

RE: Clustering Analysis services 2005 and SQL Server 2005: Best Ap

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.olap/2007-07/msg00204.html>

- *From:* Chip <Chip@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 25 Jul 2007 11:12:05 -0700
-

What hasn't been mentioned is that the numbers for the memory being used point to the fact that either configuration will meet our needs for the near future. Also, the Intel servers with 32GB of ram can be upgraded to 64 GB of ram when it is necessary. Further, in configuration 1 we run the risk of having both AS and SQL (customer facing) on the same server. If this is no longer regarded as bad practice, I'd like someone from MS to respond so.

There are also admin related reasons to keep the clusters as like/like. Patching is easier as well as server configuration settings. AS and SQL are 2 different animals and what works well for one, may not work for the other. In a mixed configuration we need to set the instances to the lowest common denominator instead of what each application likes.

"Jason" wrote:

Thanks Peter, I agree with you.

Does anyone see any benefit in the 2nd solution? or problems with the first approach. This is causing quite a heated interanl debate.

Some would argure that best practice would be to install AS and SQL server on different machines. does that make any sense in this case?

my understanding is that in a normal scenario, they are isolated from each other. and only when we have a failure over, are the two instances sharing the same resources.

It also would seem that if we wanted to leverage the processing benefit of having both on the same machine, we could simply fail AS over to the sql node, process the cube and then fail back.

Would that work?

RE: Clustering Analysis services 2005 and SQL Server 2005: Best Ap

""Peter YangMSFT]"" wrote:

Hello Jason,

From my point of view, both of the configurations should work. However, for production server I think it shall be all installed on more powerful server. Therefore, I prefer the first approach to the second one. Also, production server have more memory to use (especially on 64bit server), which is very important to heavy load production environment.

The following link might be helpful:

Microsoft SQL Server 2005 Analysis Services Performance Guide
<http://download.microsoft.com/download/8/5/e/85eea4fa-b3bb-4426-97d0-7f7151b2011c/SSAS2005PerfGuide.doc>

If you have any comments or feedback, please feel free to let's know.

Best Regards,

Peter Yang
MCSE2000/2003, MCSA, MCDBA
Microsoft Online Community Support

=====
Get notification to my posts through email? Please refer to
<http://msdn.microsoft.com/subscriptions/managednewsgroups/default.aspx#notifications>

<<http://msdn.microsoft.com/subscriptions/managednewsgroups/default.aspx>>.

Note: The MSDN Managed Newsgroup support offering is for non-urgent issues

where an initial response from the community or a Microsoft Support Engineer within 1 business day is acceptable. Please note that each follow up response may take approximately 2 business days as the support professional working with you may need further investigation to reach the most efficient resolution. The offering is not appropriate for situations that require urgent, real-time or phone-based interactions or complex project analysis and dump analysis issues. Issues of this nature are best handled working with a dedicated Microsoft Support Engineer by contacting Microsoft Customer Support Services (CSS) at

<<http://msdn.microsoft.com/subscriptions/support/default.aspx>>.

=====
This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.