

Re: Unix runs faster, maybe (was: Re: Educating potential VMS users)

Re: Unix runs faster, maybe (was: Re: Educating potential VMS users)

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2006-06/msg00368.html>

- *From:* Bill Todd <billtodd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 07 Jun 2006 00:46:26 -0400
-

BobH wrote:

Bill Todd wrote:

Main, Kerry wrote:

...

The environments I am talking about in the majority of Windows/UNIX servers today are not CPU lite, but disk IO heavy. They are just not utilized that much at all in peak periods – period.

That's what I just suggested, Kerry: they're limited by disk I/O, not CPU, and hence CPU utilization **will** be low, even if the disks are working their little tails off.

And any file system optimizations that will reduce the load on the disks (as Unix's do far better by default than VMS does) **will** be useful.

Part of this might be attributed to the one–app, one server philosophy as repeated refreshes makes for a much faster server at lower costs, but if the workload does not increase that much, then the overall utilization goes down. Multiply this by hundreds of x86 servers in many environments and you have one of the basic reasons why CIO's are so concerned about their Windows environments.

Re: Unix runs faster, maybe (was: Re: Educating potential VMS users)

Yadda, yadda, yadda: so what? This has nothing to do with the subject at hand, as I already observed.

...

And btw, a server with low cpu utilization, but heavy IO makes for a poor candidate for virtualization.

But since you seem to insist on this digression: horseshit. A server with very low CPU utilization is a **good** candidate for virtualization, since it's got lots of horsepower left over for other tasks that (especially in Windows environments) admins might be reluctant to run on the same OS instance: just hook up some more disks to service the added application(s) and let 'er rip.

Remember that virtualization adds

another level of overhead for both IO and CPU loads.

As