

# VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance ...

---



[Vliegenmepper](#) 1,511 posts since

May 10, 2006

Hi,

I've got several **VC2.5** servers (different sites) that are running **as a VM with a local SQL instance**. All of these servers experience slow performance while connecting to it with the VC Client.

Slow performance as in:

- Slow startup's, after entering credentials, it can take up to 30 seconds for the GUI to load and display everything
- Slow rebuilding of the screen while clicking through the server list and displaying different tabs.

Memory isn't the bottleneck in this scenario and adding an extra VCPU doesn't help the system as well (RDY times also good)

Then I've tested with CPU affinity and this seems to make a difference in performance (I know that SQL loves CPU affinity because of the caching behaviour of SQL)

My question now is, do other people who are running VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL instance experience these same problems?

Some other things that I can check to boost performance some more?

Thanks in advance,

Kenneth



[khenry567](#) 69 posts since

Sep 1, 2006 1. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Feb 20, 2008 7:10 AM

Hey Vliegenmepper,


Just wanted you to know that I have a setup just like you described and it is horribly slow. I did not have this problem with 2.0.2, but once I changed to 2.5 the performance just crashed. If I am working within my local subnet it is fast enough to be tolerable. If I am working remotely it is intolerable to the point of unusable. If I am working remotely the only way I can function is to remote desktop into the VC server and open VC client locally on it. Even then it is very slow and yesterday I tried to open a vm console and it bogged my rmd down so bad that I had to shut it down. Tried this twice and gave up the remote stuff. Now the only way I can work with the VC client at a reasonable speed is to come into the office.

Have you found any solutions?



[obpa](#) 20 posts since

Oct 17, 2007 2. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Feb 20, 2008 7:17 AM

 in response to: [khenry567](#)


VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance ...

Dittos. No problems on 2.0.2. Did a 2.5 install (local sql 2005 db) and performance is terrible. VC Client logins take 30sec from a workstation on the same subnet. The VC server is a dual proc, 4gb mem box w/ nothing else on it.



[Vliegenmepper](#) 1,511 posts since

May 10, 2006 3. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Feb 20, 2008 11:17 AM

 in response to: [khenry567](#) Well I tried several things, at some sites adding a vCPU and some memory increased the system performance

and in my own test environment I'm running with the CPU affinity set, apparently VC25 interacts much more with SQL and SQL loves the affinity set.

I'm curious if this increases your overall speed as well?


Cheers,

Kenneth



[dagterberg](#) 28 posts since

Jul 13, 2007 4. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Mar 7, 2008 12:28 AM

 in response to: [Vliegenmepper](#) I had the same problem (VC as a VM with local SQL 2005, 1 vCPU and 3 GB RAM) but I resolved it differently. Did some tuning and it performs great now. Here's what I did:

First (this one is important)

Configure "Server Optimization" for "Maximize data throughput for network applications". (Control Panel => Network Connections => Properties Networkcard => Doubleclick File and Print sharing for MS networks)

Second

Do some tuning in SQL. Set memory to min 512 and max 2048. Then I set growing for the TEMPDB and the VirtualCenter DB to 100 MB initially with a grow of 10 MB at a time

Hope this helps

Regards,

Dennis



[Vliegenmepper](#) 1,511 posts since

May 10, 2006 5. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Mar 7, 2008 12:32 AM


 in response to: [dagterberg](#) You just received some points with the first remark you made.

Strangely enough SQL Express didn't change this value itself like it should do.



[dagterberg](#) 28 posts since

Jul 13, 2007 6. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Mar 7, 2008 12:35 AM

 in response to: [Vliegenmepper](#) I have SQL 2005 Standard and it also didn't change this value as I assumed it would do.

VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance ...



[Vliegenmepper](#) 1,511 posts since

May 10, 2006 7. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Jul 9, 2008 5:52 AM

in response to: [dagterberg](#) Hi Guys, well I'm sort of going to re-open this thread.

I've currently got two virtual VC servers in small deployments (local SQL 2005 express) who both suffer from extreme slowness.

I've tested some stuff to reveal the local performance of the system and I noticed that the read/write performance to disk is very bad.

For example,

VC server: 2.9 MB writes per second (1000 MB total in chunks of 1024 MB) It starts very fast completely collapses after a few seconds

Another server: ~ 50.0 MB writes per second (1000 MB total in chunks of 1024 MB) It starts and stays very fast.

Both VM's are running on the same ESX Host and same Datastore.

I've connected the VC .vmdk to another server and written to this to make sure the .vmdk isn't corrupted, this wasn't the case.

So the real conclusion is: Windows is messing things up. I've uninstalled SQL server from the VC to test if this brings back the speed but unfortunately this didn't help.

Obviously I can reinstall my VC but actually I want to find out what is causing Windows to do this.

Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Cheers,

Kenneth



[dagterberg](#) 28 posts since

Jul 13, 2007 8. **Re: VC2.5 as a VM with local SQL Instance performs badly** Jul 25, 2008 11:55 AM

in response to: [Vliegenmepper](#) Ey Kenneth,

Does your problem still exists?

If you still have the problem even when SQL is uninstalled, then we can assume SQL is not the problem. Can you tell us more about the configuration?

Are the VC VM's the only VM's on the ESX server(s) or are there more VM's. Are they too having disk performance problems?

Regards,

Dennis