

## Re: SQL server 2000 Hardware

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.setup/2004-08/0106.html>

---

**From:** Keith Kratochvil (*sqlguy.back2u\_at\_comcast.net*)

**Date:** 08/10/04

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2004 06:27:06 -0500

SQL Server 2000 Standard Edition supports 2GB of RAM. If you want to use more than that you will have to upgrade to SQL Server Enterprise. You will probably want to get at least a dual processor machine. Many of the current dual processor servers are hyperthreaded so it will look like 4CPUs to SQL Server (but you will only have to purchase two per-processor licenses if you go the per processor licesing route). It is generally recommended to have a RAID volume for your database files, a separate RAID volume for the log files (if this is a highly transactional system), and a RAID volume for tempdb. You will of course need a RAID array for the OS partition. You can probably get by with three — one for the data, one for the logs, and one for the OS + tempdb. If you don't have lots of transactions happening you could probably combine the log with the OS and tempdb partition.

If you want to spend lots of money to insure availability you could go the clustered route. This will mean that you have to purchase two copies of Windows that support clustering. You will also need to purchase appropriate hardware to support clustering. Finally, you will have to go with SQL Server Enterprise. This adds up quickly.

The alternative is to purchase a redundant machine. Some of the newer machines have hot-swappable RAID RAM, dual (redundant) power supplies. I have heard that some of the higher end multiprocessor machines even allow one processor to fail without bringing down the entire system. I don't want to tell you which approach to use, but this is often sufficient.

Is this a brand new system that you are rolling out, or are you upgrading the hardware and rolling it out to more users? I ask the question because if it is an upgrade you should have some idea of how well your current hardware performs and where your bottlenecks are.

--

Keith

"Homer" <anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message news:355001c47ec2\$ee4f0dd0\$a601280a@phx.gbl...

> Keith

>

> I see your point.

>

> It will be a database with approximately 300 users. It

microsoft.public.sqlserver.setup: Re: SQL server 2000 Hardware

> has to be available 24/7 and reliable, so will require  
> RAID, but which one? Cluster, I don't know if the shared  
> info goes down we lose availability?  
>  
> Thanks.....  
>  
>