

Re: Quorum drive and Data Drive on the Shared Array

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.clustering/2006-06/msg00141.html>

- *From:* "John Fullbright [MVP]" <fjohn@donotspamnetappdotcom>
 - *Date:* Sat, 10 Jun 2006 19:33:44 -0700
-

What are the best practices for SQL these days in terms of response time? In any event bufflatch waits and write log waits would be an indication that there is a disk bottleneck. To answer the question, something that won't load the array to the point where you exceed the response times in the best practices.

This brings up a point about SAN storage in general. The ability to pool storage and divvy chunks out to various servers is great, but it also introduces a potential problem; comingling. Comingling happens when IO against one LUN impacts IO against another LUN that shares the same physical spindles. The problem gets really difficult to troubleshoot in scenarios where multiple servers connect to the same storage device. Today, you have to design the array to account for peak load on all the LUNs that share the same spindles. With IO intensive applications like SQL or Exchange, this often results in situations where the spindle count is driven by the performance requirement and you end up with unused space. When you design storage, you have to consider both space and performance.

"Abbie" <Abbie@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:8A53E644-BC2C-40AD-9E2E-66033202207B@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

In the situation where I CAN present a 1gb lun and another 145gb lun from a 146gb mirror, and if sql server will be the only application, what is the best use for thie 145gb lun with performance in mind? database backups?
tlog
backups?

excuse the typing, broken radius, got screws and a plate yesterday.

cheers!

-abbie

"Russ Kaufmann [MVP]" wrote:

Re: Quorum drive and Data Drive on the Shared Array

"Abbie" <Abbie@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:54385CCE-1243-4598-B246-FEF4A4765955@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

When building an active/passive sql2k cluster (win2k3),
should you:

- a)create a physical mirror just for the quorum (lots of wasted space)
- b)create a 1gb(or so) logical from physical mirror

It depends on the hardware. Some lower end SANs will not let you break physical disks down inside the SAN into smaller LUNs. For example, if you have two 146 GB drives, you can create a 1 GB LUN and a 145 GB LUN out of the two disks (in a mirror in the SAN) which are then presented to the cluster nodes as two basic disks of 1 GB and 145 GB. However, some lower end SANs will not let you break the physical disks down. Then, you can create only a 146 GB LUN and would have tons of wasted space.

—
Russ Kaufmann
MVP – Windows Server – Clustering
ClusterHelp.com, a Microsoft Certified Gold Partner
Web <http://www.clusterhelp.com>
Blog <http://msmvps.com/clusterhelp>