

SQLskills Immersion Event IE0: Accidental/Junior DBA

Module 1: Hardware Considerations

Jonathan Kehayias
Jonathan@SQLskills.com



Introduction

- **Module Overview**
 - The importance of processor selection
 - Intel or AMD processors?
 - How to evaluate and compare processors
 - Determining how much physical RAM to buy
 - Planning SQL Server I/O subsystems
 - SAN considerations
 - Virtualization considerations



2

© SQLskills. All rights reserved.
<http://www.SQLskills.com>



Why Does Database Hardware Matter?

- **Database servers are mission critical assets**
 - Performance and scalability problems are immediately noticeable
 - Multiple applications typically depend on the database server
- **Very difficult to compensate for poor hardware choices**
 - Inadequate I/O performance and capacity can cripple the system
 - Insufficient memory capacity can cause extra I/O pressure
 - Insufficient CPU capacity hurts performance and scalability
- **Wise hardware selection can save money on SQL license costs**
 - Physical core counts are cost driver for SQL Server 2012 core licensing
 - New two-socket servers can often replace older four-socket servers
 - It is possible to save so much on license costs, that your hardware is free!

Top Scalability Issues with SQL Server

- Poor application architecture and design
- Poor database architecture and design
- Poor indexing strategy and maintenance
- Improper instance configuration settings
- Improper database configuration settings
- Inadequate storage subsystem
- Old or inappropriate hardware

- Hardware cannot solve all problems!

The Costs of Scaling Up

- **Scaling up is easy from an engineering perspective**
 - Very little development or testing effort is required
- **Scaling up is expensive from a capital cost perspective**
 - Hardware costs increase exponentially as you add sockets
 - SQL Server 2012 core-license costs can add up very quickly
- **Higher hardware license limits with Windows 2012 and SQL Server 2012**
 - 640 logical processors and 4TB of RAM
 - You can currently get 4TB of RAM in an eight-socket machine
 - You will be able to get 12TB of RAM in an eight-socket machine in Q4 2013
 - You can currently get 160 logical processors in an eight-socket machine
 - You will be able to get 240 logical processors in an eight-socket machine in Q4 2013
- **Even NUMA architecture hardware does not scale linearly**
 - Typically a 70-80% scaling factor as you double the number of sockets

SQL Server and Hardware Selection

- **Nobody will ever complain that a database server is too fast!**
 - Don't be needlessly frugal with your database server hardware
 - You will be blamed for performance whether you selected the hardware or not
 - Server hardware is very affordable compared to SQL Server licenses
 - Don't ever reuse "old" database hardware for a new version of SQL Server
- **Be aware of SQL Server hardware licensing limits**
 - There are differences between SQL Server 2008, 2008 R2 and 2012
 - 64GB RAM limit for SQL Server 2008 R2 and 2012 Standard Edition
 - Four-socket or 16 core limit for SQL Server 2008 R2 and 2012 Standard Edition
 - Eight-socket limit for SQL Server 2008 R2 Enterprise Edition
 - SQL Server 2012 Enterprise Edition can use OS limit for RAM and processors

Intel or AMD Processors?

- **Intel is completely dominant in single-threaded performance**
 - Two-socket space since December 2008 (Xeon 5500 series)
 - Four-socket space since April 2010 (Xeon 7500 series)
- **AMD processors are more expensive to license**
 - Modern AMD processors have high physical core counts
 - SQL Server 2012 Core Factor table gives 25% license discount
 - Even with this discount, AMD licensing costs are higher than Intel
- **AMD processors are less expensive (hardware cost)**
 - Processor cost is a very small component of total cost of the server
 - Not a compelling reason to pick an AMD processor
 - Opteron 6100/6200/6300 series works better for DW/DSS workloads
 - Opteron 6200/6300 series (Bulldozer/Piledriver) not good for OLTP

Database Server Processor Considerations (1)

- **Non-Uniform Memory Access (NUMA)**
 - Both AMD and current Intel systems support NUMA
 - Intel has supported NUMA since the Nehalem microarchitecture
 - Eliminates the old front-side bus contention issue of SMP architecture
 - This is more important as the number of sockets increase
- **Larger L2 and L3 processor cache sizes**
 - Very important for database performance
 - Finding data in L2/L3 cache is much faster than finding it in main memory
- **High processor core counts**
 - The more the better! (pre-SQL Server 2012)
 - Helps scalability and performance
 - SQL Server 2012 changes the story quite a bit...

