

Re: Type of Cluster?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.clustering/2005-10/msg00071.html>

- *From:* "Geoff N. Hiten" <sqlcraftsman@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 13 Oct 2005 10:33:30 -0400
-

I have heard of many horror stories with iSCSI implementations and none with successful, happy users. Pardon me if I find it difficult to recommend such a "solution". Just because it is supported and possible doesn't mean it is a good idea.

—
Geoff N. Hiten
Senior Database Administrator
Microsoft SQL Server MVP

"Rodney R. Fournier [MVP]" <rod@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:%23ZxG95\\$zFHA.3152@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:%23ZxG95$zFHA.3152@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> Since SP1 for Windows Server 2003, iSCSI also supports more a multi-node
> cluster, granted not as fast as a SAN, but cheaper :)

>
> Cheers,
>
> Rod

>
> MVP – Windows Server – Clustering
> <http://www.nw-america.com> – Clustering Website
> <http://www.msmvps.com/clustering> – Blog
> <http://www.clusterhelp.com> – Cluster Training

>
>
> "Geoff N. Hiten" <sqlcraftsman@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> [news:e%23orvh\\$zFHA.3720@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:e%23orvh$zFHA.3720@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>>A multi-instance cluster would be the correct solution. You can run each
>>instance on its own host node during normal operating conditions. During
>>a failover event, you would host multiple SQL instances on a single node.
>>I would purchase a fourth node and have a 3-instance, 4-node cluster.
>>That way, any single node failure will cause the failed instance to move
>>to the empty node. This requires a bit of configuration work, but is well
>>within the capabilities of SQL Server. I have built and operated just
>>such a cluster in the past with a high degree of success.

>>
>> A SAN is a required element for a cluster with more than two nodes.
>>

Re: Type of Cluster?

>> --
>> Geoff N. Hiten
>> Senior Database Administrator
>> Microsoft SQL Server MVP
>> "rui" <rui@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:3F786FD2-AFE4-4F6C-A1A4-71C005C68977@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>> Hi,
>>>
>>> I have 3 databases on 3 separate SQL 2000 servers, all are used heavily.
>>> There is no high availability solution.
>>>
>>> I was thinking of placing the databases in Windows 2003 Cluster. If I do
>>> that, in terms of performance shouldn't I use an active\active
>>> configuration
>>> (i think it's called multi-instance nowadays). What I am trying to say
>>> is
>>> that each server in the cluster will maintain its own database.
>>>
>>> Wouldn't I need a beefed up server to put all databases on a single node
>>> in
>>> an active\passive cluster.
>>>
>>> I also have use of a SAN
>>>
>>> Thanks
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Type of Cluster?**
 ◇ From: Linchi Shea
- ◆ **Re: Type of Cluster?**
 ◇ From: Rodney R. Fournier [MVP]

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: Type of Cluster?**
 ◇ From: Geoff N. Hiten
- ◆ **Re: Type of Cluster?**
 ◇ From: Rodney R. Fournier [MVP]

- Prev by Date: **Unable to create physical disk for MSDTC**
- Next by Date: **Re: Type of Cluster?**

Re: Type of Cluster?

- Previous by thread: *Re: Type of Cluster?*
- Next by thread: *Re: Type of Cluster?*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*