

Re: WSUS

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2007-10/msg02434.html>

- *From:* "Les Connor [SBS MVP]" <les.connor@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 17 Oct 2007 19:06:08 -0500
-

Hi JJ,

I'm not sure your memory use looks all that bad, so perhaps the performance problem is elsewhere? 3-5 instances isn't anything out of the ordinary. I'm not seeing performance issues with the full enchilada installed, and 25 users busy hitting SQL.

In any case:

You can switch ISA to log to file instead of MSDE, and eliminate that one.

WSUS isn't difficult to uninstall – if you have WSUS v2 (installed with SBS R2) uninstall R2 from add/remove programs. If you installed manually, then the WSUS would be listed in Add/Remove programs.

If this was a newly built box, had you updated it completely? There were some performance issues related to updating that were corrected by updates.

—

Les Connor [SBS MVP]

"JJ" <JJ@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:D21D8D08-2F71-4B28-9FC7-92604DE0C4CA@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

I'm already restricting SQL Server's memory usage. I set the limit to 100MB for all 4 instances: ISA – MSFW, WSUS, SBS Monitoring and SharePoint. Since I had not been using SharePoint all that much, it behaves. The rest, all three of them go way above 100 MB – up to 180 MB of peak usage and 140 MB – 150 MB of normal usage.

How can anyone work with 4 instances of SQL Server on the same box? Plus, I need to use SQL Server 2005 for my production database. I can't use SQL 2000, I need CLR integration.

So, I completely rebuilt my server since I couldn't find a way to uninstall WSUS. I chose not to install WSUS and I will manually uninstall the SharePoint instance of SQL Server. I need WSS 3.0 anyway, for which I can specify a SQL Server 2005 instance during installation.

Re: WSUS

I would take any kind of bundled solution like SBS with a mountain of salt.

JJ

"Les Connor [SBS MVP]" wrote:

Hi JJ,

You need to learn how to limit the memory use of the SQL/MSDE instances.

A

google search of this newsgroup should turn up some hits.

--

Les Connor [SBS MVP]

"JJ" <JJ@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:8CA9A03C-E479-4BA0-9E72-95CB92E3532B@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> "Steve Foster [SBS MVP]" wrote:

>> How do you know that it's "too much"?

>> Is your server exhibiting significant performance problems, and if so,

>> how

>> do you know that it's down to excessive memory usage by the WSUS

SQL

>> instance?

>

> You're actually defending Microsoft on this? Try this on a server > running

> SQL Server:

> tasklist /svc /fi "IMAGENAME eq sqlservr.exe"

>

> That gives you the process ids, instance names, etc. of all SQL Server

> instances on the PC. Using the process id in Task Manager, you can find

> which

> SQL Server instance is using what amount of memory.

>

> I guess since you do not know these basic things, it's pointless to try > to

> convince you of anything – it would just bounce off you.

>

> And how do you know my server is not exhibiting performance problems?

>

> Plus, how can you speak for every possible installation of SBS, even > with

> 4GB of RAM?

>

> JJ

>

>> JJ wrote:

>>

>> >Hi:

>> >

>> >Is there anyway to uninstall WSUS from a SBS installation? It's SQL

Re: WSUS

Re: WSUS

>> >Server
>> >instance uses way too much memory.
>>
>> How do you know that it's "too much"?
>> Is your server exhibiting significant performance problems, and if so,
>> how
>> do you know that it's down to excessive memory usage by the WSUS
SQL
>> instance?
>>
>> >And why didn't Microsoft build SBS in a way that is uses a single SQL
>> >Server
>> >instance for WSUS, MSFW, SharePoint and SBS Monitoring?
>>
>> There are a number of factors involved in deciding whether to use
>> multiple
>> instances of SQL Server or not. Not least in the case of SBS is that >> it's
>> a number of pre-canned applications stitched together and there's >>
limited
>> room for changing installation methodologies for the individual >>
products
>> without making them unsupported. Another significant angle is which
>> versions of SQL are supported by each application, and the consequent
>> variation in SQL features available to each application.
>>
>> In the grand scheme of things, it really doesn't matter much anyway. >>
The
>> major difference is in visibility and manageability – you can tell >> which
>> SQL instance(s) are busier or working harder than the others, >>
something
>> that would be impossible if they were all running together.
>>
>> >No wonder SBS brings servers with 4GB of RAM to their knees. And to
>> >top
>> >it
>> >all, SBS can't use more than 4GB of RAM due to the 32-bit >>
>architecture.
>>
>> I don't see SBS servers with 4Gb RAM "on their knees". They're running
>> nicely, and making use of all that RAM, just as I expected them to. If >>
an
>> SBS server with 4Gb RAM really is suffering, then it's underspecified >>
for
>> the given workload.
>>
>> SBS2003 can't use more than 4Gb RAM because it's essentially WS2003
>> Standard, which also can only use 4Gb RAM.
>>
>> The next version of SBS is going to be 64-bit, and I speculate that >> the
>> RAM limit is likely to rise significantly. If it remains consistent >> with
>> WS2003 standard, that would be 32Gb.

Re: WSUS

>>

>> >I can't imagine I'm the only person to request this.

>>

>> You do seem to be, at least so far.

>>

>> -- >> Steve Foster [SBS MVP]

>> -----

>> MVPs do not work for Microsoft. Please reply only to the newsgroups.

>>