Database Server Processor Considerations (2)

- **Purposely over-provision processors**
 - Better single-threaded performance for OLTP workloads
 - Multiple cores increase capacity and scalability
 - Excess CPU capacity is very useful for reducing I/O requirements
 - SQL Server data compression (Enterprise Edition only)
 - Backup compression (native or 3rd party)
 - Log stream compression for database mirroring
- **Processors are relatively inexpensive**
 - Adding I/O capacity is usually much more expensive than a good CPU
 - The license costs per core are the same, so pick the right processor
 - Don't pick a lower speed processor from the same family to save money

Intel Specific Considerations

- **Hyper-threading (HT)**
 - Physical cores divided into logical cores
 - Latest processors work with HT much better than the old NetBurst Pentium 4
 - A cache miss is not as expensive as it used to be
 - Works especially well with single-threaded OLTP workloads
 - All TPC-E submissions have had HT enabled
 - Test with your workload
- **Turbo Boost 2.0**
 - Boosts the speed of individual cores when other cores are idle
 - Very helpful for OLTP performance
 - Rack-mounted servers have ample cooling capacity

SQL Server 2012 Licensing Considerations

- **SQL Server 2012 Enterprise Edition is licensed per physical core**
 - You pay four-core minimum per physical socket
 - Retail cost is \$6,872 per physical core
 - This is another reason to retire old hardware
- **If SQL Server 2012 licensing costs are the biggest issue**
 - Consider “frequency-optimized” quad-core model CPU
 - Intel Xeon E5-2643 – four cores, 3.3GHz Base to 3.5GHz Turbo
 - Otherwise, get higher core count for more scalability
 - Intel Xeon E5-2690 – eight cores, 2.9GHz Base to 3.8GHz Turbo
 - Consider processor architecture and cache sizes, not just clock speed
 - Physical vs. logical cores
 - Only physical cores matter for non-virtualized SQL Server 2012 core-based licensing

Why Use Two-Socket Servers?

- **Two-socket systems can handle a high percentage of workloads**
 - Newer, faster Intel processors compared to four-socket servers
 - Two-socket space has much higher sales volume than four-socket space
 - Two-socket Intel processor release cycle is 12-18 months ahead of four-socket
- **Lower RAM capacity, but up to 24 memory slots**
 - Two-socket servers support up to 768GB of RAM with 32GB DIMMs
 - Up to 384GB or RAM with more affordable 16GB DIMMs
- **Can have fewer PCI-E expansion slots than four-socket servers**
 - Typically four to six PCI-E slots in a modern two-socket server
 - This can limit maximum I/O capacity somewhat
 - Intel Sandy Bridge-EP has PCI-E 3.0 support
 - This has double the bandwidth of PCI-E 2.0 standard in older servers

Why Use Four-Socket Servers?

- **Tradition has dictated four-socket database servers**
 - Four-socket servers have more physical and logical cores than two-socket
 - Higher total CPU capacity increases total server capacity
 - Lower single-threaded CPU performance because of older processor models
 - Higher total memory capacity
 - More memory slots and higher capacity memory controllers (in the CPU)
 - More PCI-E expansion slots (but limited to PCI-E 2.0)
 - Used for FC HBAs, DAS RAID controllers, NICs, PCI-E flash storage cards
 - Number and type of PCI-E slots sets upper limit for total I/O capacity
 - Four-socket servers have better reliability, availability and servicing (RAS) features
 - Memory error recovery in SQL Server 2012 Enterprise with Xeon E7 family
 - Requires Windows 2012 Server

(1) Four-Socket Server vs. (2) Two-Socket Servers

- **(1) Four-socket server - Dell PowerEdge R910 (4U)**
 - (4) Xeon E7-4870 2.4GHz processors (80 logical cores with HT)
 - 1024GB RAM (with 64 * 16GB DIMMs)
 - 3218 tpsE TPC-E score, 45000 Geekbench score
 - \$53,763 hardware cost (no OS license or internal storage)
 - \$314,480 SQL Server 2012 Enterprise Edition license cost (40 core licenses)
- **(2) Two-socket servers – Dell PowerEdge R720 (2U each)**
 - (4) Xeon E5-2690 2.9GHz processors (64 total logical cores with HT)
 - 768GB total RAM (with 48 * 16GB DIMMs)
 - 3763 total tpsE TPC-E score, 60000 total Geekbench score
 - \$38,590 hardware cost (no OS license or internal storage)
 - \$219,968 SQL Server 2012 Enterprise Edition license cost (32 core licenses)

