

# Re: Clustering for Performance

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.clustering/2006-01/msg00083.html>

---

- *From:* "Kevin3NF" <[Kevin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Kevin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 11 Jan 2006 21:56:05 -0600
- 

Richard, I don't know where you are based, but Google around for a Dallas Based company called Scalability Experts. I have no affiliation with them other than a casual acquaintance of a few employees. They are frequent presenters at Microsoft events relating to Scalability...and seem to have a grasp of the very large systems and what it takes to implement. Again, I get nothing from this....

—  
Kevin Hill  
3NF Consulting  
[www.3nf-inc.com/NewsGroups.htm](http://www.3nf-inc.com/NewsGroups.htm)

"Richard" <[Richard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Richard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:427BB31F-57CA-43A9-965C-E5F18196D696@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:427BB31F-57CA-43A9-965C-E5F18196D696@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> Thank you Geoff and Andrew for you swift responses.  
>  
> We are actually looking for a consultant to come in and help with this.  
> However I am just doing some ground work beforehand.  
>  
> I was hoping that SQL Server 2005 would give us some performance  
> improvements (such as true Load Balancing like Oracle Real Application  
> Clusters), but the improvements over 2000 seem to be mostly for failover  
> rather than scaling.  
>  
> Thanks again for your input  
>  
> Richard  
>  
> "Andrew J. Kelly" wrote:  
>  
>> Richard,  
>>  
>> Try not to take this the wrong way but if you are asking questions like  
>> these and need to implement a system that large you are probably a bit  
>> over  
>> your head. I suggest you seriously consider hiring a consultant who has

## Re: Clustering for Performance

>> been thru things like this before. Quite honestly there aren't many  
>> people  
>> who have dealt with systems that large. And if not done correctly it will  
>> almost certainly turn belly up and die when you even get close to that  
>> many  
>> users. That said here are a few comments. One is I doubt you will really  
>> have 40K concurrent users especially since SQL Server only allows  
>> 32,767<g>.  
>> Even with heavy use web based apps you rarely have as many concurrent  
>> connections as you would think. And if you are talking anywhere near  
>> this  
>> amount you are talking some serious hardware to support it. As I  
>> mentioned  
>> in another post Clustering is not a load balancing option. Only one node  
>> at  
>> a time has control over a specific disk resource in the cluster. So even  
>> with Active / Active (or more correctly Multi-Instance) you can't share a  
>> database since it resides on only one disk resource. You can't design a  
>> system like this in a newsgroup and if you try you will fail. It  
>> requires a  
>> very careful and well laid out plan to implement a large scale database  
>> application.  
>>  
>> --  
>> Andrew J. Kelly SQL MVP  
>>  
>>  
>> "Richard" <Richard@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
>> [news:A115E5ED-8801-4142-B921-FD25665FE3C0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:A115E5ED-8801-4142-B921-FD25665FE3C0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
>> > Hello All. I need to set up quite a large SQL System 2005 system that  
>> > needs  
>> > to deal with 40,000 concurrent users, and one of the tables will  
>> > contain  
>> > blob  
>> > data. 40,000 users throwing around Mb's of data at the same time  
>> > worries  
>> > me a  
>> > little bit!  
>> >  
>> > My question is to do with Database Clustering and Mirroring. From what  
>> > I  
>> > can  
>> > see, there is still no load-balancing with SQL Server 2005, so does  
>> > this  
>> > mean  
>> > even in a clustered environment I am still basically only using a  
>> > single  
>> > database server? I have seen many posts that tell me that clustering is  
>> > ONLY  
>> > for failover and not for performance. I understand that with  
>> > Active/Passive

## Re: Clustering for Performance

>>> this is the case, but how about Active/Active? If I can set up  
>>> Active/Active  
>>> (2 nodes? 4 nodes? 8 nodes? how many are possible?) with a SAN and NOT  
>>> have  
>>> failover implemented (can I turn failover off?) then would I have a  
>>> load  
>>> balanced environment? I could then have all nodes running up to 100%  
>>> (because  
>>> I don't have to worry about the failover) and therefore give me a  
>>> dramatic  
>>> increase in performance compared with using a single server?  
>>>  
>>> If I can do this then I can set up 2 identical clusters and an extra  
>>> server  
>>> for the witness, and use database mirroring for failover? Of course I  
>>> understand that mirroring will decrease performance on the clusters.  
>>> But  
>>> would this give me a super-fast database system that might cope with  
>>> what  
>>> I  
>>> need?  
>>>  
>>> Also, I am thinking about taking the blob data of of the database and  
>>> create  
>>> a new database that just deals with the blobs. How would this affect my  
>>> clustered/mirrored environment?  
>>>  
>>> Thanks  
>>>  
>>> Richard  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>

---

### • *References:*

◆ *[Re: Clustering for Performance](#)*

◇ *From:* Andrew J. Kelly

◆ *[Re: Clustering for Performance](#)*

◇ *From:* Richard

- Prev by Date: *[Re: Cluster Set up Question](#)*
- Next by Date: *[Re: No item under Computer Management](#)*
- Previous by thread: *[Re: Clustering for Performance](#)*
- Next by thread: *[Re: Clustering for Performance](#)*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *[Date](#)*

◆ *Thread*