

Re: Terminal Server Performance

Source:

http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Windows/microsoft.public.windows.terminal_services/2008-07/msg00147.html

- *From:* Grecko <Grecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 5 Jul 2008 13:17:00 -0700
-

I hope you had a good 4th. I will have to look at the disk queue on Monday.

We are using switches and the server has a 1 gbps card in it connecting it to the switch. I already told them they need to get a fiber connection from the server to the switch. Is there anyway to tell from the Windows Task Manager if the network connection is saturated? What is an acceptable range for the percentage in the network utilization?... I really appreciate the help...Grecko

"Jeff Pitsch" wrote:

Read/Writes themselves aren't really indicative of a problem unless the queue is building up. If there is no queue then your disks probably aren't a problem. In other words, no commands are waiting for the disk/channel to free up.

As for the tool, there's a bunch out there but the free ones slip my mind. almost midnight and I'm tired :(but you really are looking to see if the, I'm assuming, 100meg connection is simply saturated tot he terminal server. Out of curiosity are they using a hub or switch for all those single segment connections?

Jeff Pitsch
Microsoft MVP – Terminal Services

"Grecko" <Grecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message <news:D0791121-8F28-46BA-BE83-E9AFC47696D6@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

No we havent sniffed or analyzed the network traffic. Like I said I know they have network issues because they still have static ips, there is no segments in the network, etc. What tool would you recommend to analyze the traffic? What do you mean by the link saturated? We havent looked at the queue yet during peak period...just the reads/writes. What would the queue indicate?...We are using RAID1 mirroring...Grecko

Re: Terminal Server Performance

"Jeff Pitsch" wrote:

100 users does equal a lot fo traffic. Have you sniffed or analyzed the network traffic? is the link saturated? Have you looked at the queue for the hard drives to see if commands are lining up during peak periods? What RAID config are you using?

Jeff Pitsch
Microsoft MVP – Terminal Services

"Grecko" <Grecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:55B7AA77-B11B-48AA-A66D-B060F6D2808E@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

There is a lot of memory still available on the server when the performance is slow and no spikes in the processor. The only thing that indicates a problem is the high read/writes in the perfmon. Our application people our telling us that the bottle neck is in the network and that the read/writes shouldnt have an effect on performance. Of course, we are seeing the opposite of this. I am new to the environment and just trying to help each side. It seems that it may be a little of both network and hard-drive read/writes as best as I can tell. Any ideas?...Grecko

"Jeff Pitsch" wrote:

I'm not sure how network would affect read/writes to

Re: Terminal Server Performance

the HD of the
server.
The only way it could, that I
can think of off hand, is if
the network
card
was bad and causing an
unusual amount of interrupts
forcing the
processor
to
work harder and forcing
more read/writes as the cpu
is backed up more
and
more. What does the queue
show for requests waiting to
the hard
drives?
Is
CPU being spiked at all?
How much memory is
available on the servers
when
this is happening?

Jeff Pitsch
Microsoft MVP – Terminal
Services

"Grecko"
<Grecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
news:C6ECF95E-4FA8-4034-889E-D1C2E28DCB6D@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

We havent
tried
anything
yet. Yes, we
are
probably
going to
add
another
server to
offload
some of the
users. We
didnt want
to do this

Re: Terminal Server Performance

until
we
had
figured out
whats
causing the
problems.....network,
hard-drive,
etc...Grecko

"Jeff
Pitsch"
wrote:

Page
files
should
also
be
min/max
the
same
so
windows
is
not
growing/shrinking
dynamically.
this
can
add
alot
of
overhead.
Adding
more
pagefile
space
would
just
worsen
the
situation.

both
Vera
and
I
have
mentioned

Re: Terminal Server Performance

this
but
have
you
seriously
considered
that
you
may
have
simply
maxed
out
the
server?
Have
you
tried
virtual
memory
products
from
companies
such
as
ThinPrint,
RTO
Soft,
Provision
Networks
(I'm
an
employee)?
Those
would
cut
down
on
your
paging
drastically
if
there
are
savings
to
be
had.

Jeff
Pitsch

Re: Terminal Server Performance

Microsoft
MVP
–
Terminal
Services

"Grecko"
<Grecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote
in
message
news:6E96045F-ACCE-4752-8113-2F175A1FF2A7@xxx

I
checked
the
page
file
and
its
setup
on
drive
C:
for
400
to
1000
MB,
on
drive
F:
for
12286
–
13386,
drive
H
is
a
system
managed
drive,
and
driveE
has
no
paging
file.
Should

Re: Terminal Server Performance

we
make
the
amount
lower
on
C:.
I
am
assuming
it
wont
roll
to
F
until
it
uses
the
all
page
file
on
C:?
Of
course
if
this
is
the
case,
then
we
would
have
a
bottle
neck
on
the
C:
drive.
What
would
be
the
best
way
to
distribute
the

Re: Terminal Server Performance

calls
to
the
drives?...Gregg

"Vera
Noest
[MVP]"
wrote:

It's
impossible
to
say
here
why
the
server
is
having
performance
problems
(but
100
concurrent
sessions
is
quite
a
lot,
depending
of
course
on
which
applications
the
users
are
running).

You'll
have
to
use
Performance
monitor
to
find
out

Re: Terminal Server Performance

what
the
bottleneck
is.
Since
you
have
noticed
high
RW
activity
on
the
drive,
check
the
size
and
location
of
your
swap
file.
You
can
find
some
tools
and
guidelines
here:
http://ts.veranoest.net/ts_performance.htm

Vera
Noest
MCSE,
CCEA,
Microsoft
MVP
—
Terminal
Server
TS
troubleshooting:
<http://ts.veranoest.net>

—
please
respond
in
newsgroup,
NOT

Re: Terminal Server Performance

by
private
email

—

=?Utf-8?B?R3JIY2tv?=
<Grecko@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
on
03
jul
2008
in
microsoft.public.windows.terminal_services:

We
are
having
poor
performance
on
our
terminal
server.
We
only
have
about
100
users
on
one
server
with
2
processors
and
8
gigs
of
ram.
The
poor
performance
seems
to
coincide
with
high/read
writes

Re: Terminal Server Performance

on
our
C:
drive.
Could
the
drive
itself
be
the
bottleneck
or
the
network
itself?...Thanks...Grecko