Comparing Performance with TPC-E

- TPC-E OLTP benchmark available since 2007
 - http://tpc.org/tpce/results/tpce_perf_results.asp
 - Much more realistic than old TPC-C OLTP benchmark
 - Less dependency on I/O subsystem perf, requires fault-tolerance
 - Only SQL Server systems have been submitted so far
 - 61 official submissions as of May 2013
 - Benchmark is CPU-bound with adequate I/O capacity
 - Look at Executive Summary and Full Disclosure Report for details
 - TPC-E terminology translation
 - Processors = sockets
 - Cores = physical cores
 - Threads = logical cores

TPC-E Score Analysis (SQL Server 2012)

- Divide tpsE score by number of processors
 - Indicator of scalability
 - Intel Xeon E7-4870
 - $3218.46 \text{ tpsE} \div 4 \text{ processors} = 804.61/\text{processor}$
 - Intel Xeon E5-2690
 - $1881.76 \text{ tpsE} \div 2 \text{ processors} = 940.88/\text{processor}$
- Divide tpsE score by number of threads
 - Indicator of single-threaded performance
 - Intel Xeon E7-4870
 - $3218.46 \text{ tpsE} \div 80 \text{ threads} = 40.23/\text{thread}$
 - Intel Xeon E5-2690
 - $1881.76 \text{ tpsE} \div 32 \text{ threads} = 58.81/\text{thread}$

Geekbench CPU/Memory Benchmark

- **Geekbench is a CPU/memory benchmark**
 - Quick assessment of CPU/memory performance
 - No configuration required, takes a couple of minutes to run
- **Correlates reasonably well with TPC-E scores**
 - Can be used to “adjust” TPC-E score for slightly different CPU
- **Online database of Geekbench scores**
 - <http://browse.geekbench.ca/>
 - Search for similar system by server model number
 - Make sure to compare 32-bit scores to 32-bit scores!

SQL Server Memory

- **Maximize your physical RAM**
- **Larger buffer pool cache reduces physical reads from disk subsystem**
 - More data in the buffer pool (logical vs. physical reads)
- **RAM is faster and much less expensive than any disk subsystem**
 - Logical reads vs. physical reads
 - Orders of magnitude difference in latency
- **Can reduce the frequency of lazy writes and checkpoints**
 - Evens out the write workload to data files
- **Physical memory is very important for Hekaton (SQL Server 2014)**
 - 512GB RAM limit for Hekaton usage

DDR3 PC3-10600 ECC Memory Prices

▪ 32GB module	\$779.00	\$24/GB
▪ 16GB module	\$200.00	\$12/GB
▪ 8GB module	\$92.00	\$11/GB
▪ 4GB module	\$52.00	\$13/GB
▪ 2GB module	\$30.00	\$15/GB

□ Retail prices from Crucial.com (7/25/2013)

- **Current capacity/price sweet spot is 16GB modules!**

SQL Server I/O Planning

- **Poor I/O performance is one of the most common bottlenecks we see during our server health check consulting engagements**
- **Don't just plan for capacity requirements - sizing storage for SQL Server should be done in terms of I/O operations per second (IOPS), average transfer size, maximum latency expectations, and high availability/redundancy requirements**
 - Good performance using traditional rotating spindles generally means:
 - Using the fastest rotational speed possible (15K RPM disks)
 - Using smaller capacity drives in higher numbers
 - Overprovisioning physical capacity and only using a portion of the total storage
 - SSDs may meet performance requirements in a single drive, but won't have redundancy

Physical Layout Considerations

- **Degree of separation depends on I/O workload and I/O subsystem**
 - E.g. it may be fine to have several databases on one volume
 - E.g. SAN can do a better job of spreading I/O costs than a single drive
- **Consider separating:**
 - Log files from data files
 - Different databases on different volumes
 - SQL Server files separate from other uses (e.g. OS files)
- **Decide on file/filegroup layout**
 - tempdb
 - Multiple data files for increased performance?
 - Multiple filegroups for partitioned maintenance?
 - Multiple filegroups to allow partial database availability?
 - Usually don't put all logs on one LUN and all data on another LUN
- **WP: Physical Database Storage Design**
 - <http://www.microsoft.com/technet/prodtechnol/sql/2005/physdbstor.mspx>

