

Re: Breaking a Sql Cluster

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.clustering/2008-03/msg00009.html>

- *From:* David <David@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 3 Mar 2008 12:40:00 -0800
-

Sorry I meant to say we have 1 default instance and 1 named instance.

"Tom Moreau" wrote:

Correct. So do you have only one clustered instance now or two? Let's be sure we are talking about the same thing here. By "local", I mean local only to a given node. You can have default or named instances on any node. However, you can have only one default instance within a cluster – local or virtual.

--
Tom

Thomas A. Moreau, BSc, PhD, MCSE, MCDBA, MCITP, MCTS
SQL Server MVP
Toronto, ON Canada
<https://mvp.support.microsoft.com/profile/Tom.Moreau>

"David" <David@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:A1AF0D63-985E-43F3-9818-90D38013F6A1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
We have one local and one named instance of SQL 2000 on the cluster at present. So you are telling me we could still do a local install to the passive node and then migrate the databases without evicting it from the cluster?

"Tom Moreau" wrote:

Ouch! High Availability and Low Budget are terms that should not be seen
in

the same sentence. If you are not going to have any extra SAN space, you could keep all 3 nodes and then do a *local* install of SQL 2005 on one node, and migrate DB's from one existing instance to it. You lose the HA,

Re: Breaking a Sql Cluster

but you were gonna lose it anyway. Once all of the DB's in once instance have moved to it, then remove the old instance and install a *clustered*

SQL

2005 instance on that same cluster. Detach the DB's from the local

instance

and, copy and move them to the clustered instance. Remove the local instance whenever you like. Now you have the HA and SQL 2005. You'll

have

to insure that the individual node has enough local disk capacity to

receive

the DB's that you want to shuffle over there.

--

Tom

Thomas A. Moreau, BSc, PhD, MCSE, MCDBA, MCITP, MCTS
SQL Server MVP
Toronto, ON Canada
<https://mvp.support.microsoft.com/profile/Tom.Moreau>

"David" <David@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:9A48DA7E-91B2-4371-98B3-642E16FC0E2E@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
2 reasons, First, we can't do an upgrade because we know some of the databases are not compatible with SQL 2005 so an inline upgrade won't work for us. Second, Microsoft recommended we create another cluster group and install along side the existing but we don't have the disk space on the existing SAN and we are currently in an extreme budget crunch right now so expanding is out of the question. So with no server money or SAN money we talked about breaking the cluster and doing a fresh SQL install on the new server once we took the passive node from the cluster. We should have Active/Passive and not active/active/passive after it's done, right?

"Tom Moreau" wrote:

Why not keep the cluster and run SQL 2005 on there?

--

Tom

Re: Breaking a Sql Cluster

Thomas A. Moreau, BSc, PhD, MCSE, MCDBA, MCITP,
MCTS
SQL Server MVP
Toronto, ON Canada
<https://mvp.support.microsoft.com/profile/Tom.Moreau>

"David" <David@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message
news:A05DA0CB-60E8-4EB4-A2E3-7DF5A2CBF031@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Yes we are aware we lose the high availability. After we
have the

standalone

we are going to install SQL 2005 on the box and migrate our
databases to

the

standalone SQL 2005 box. After all the migration is
complete we will
probably
kill the cluster and use the servers for something else. There
was some

talk

about possibly building another cluster later.

"Tom Moreau" wrote:

A cluster can run with even one node. What
you are planning is quite
feasible. What are your plans once you have
the DB's on the

stand-alone?

Keep in mind that on a stand-alone server,
you lose the high

availability

that you once had.

--

Tom

Re: Breaking a Sql Cluster

Thomas A. Moreau, BSc, PhD, MCSE,
MCDBA, MCITP, MCTS
SQL Server MVP
Toronto, ON Canada
<https://mvp.support.microsoft.com/profile/Tom.Moreau>

"David"
<David@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
<news:167E99AC-0D2C-4FA5-8A07-0ED3A45CDB68@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
We have an Active/Active/Passive SQL
2000 cluster and budgetary

constraints

have made it impossible for us to upgrade
the hardware to new servers.

Our

current servers are capable of handling the
upgrade but some of our
databases
might not be compatible with SQL 2005.
Can we evict the passive node,

make

it a standalone, upgrade it and then migrate
the databases to the new

server

without killing the cluster? Will the cluster
run if the passive node

is

evicted?

Re: Breaking a Sql Cluster