extra Credit: What's the difference between a decimal Terabyte and a binary Terabyte? Answer: $1000^{4}=1,000,000,000,000 ; 1024^{4}=1,099,511,628,000 ;$ a difference of approximately $10 \%$. And it gets worse with Petabytes: the difference increases to approximately $12.6 \%$, causing an ever increasing GigaByte understatement, as long as the math is not understood.

In conclusion, the lack of arithmetic semantic clarity in drive capacity has caused a great deal of confusion among consumers, but has not truly caused system manufacturers to ship computers with less than indicated capacity. An examination of the mathematics shows that hard drive manufacturer claims are nearly exactly equivalent to the operating system statements, after conversion from binary GigaBytes (with decimal representation) to straight decimal arithmetic. The conversion works in either direction. Minor issues which would improve consumer understanding would include explanations of operating system overhead, capacity understatement, and other slight variations.

WiebeTech's policy is to state capacities as represented by the hard drive manufacturer, in plain decimal arithmetic, with unformatted capacity. (Or to understate capacity in the case of the IBM / Hitachi product.) How the operating system manufacturer wants to state the capacity is up to them. ©)
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