Data Reading

- **Reads can be:**
 - Single/multiple pages from a data file
 - Single/multiple extents from a data file
 - Variable size chunks of FILESTREAM files
 - Usually random, except for large scans and backups
- **Misconception that SQL Server always reads extents**
 - But it will do sometimes to 'ramp up' the buffer pool
- **Reads can come from the buffer pool or backups**
- **Read performance can be dramatically affected by:**
 - Number of files and file placement
 - Incorrect I/O subsystem configuration
 - Buffer pool memory and memory pressure
 - Ability to perform efficient read-ahead on indexes

Data Writing

- **Data file writes can be:**
 - Single/multiple pages
 - Single/multiple extents (for bulk operations)
- **Data file pages are written when:**
 - A checkpoint occurs (for whatever reason)
 - The lazywriter forces a dirty page from the buffer pool
 - A bulk operation flush occurs (a.k.a 'eager writes')
 - A database mirror is processing log records
 - Dirty pages are continuously flushed out, leading to heavy I/O load
 - Does not happen for Availability Groups in 2012
- **Write performance can be dramatically affected by:**
 - Number of files and file placement
 - Incorrect I/O sub-system configuration

Transaction Log Writes

- **Writes are always sequential**
- **No performance gain from having multiple log files**
 - SQL Server ALWAYS perform sequential writes of log records
- **There are specific limits on transaction log I/Os**
- **Limit of outstanding I/Os (2005 SP1 onwards)**
 - 64-bit: 32 outstanding I/Os
 - 32-bit: 8 outstanding I/Os
- **Amount of outstanding I/O**
 - SQL Server 2008 onwards: limit of 3840KB at any given time
 - Prior to SQL Server 2008: limit of 480KB at any given time

Transaction Log Reads

- **The following can cause sequential transaction log reads:**
 - Backups
 - Transactional replication or Change Data Capture
 - Database Mirroring or Availability Groups
 - A checkpoint in the SIMPLE recovery mode
- **The following can cause random transaction log reads:**
 - Transaction rollbacks
 - Crash recovery
 - Creating a database snapshot
 - Running DBCC CHECKDB
 - Manually looking in the transaction log with fn_dblog

Latency Matters!

- **How long it takes an operation to finish measured in milliseconds**
- **Monitoring**
 - Physical Disk: Avg. Disk Sec/Read
 - Physical Disk: Avg. Disk Sec/Write
- **General SQL Server guidelines**
 - < 8ms: excellent
 - < 12ms: good
 - < 20ms: fair
 - > 20ms: poor
- **Reality is "It Depends"**
 - Should be SLA-based to meet business requirements
 - Log writes should be as fast as possible (i.e. minimal latency)

Traditional HDD

Access Time


- The response time or amount of time it takes for the drive to begin to transfer data
- **Response time = seek time + rotational latency**
 - Seek time: the time it takes the read/write head to move from the current track to another track on the hard drive.
 - Rotational latency: the time it takes to rotate the disk platter to the correct position for access by the read/write head

HDD Spindle [RPM]	Average rotational latency [ms]
7,200	4.17
10,000	3.00
15,000	2.00

Traditional HDD

Data Density

- Outer tracks have a higher data density than inner tracks due to the distance traveled per rotation
 - ~4 sectors vs. 3 sectors vs. 2 sectors
- Short stroking disks can increase the number of IOPS and decrease seek time by shortening the distance the read/write head must travel to change locations on the platter
 - Trade off better performance for lower storage usage on disk
 - 1TB 7200 RPM disk short stroked 300GB will have a faster seek latency than a 300GB 15000 RPM disk at full stroke



SSDs

Access Time

- SSD access time does not depend on mechanical moving parts, but electrical connections to solid state memory, so the access time is very fast and consistent across cells
- General average seek time ranges between 0.08ms and 0.16ms

SSDs (2)

- PCI Express cards allow for higher throughput by bypassing traditional SCSI interface limitations
 - Requires multiple cards and Windows software RAID 1 for redundancy
- Excellent for random I/O, but also good anywhere there is an I/O bottleneck
- Enterprise ready
 - We have many enterprise clients running on them
- Don't just put tempdb or transaction logs on them!
- Don't ignore index fragmentation when using them!

