

## Re: Performance on XP

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2005-02/25941.html>

---

**From:** Sleepless in Seattle ([jonah\\_at\\_guest.com](mailto:jonah_at_guest.com))

**Date:** 02/25/05

Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 12:34:26 +1300

Toss Registry Mechanic – a piece of worthless crap for morons. Next you'll be driving a Lada.

--

Jonah

"Wayne Bjorcken" <[Wayne.Bjorcken@discussions.microsoft.com](mailto:Wayne.Bjorcken@discussions.microsoft.com)> wrote in message news:37BD8DE1-3880-40D4-ABAD-E5A5EE42A794@microsoft.com...

>

>

> "StringFellow Hawk" wrote:

>

>> In SQL Server Enterprise Manager, how did you configure memory on both -

>> dynamic or fixed - what did you allow min/max to be if dynamic or what

>> did

>> you allow memory to be if fixed?

>>

>> --

>>

>> StringFellow Hawk

>>

>> "Dom, Give me Turbos"

>> "David Mohandas" <[david\\_mohandas@yahoo.com](mailto:david_mohandas@yahoo.com)> wrote in message

>> news:uEat8px2EHA.3376@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...

>> > I am running our application on Windows XP SP1 and Windows 2000 and i

>> > see

>> > a

>> > lot slower performance on XP than on 2000. XP machine has 1GB RAM and

>> > 2000

>> > machine has 768MB RAM. Our application uses SQL server 2000 SP3A. Our

>> > application on XP to run a process takes 3.5hrs and on 2000 the same

>> > process

>> > runs in 1.5hrs.

>> >

>> > Looking at the task manager on XP the sqlservr.exe Mem usage is around

>> > 0.5GB

>> > and our application mem usage is 7MB. Whereas on 2000 sqlservr.exe Mem

>> > usage is around 0.5GB and our application mem usage is around 50MB.

>> >

>> > I don't understand why in XP my application is not getting enough RAM,

>> > because i don't see all of the RAM being used (i.e) i don't see any

>> > other

>> > application in the process list that uses a lot of RAM other the

>> > sqlservr.

>> > But whereas the available physical memory is 4GB, i wondering where it

>> > all

microsoft.public.windowsxp.general: Re: Performance on XP

>> > went away. Also i notice heavy page faults in XP and that is leading to  
>> > under utilization of CPU which is causing the performance degradation.  
>> >  
>> > Has anyone seen such a behaviour on XP?  
>> >  
>> > Thanks,  
>> > David  
>> >  
>> >  
>>  
>>  
>>  
> My performance problem started when I upgraded from HOME to PRO. NO  
> hardware change and no application. MS support lead me up the wrong tree  
> so  
> after examining the Manage created I discovered several problems created  
> by  
> the upgrade process. I always check my logs. I found a stubbed DCOM CLID  
> and  
> Registry Menchanic found errors too numerous to mention. If there was a  
> downgrade procedure other than a reload, PRO would GO.