

2. Remote S3 Storage

Deduplication Capabilities

Remote PBS is generally better if you're looking for performance, cost efficiency, and faster recovery times—especially if you have control over both your local and remote PBS instances on reliable networks. You get PBS's full optimization for backup workflows.

S3 is better if you prioritize cloud-based redundancy, geographic distribution, vendor lock-in avoidance, or if you lack a reliable remote location for another PBS instance. The higher costs may be worth it for extreme durability and geographic resilience.

For most setups with control over infrastructure, PBS-to-remote-PBS is the superior choice due to better performance and lower costs.

When PBS-to-PBS is Better

- Bandwidth efficiency: Deduplication before transmission saves significant bandwidth for remote replication
- Storage efficiency: The remote PBS instance benefits from ongoing deduplication across all backups
- Recovery speed: Direct PBS-to-PBS transfers and restores are typically faster than S3 retrieval
- Cost: Less storage consumed on the remote side due to deduplication

When S3 Might Be Acceptable

- Geographic distribution: S3 offers geo-redundancy and availability across regions
- Disaster recovery: Completely separate infrastructure from your PBS systems
- Compliance: Some regulations prefer data in cloud object storage
- Simplicity: Less infrastructure to manage

For most scenarios, you're right that another PBS system is superior for deduplication efficiency and performance, but S3 still serves valid use cases, particularly for geographic separation and disaster recovery scenarios.