PCI-E Numbers to Know

- **PCI-E 1.0 Bus (one-way)**
 - x4 slot: 750MB/sec
 - x8 slot: 1.5GB/sec
 - x16 slot: 3.0GB/sec
- **PCI-E 2.0 Bus (one-way)**
 - x4 slot: 1.5-1.8GB/sec
 - x8 slot: 3.0-3.6GB/sec
- **PCI-E 3.0 Bus (one-way)**
 - x4 slot: 3.0-3.6GB/sec
 - x8 slot: 6.0-7.0GB/sec
- **So far, only Intel Xeon E5 family has PCI-E 3.0 support**

RAID


Redundant Array of Independent/Inexpensive Disks

- Combines multiple disk drive components into a single logical unit, distributing data across the disks for redundancy and improved performance
- Configurations or levels are named by the word RAID and a numeric value specific to the configuration for standardization

RAID Levels: RAID 0

Striping


- **Usage scenarios:**
 - Data you don't care about
 - Performance matters more than data loss risk
- **Pros:**
 - Fast read and write performance
- **Cons:**
 - Total loss of data from single disk failure



RAID Levels: RAID 1

Mirroring


- **Usage scenarios:**
 - Important data that requires redundancy to protect from disk failures
- **Pros:**
 - Mirrored storage protects from single disk loss
- **Cons:**
 - Only provides half the storage
 - Write performance equal to one disk



RAID Levels: RAID 5

Striping with Parity

- **Usage scenarios:**
 - Where reads exceed writes, data files
- **Pros:**
 - Maximize available capacity from minimal number of disks with redundancy
- **Cons:**
 - Protection from single disk failure only as loss of two disks results in total data loss
 - Write penalty for parity calculation
 - Significant performance impact occurs when degraded



Nested RAID Levels

- Implement one level of RAID on top of another level of RAID
- Can be used to create better redundancy as well as higher levels of performance
- Common nested RAID levels are
 - 10 or 1+0: striping over mirrored pairs
 - 01 or 0+1: mirroring over striping
 - 50 or 5+0: striping over single-parity striping
 - 60 or 6+0: striping of double-parity striping
 - 100 or 10+0 or 1+0+0: striping over a striped set of mirrored pairs

Nested RAID Levels: RAID 10 or 1+0


Striping Over Mirrored Pairs

- **Usage scenarios:**
 - Transaction log files, heavy write data files
 - Redundancy is more important than cost
- **Pros:**
 - Fast read and write performance
 - Supports multiple disk failures as long as two of the failed disks aren't in the same RAID 1 pair
- **Cons:**
 - Doubles the cost of storage

Nested RAID Levels: RAID 10 or 1+0

Striping Over Mirrored Pairs


- Single disk loss keeps array available
- Multiple disk losses in different RAID 1 keeps array available
- Double disk loss in same RAID 1 results in array failure



Nested RAID Levels: RAID 01 or 0+1

Striping Over Mirrored Pairs

- IS NOT THE SAME AS RAID 10/1+0
- Single disk loss keeps array available
- Double disk loss in different RAID 0 results in array failure



Other RAID Configurations

- RAID 6
 - Similar to RAID 5 but provides double parity disks allowing for up to two disks to fail and the array remains available
 - Common recommendation for some SAN vendors
- RAID 50, RAID 100, etc
 - Specialized RAID configurations that stripe other RAID levels to increase performance

Using SAN Storage

- **Storage Area Networks (SANs) virtualize and consolidate storage in the data center**
 - Network multiple storage devices together to provide block level access to servers, which share the underlying configuration
- **There are many SAN vendors and models on the market, each with different configuration options and limitations**
 - Hybrid arrays may mix HDDs and SDDs together into storage pools for tiered performance optimizations internally
 - Storage pools may only allow RAID 5/6 and prevent isolating workloads
- **Front access ports connect servers to the storage**
 - Port speed matters – 1Gb/sec iSCSI is usually a bottleneck for SQL Server
 - Ports are shared across all connected servers and must be monitored for total workload throughput across the enterprise, not just SQL Server in shared configurations

SAN Advantages

- **Shared storage**
 - Increases disk utilization
 - Reduces management by making it easier to create new volumes and dynamically allocate storage
 - Create diskless servers that boot from SAN only
- **Advanced features**
 - Mirroring, snapshots, continuous data protection, clustering and geo-clustering only offered by SANs
- **Performance**
 - Almost unlimited number of spindles, controllers, and cache can be put together to meet the requirements depending on the SAN model and vendor

