

Re: Best practice on virtualizing SBS

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.server.sbs/2007-12/msg03525.html>

- *From:* MijakiDK <MijakiDK@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:42:00 -0800
-

Would the /3GB switch give me problems if I only have 3 GB of ram and not 4?

"Tony Su" wrote:

1. If you can wait for Win2K8, then use the \$28 hypervisor only for the host.
2. If you do install a full HostOS, then make the HostOS a Standalone Server (not a member of the Domain) and install SBS with any other OS as Guests.
3. If you use Microsoft's virtual solutions, be aware Virtual Server 2005 heavily using kernel mode memory addresses, whereas if you use VMware you'll be using largely user mode memory addresses, so in the second case will likely want to implement the /3GB switch in the boot.ini for the HostOS if the HostOS is 32-bit.

--
Tony Su
www.su-networking.com
ISA
SBS
Enterprise Mobile Solutions Architect

"MijakiDK" wrote:

I can throw in up to 8GB on my existing HW – New HW will be budgetted for when SBS 2008 comes our way.

I will start with expanding from 1GB to 3 GB and then install more if needed

Thank you for all your input – It has made my decision clearer at least to me ;-)

Happy new year

"SuperGumby [SBS MVP]" wrote:

Re: Best practice on virtualizing SBS

OK, so if we stay within your expectations.

The current SBS hardware has 1GB RAM and your user count is low. It is this hardware that will be hosting both SBS and your TS but you are prepared to throw more RAM in the machine. Please confirm.

Hopefully, in 2009 new hardware will be purchased. This is pretty well ideal as you have a fully fine SBS2003 and by then the 'kinks' will be ironed out of SBS2008 and Hyper-V. (are you sure you can't go to 4GB (3.5 maybe) on the current HW? it would be good. Depends on mobo/bios whether all such would be available though.)

I'd throw the extra RAM in the current SBS and use it as host for TS in a VM. You will be stealing RAM to run the VM but also have more RAM for the SBS. In 2009 I would look at purchasing the new box with 'Server Core + Hyper-V' only, doing the move to a VM at that time, 1st by moving the existing SBS2003 to virtual then possibly moving to SBS2008.

"MijakiDK" <MijakiDK@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
news:DE8D8FF1-A942-4A09-A3FD-380F594EAC44@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Wow that was a lot, nothing short and sweet from you Gumby :-)

The x64 issue has to be dealt with on a later stage as the existing server is x32 and budget does not allow for the purchase of new hardware before 2009
- I hope ;-)

We are a tiny company with 6 active users - 3 working outside the office on PDA (sales) and dsl in the evening for mail. So the performance we have today is very fine and bottlenecks are not on the

Re: Best practice on virtualizing SBS

server side – I expect a
virtual
SBS will not be slower.

At the moment my SBS is running on 1GB
of ram, the host box will get 3GB
and
I expect to use 2GB for the SBS and dual nic
of course.

And finally, getting past the hardship of
updating hardware using a
virtual
SBS is a very promising concept.

Currently I'm having user data etc. on the
D–drive of my SBS and AFAI
understood you would keep the D–drive in
the VHD file?

"SuperGumby [SBS MVP]" wrote:

I can't go as far as saying
this is anything formal 'best
practice'
but...

Host box should be x64.
This is even more necessary
as we move forward
where
the host can be expected to
be best implemented as
Windows Server 2008
(CORE
only) with Hyper–V, I
believe this will be x64 with
VT only. Even staying
at
a W2k3+VS200x you can
expect x64 on the host to
offer best performance.
OK, VMWare Server will
do x64 guest on x32, as long
as it fully supports
VT
(CPU, mobo, BIOS), but the
x64 host can be _expected_
to handle it
better.

Re: Best practice on virtualizing SBS

I'm starting to think that for a decent implementation you also want dual or better 'teamed' NICs on the host. There is some impact to network performance in the VM imposed by the mere fact of virtualisation, compensating for this by providing the best possible network performance on the host sounds like a reasonable idea.

It is suggested that having multiple RAID arrays, dedicating arrays to the VM and providing the arrays to the VM as 'direct' drives will provide best performance. I do not disagree with this in this aspect but prefer that only the VM be able to access the content of it's drives, I therefore sacrifice some performance by running 'drives as files'.

AV on the host should be told to exclude the folder containing and VHD's from scanning and if you do provide 'direct drives' to the VM I'd also exclude those drives from scanning by the host.

I would disable Shadow Copies on the host partitions holding VHD's. SC's of the VHD's will not be

Re: Best practice on virtualizing SBS

maintained anyway, due to
size, but I don't want
any
impact from the host
'inspecting' the partition to
see if it can SC
anything.

"MijakiDK"

<MijakiDK@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in message

news:FBC63E68-4EE5-43C3-B62A-7A700C2F937D@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hey there,

Any input
on this?

Do I take an
ordinary
W2K3
server an
load my
SBS as a
virtual on
that
or?

Do I "loose"
my D-drive
for data and
map to the
data in the
future when
I
have done
the
virtualisation?
Thus only
make a
virtual
server of
my SBS
C-drive?

I haven't got
a SAN or
anything –
I'm simply
trying to get
my 2 server

Re: Best practice on virtualizing SBS

system
down to 1
physical
box.

My other
server is a
W2K3 for
TS.

Happy new
year

Kim