

## Re: Active/Active Clustering

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.clustering/2004-07/0203.html>

---

**From:** Jason Nash [MSFT] ([jasnas\\_at\\_online.microsoft.com](mailto:jasnas_at_online.microsoft.com))

**Date:** 07/20/04

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 2004 06:50:32 -0500

I have encountered it in the "real world" on multiple occasions. The setup was great and high availability was maintained.

--

Jason Nash [MSFT]

**\*\*Please do not send e-mail directly to this alias. This alias is for newsgroup purposes only\*\***

This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.

<http://www.microsoft.com/info/copyright.htm>

"Rodney R. Fournier [MVP]" <rod@die.spam.die.nw-america.com> wrote in message news:%23QQE2acbEHA.3148@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

> Agreed, but I have never hit one in the real world. If you want High  
> Availability, you have pay the price. When a system fails, you want the  
> same  
> level of performance out of it. Most people don't configure the systems so  
> that happens, hence why I really think this is a very bad idea.

>

> Cheers,

>

> Rod

>

> MVP - Windows Server - Clustering

> <http://www.nw-america.com> - Clustering

>

> "Jason Nash [MSFT]" <jasnas@online.microsoft.com> wrote in message

> news:40fcld94\$1@news.microsoft.com...

>> Hi Marcos,

>>

>> It isn't necessarily a bad idea. It really depends what type of

>> resources

>> you will be running on your cluster. There are many valid reasons to run

> an

>> Active/Active solution.

>>

>>

>> --

>>

>> Jason Nash [MSFT]

>> **\*\*Please do not send e-mail directly to this alias. This alias is for newsgroup purposes only\*\***

>> This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no  
> rights.

>> <http://www.microsoft.com/info/copyright.htm>

>>

>>

microsoft.public.windows.server.clustering: Re: Active/Active Clustering

```
>>
>> "Marcos" <anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in message
>> news:006a01c46dc1$ba019c80$a501280a@phx.gbl...
>> > Hey Rod,
>> >
>> > I'm looking to setup a shared-nothing Active/Active
>> > configuration. In which both nodes can host resources at
>> > the same time, but they cannot host the same resource at
>> > the same time.
>> >
>> > In your opinion, why is this a bad idea?
>> >
>> > Thank you.
>> >>-----Original Message-----
>> >>Active/Active is a very bad idea. When a system fails
>> > and you run both DB's
>> >>on one server, it can get ugly. With that said I have a
>> > ton of white paper
>> >>references on my website for SQL.
>> >>
>> >>Cheers,
>> >>
>> >>Rod
>> >>
>> >>MVP - Windows Server - Clustering
>> >>http://www.nw-america.com - Clustering
>> >>
>> >>"Marcos" <anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com> wrote in
>> > message
>> >>news:07ae01c46db9$61f8f720$a501280a@phx.gbl...
>> >>> Any good information, white papers, how-tos, examples,
>> >>> etc. on Active/Active Clustering?
>> >>>
>> >>> Thank you.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>.
>> >>
>>
>>
>
>
```