

Re: Server Configuration

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.setup/2005-12/msg00097.html>

- *From:* "Andrew J. Kelly" <sqlmvpnoospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 8 Dec 2005 07:59:13 -0500
-

It's always a good idea to separate the log from the data files onto different physical drive arrays when possible. Both from a performance and DR standpoint. In your case you may or may not see a noticeable performance increase now but who is to say you won't sometime down the road as traffic increases.

—
Andrew J. Kelly SQL MVP

"C Barnhart" <CBarnhart@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:1AD7AC6C-BE8D-4D39-B3BF-9ED134793B83@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

- > Thanks for the reply.
- >
- > It sounds like segregating the OS/app/Tr Log from the data is not that
- > much
- > of a concern in an environment like mine, where the transaction rate is
- > not
- > that high (or heavy) or, more importantly, a little server down time is
- > not
- > job-threatening. The information I have read recommends putting each
- > (OS/App,
- > Tr Log, and Data) on separate RAIDs—that would be 3 RAIDs in one box!
- >
- > In situations where there are thousands or millions of transactions per
- > minute, this might be reasonable. However, in my situation, there might be
- > 100s/min. So we are more concerned with fast-running queries than
- > transaction
- > rate and fault tolerance (tr log is backed up hourly and database is
- > backed
- > up nightly). But since we have the opportunity to purchase a new server, I
- > wanted to do it "right".
- >
- > It sounds like, from your answer, there IS something to gain by locating
- > the
- > OS, App, and Tr Log on one RAID and the database on the other.
- >
- > Thanks for your clarification.

Re: Server Configuration

>
> Charles Barnhart
>
>
> "Andrew J. Kelly" wrote:
>
>> It really depends on the type and volume of transactions. The more you
>> do
>> or the heavier they are the more you can usually see a difference over
>> having the log file on the same drive as the data. Since the OS is
>> rarely
>> used on a properly configured machine with only SQL Server running it can
>> be
>> more beneficial to place the log with the OS vs. the data. As for the
>> data
>> RAID you might want to see if you can't do a RAID 1+0 instead of 5.
>>
>> --
>> Andrew J. Kelly SQL MVP
>>
>>
>> "C Barnhart" <CBarnhart@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:DB30BA10-8584-4C36-B308-8005A8934296@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> > Does storing the Transaction Log on the same mirrored disk set as the
>> > OS
>> > negate any benefit of storing on a separate physical drive from the
>> > database?
>> > I am about to purchase a new server and would like to address the "log
>> > on
>> > separate physical disk" issue.
>> >
>> > Planning to purchase an HP DL380 with two raid configurations:
>> > (1) RAID 1 for OS, app and Tr Log (2 – 36GB mirrored drives)
>> > (2) RAID 5 for database (4 – 72GB)
>>
>>
>>

• **References:**

◆ **Re: Server Configuration**

◇ From: Andrew J. Kelly

- Prev by Date: **Re: Duplicate SQL 2005 using Virtual images**
- Next by Date: **sql collation question**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Server Configuration**
- Next by thread: **Re: Duplicate SQL 2005 using Virtual images**

Re: Server Configuration

- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*