

Re: SQL 2005 hardware recommendations

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.setup/2007-11/msg00060.html>

- *From:* "David" <David@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 9 Nov 2007 14:54:59 -0600
-

Andrew,

Thanks for your help.

When you suggest a "RAID 1+0" configuration, I assume you mean 0 (striping) first, 1 (mirroring) next. In other words, a mirrored pair of striped sets.

If I opted for purchasing six 36 GB drives, I could use four to make a "RAID 0+1" (as I would write it) 72 GB device. Then, what is the most advisable way to partition this device? I'm asking with regard to two issues. First, partitions and sizes particularly for the installation of Windows Server 2003. Second, partitions and sizes for the installation of SQL Server 2005 Express. Are three partitions sufficient or might I want four or more?

Thanks much for any further advice.

David

"Andrew J. Kelly" <sqlmvpnoospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message <news:OuYAATwIIHA.1208@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

With a database size that small and low usage I don't see any reason not to use Express. But there are some features that Express does not support and it has limits on Processors, Memory etc. Just be sure none of those limitations are an issue with how you plan to use it. It does not sound like it though. I don't think you will see a difference in having the additional drives either. If the slots are there I would opt for 4 drives in a raid 1+0 configuration for the best in performance and redundancy.

Andrew J. Kelly SQL MVP
Solid Quality Mentors

"David" <David@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message <news:37011776-AB29-4BE0-A194-75030C87CE8B@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

I must quickly purchase a small server for a client of mine to run SQL

Re: SQL 2005 hardware recommendations

Server 2005. I will be using the Access upscaling tool to migrate the backend mdb file to SQL Server. I designed my Access application from the beginning knowing that it will eventually be upscaled to SQL Server.

Thus,

there is both a backend mdb file with data only and a frontend mdb file with software, user-interface, etcetera.

The server will be exclusively for running SQL Server, except for very light

file and print service. Furthermore, there are very few users: 4 or 5 at most. I hope to use SQL Server 2005 Express Edition since it's free, the data (after several years) is under 100 MBytes, and there are so few users.

Is there any reason not to use the Express Edition?

Most important, what's an ideal hard drive configuration. I have the opportunity to purchase an HP ProLiant ML350 with six 36GB drives. I'd plan to make 3 mirrored pairs resulting in three 36 GB volumes on separate physical devices.

I also have the opportunity to purchase the same machine with three 72GB drives. With this, I'd make one mirrored pair with a hot spare. Then, the multiple volumes would share the same physical device. Since there are so few users, does it make a darn bit of difference?

In the last analysis, what is the ideal number of volumes (and sizes, which

I know depends on the DB itself) for Windows Server 2003 and SQL Server 2005

Express (or perhaps Workgroup or Standard if Express is not sufficient).

Thanks for reading through all this. I am very appreciative of any advice.

Regards,

David