

Re: Frequent use of attach and detach

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.server/2004-03/2434.html>

From: Greg Linwood (g_linwood@hotmai.com)

Date: 03/17/04

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2004 14:41:34 +1100

Hi Terris.

I'm inclined to agree with you on this as you're right – attach / detach is a feature that should work regardless of usage frequency.

However, Replication stands out to me as an obvious alternative to your solution. Have you considered it? If so, why was it discarded? I'd suggest that replication might be your best bet as it's purpose built for scenarios like this and if used, would help define an architecture for the solution that is easier to maintain. I say this due to familiarity with DBAs generally with replication and also availability of tools for managing replicated processes – you'd also need to build admin tools capable of monitoring your solution..

HTH

Regards,
Greg Linwood
SQL Server MVP

"Terris Linenbach" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:%23SdL896CEHA.3132@TK2MSFTNGP11.phx.gbl...

- > *We are considering an architecture in which "detach" and "attach" are used*
- > *on a daily, automated basis for about 50 databases, each containing about*
- > *10*
- > *gigs of data.*
- >
- > *We use network attached storage (Network Appliance).*
- >
- > *We want to have a farm of load servers for a data warehouse. When a load*
- > *server in the farm is available, it "attach"es a local database to a raw*
- > *database file "F" and loads data. After loading data, the database is*
- > *detached. Another server later detaches its local database file and*
- > *attaches to file "F."*
- >
- > *This scheme frees personnel from manually configuring servers around*
- > *unpredictable load times. It is virtually impossible for a human to*

microsoft.public.sqlserver.server: Re: Frequent use of attach and detach

- > *optimally allocate and schedule machines for this task.*
- >
- > *We contacted MS tech support to get their feedback and they don't advise*
- > *such a strategy. The consequences of frequent use of "attach" and*
- > *"detach"*
- > *are unknown, according to tech support. This seems a little strange to*
- > *me,*
- > *since "attach" and "detach" are real features.*
- >
- > *Has anyone tried to do something like this?*
- >
- > *Thank you.*
- >
- >