

Re: Active/Active Clustering

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.clustering/2004-07/0222.html>

From: John Toner [MVP] (jtoner_at_mvps.DIE.SPAM.DIE.org)

Date: 07/20/04

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 2004 16:32:04 -0400

Just to add my \$0.02...I am a big fan of A/A clustering...as long as you are not going A/A with a single application (like Exchange). I've had lots of success with Active/Active clustering...big Exchange/SQL server on one node and file & print on the other node. I have also have had very little success with Active/Active applications in a cluster. In my experience, its a much easier "sell" if you do not have idle hardware. If you plan appropriately, never utilizing more than 50% of the resources on a server, you can achieve A/A clusters with great success rates.

The problem that usually occurs in this situation is that applications tend to grow and servers quickly use up more resources then they're originally planned to utilize. Since you see no immediate degradation of your applications, it's easy to forget that its part of a cluster and that it WILL eventually host all applications on the single server. When this happens, that where you'll usually have issues. This can be avoided with careful monitoring of your servers peak utilization statistics.

If you've got the budget, you might want to stick to an Active/Passive cluster, but once you start looking at bigger clusters, it starts making less sense to stick with an Active/Passive model. If you've got an 4-node cluster, this means that you're going to have half of the servers sitting "idle" waiting for one of the other two to die. In my opinion, this is overkill as it would be pretty rare to have 2 servers die simultaneously (though possible of course). If it's an 8-node cluster, the idle time gets more expensive in the 1:1 A/P model. I'd have no problem recommending a 6 Active, 2 Passive model to customers or even a 7:1 split in 8 node cluster.

Regards,
John

"Rodney R. Fournier [MVP]" <rod@die.spam.die.nw-america.com> wrote in message news:O1eKrCibEHA.2520@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...

> *Sadly, I have only see the opposite.*

>

> *Cheers,*

>

> *Rod*

>
> *MVP – Windows Server – Clustering*
> <http://www.nw-america.com> – Clustering
>
> "Jason Nash [MSFT]" <jasnas@online.microsoft.com> wrote in message
> news:40fd06ce@news.microsoft.com...
> > *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/cpyright.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:40fc1d94\$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>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "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.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >

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

> > >
> >
> >
>
>