SAN Disadvantages

- **Unpredictable performance**
 - When you share your disks, controllers, and fiber switches between a dozen of servers is very difficult to have predictable performance
- **Higher latency**
 - Distance the I/Os have to travel; added layers of switches, cabling and ports
 - PCI Bus → HBA → FC switches → FC ports → array processors → disks
- **Limited bandwidth**
 - FC 16Gb/s max,
 - iSCSI 10Gb/s max
 - Note: 1 Gb/s = 128 MB/s
- **Cost**

Virtualization Considerations

- **Changes in hypervisor limitations in recent years have changed the landscape for virtualizing SQL Server**
- **Limitations on vCPUs expanded**
 - 64 vCPUs on Hyper-V 2012 and ESX 5.1
- **Memory limitations expanded**
 - 1TB on Hyper-V 2012 and ESX 5.1
- **Introduce the ability to pass vNUMA configuration through to VM hardware configuration**
 - Affects SQLOS configuration for memory nodes, lazy writers, and connection distribution for higher scalability
- **Hyper-V 2012 Virtual Fiber Channel allows N_Port ID Virtualization (NPIV) to share a single physical interface with multiple virtual HBAs for direct SAN access inside a VM**

Virtualization Hardware Considerations

- **The underlying hardware still matters when virtualizing SQL Server**
 - Common VM host configurations are 4 socket systems that are planned around higher core counts and not single threaded performance
 - AMD Magny-Cours, Bulldozer, and Piledriver processors are commonly selected
 - Higher core counts allow for higher consolidation densities for VMs on a single host
 - Common for older hardware platforms to be used longer as VM hosts
- **Getting the best performance from SQL Server virtualized may require dedicated hardware for SQL VMs**
 - Higher vCPU count reduces the consolidation density due to co-scheduling
 - Mixing wide-VMs with smaller ones is generally problematic
 - Overcommitting resources should generally be avoided for SQL Server workloads

SQL VM CPU Allocation Considerations


- **How many virtual cores do we actually need?**
 - Consider co-scheduling issues under the hypervisor?
- **How many idle cores are available on the host VM?**
 - Co-scheduling on idle cores will be at full speed until another VM begins to execute and begins to take slices on the CPUs making those SQL threads slower to execute
- **How fast is each physical CPU core?**
- **Is hyper-threading being used on the physical server?**
- **How much of each physical core does the VM get % wise for execution?**
- **Did the last execution run on the same physical cores?**

Virtual NUMA (vNUMA) Configuration

- Prior to ESX 5, if the number of vCPUs exceeded the physical cores in a single NUMA node, the VM would not be NUMA optimized by the hypervisor
- vNUMA in ESX 5+ and Windows Server 2012 Hyper-V allows larger VMs to be partitioned into virtual NUMA nodes to allow NUMA optimization of the VM in the hypervisor
- ESX 5+ only enables vNUMA when a VM has more than 8vCPUs or when the VM is wider than the number of cores in a physical node
 - Can be enabled manually by adding the *numa.vcpu.min* configuration parameter to VM configuration:
 - VM Settings->Options tab->Advanced General->Configuration Parameters
- vNUMA configuration in Windows Server 2012 Hyper-V is accomplished on the NUMA page for the VM settings

vNUMA Optimized Configuration

- By configuring vNUMA for the wide VM, the vCPUs and memory allocations can be localized to the physical node configuration providing NUMA locality for scheduling and memory management to the VM
- For SQL Server this also creates a separate LazyWriter thread for buffer pool management under SQLOS



Review

- Don't reuse old hardware for a new database server
- Consider your workload type as you select hardware
- Size your hardware to minimize SQL Server 2012 license costs
- Choose the most appropriate Intel processors
- Get as much RAM as possible
- Don't neglect the I/O subsystem
- Plan virtualization based on SQL Server requirements

Hardware References

- Geekbench
 - <http://bit.ly/UGrGbu>
- TPC-E OLTP Benchmark
 - <http://bit.ly/UGs2Pm>
- CPU-Z Tool
 - <http://bit.ly/korH23>
- Intel Ark Database
 - <http://ark.intel.com/>
- AnandTech IT
 - <http://bit.ly/UGwiyg>
- StorageReview
 - <http://bit.ly/kOHUL7>

Questions?

