

## Re: Sizing / Design (ESX vs Physical)

---

*Source:* <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/ISA/microsoft.public.isa/2006-12/msg00124.html>

---

- *From:* "Julian Dragut" <[admin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:admin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 21 Dec 2006 00:18:56 -0500
- 

Why would you virtualize just one server? Why would you virtualize ISA?  
Remember that everything goes through the NIC or NIC teams.  
What level of traffic are you expecting from your 1600 users? Is there a  
peak time? What kind of traffic would you allow?

--

Julian Dragut

[www.networkmanager.org](http://www.networkmanager.org)

"iloisus" <[iloisus@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:iloisus@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:8A0B518F-5BD4-4066-AA50-4946B04D0181@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:8A0B518F-5BD4-4066-AA50-4946B04D0181@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hi, we are planning to migrate our current ISA 2000 server to ISA 2006.

This

ISA is used only for Internet Access and Caching (no firewall, no VPN). We  
are

discussing the following possibilities:

1. ESX installation: one virtual server on brand new dual core hardware
2. Physical installation: two servers with network load balancing, also  
new  
hardware.

– What are your experiences about the sizing? Would one server be enough  
for

1600 users?

– Do you have any experiences with ESX 3.0?

– What about a mix between both solutions (ESX and network load  
balancing) –

how reliable would that be and how complex to install and maintain?

Thanks for feedback.