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Company Profile

- Greenberg Traurig

- International Law Firm – 29 offices in US, Europe, Asia
- 100+ Practice areas: Appellate, Aviation, Corporate, Entertainment, Environmental, Governmental, Healthcare, Intellectual Property, Labor, Litigation, Real Estate, Securities, Tax, T&E, etc.
- 1500+ attorneys, 3500+ employees
- Ranked No. 1 in the U.S. for 5-year growth leaders in The National Law Journal Millennium NLJ 250 annual survey of the nation's 250 largest law firms
- Ranked No. 7 on The American Lawyer's 2006 Am Law 100 listing of the largest law firms in the U.S., based on number of lawyers
DR Challenges

- Design constraints
  - Highly distributed environment
    - Many remote offices
    - Each office designed to operate independently
  - Two data centers
  - Wide variety of WAN links
    - T1’s to 100Mb
  - Mixture of transactional and non-transactional data
    - MS SQL
    - MS Exchange
    - Windows based file servers
    - Domain controllers
    - Other miscellaneous servers
Previous DR Environment

- Software (host-based) replication + VMware ESX

Issues:

- Required loading software into each guest OS
  - Consumed guest resources
  - Potential conflicts with other software
    - Backup agents, anti-virus, and other modules
- Could not easily replicate entire guest as a bootable image
- Excessive re-mirror events
  - Certain conditions required replicated data to be re-synced
- Fail-over / Fail-back required extensive tinkering with replicated guest
  - Machine names, DNS registrations, IP addresses and more
- Fail-over requires “standby” host (physical or virtual)
- Limitations of source-target configurations
  - One-to-one vs. many-to-one
Design Goals

- Quick fail-over / fail-back
- Transparent fail-over / fail-back
  - No changes required to replicated servers
  - No changes required to client devices
- Replicate each server as a bootable unit
  - Fast “cold migrate” functionality
- Storage-level replication
  - No OS involvement
- Leverage capabilities provided by VMware
  - Data encapsulation
  - Hardware abstraction
- Transactionally consistent data (vs. crash-consistent)
  - Especially important for MS Exchange and MS SQL
Implementation

- Platform Components:
  - VMware ESX 2.5.x / VC 1.x
  - Storage, virtualization, management and replication
    - IPStor 5.x from FalconStor
    - SCSI or FC (SAN) shared storage array
- Networking
  - Layer 3 routing switches at each network core
- Scripting and integration
  - Tcl/Tk and Expect for scripting and integration
- Remote access
  - Citrix Presentation Server 4
  - MS Outlook Web Access
Implementation

- VMware ESX 2.x / VC 1.x
- Each remote office has full complement of servers required to work independently
  - DC, SQL, Exchange, file server, print server, document management, web proxy, SMS and other miscellaneous servers
  - Typical deployment is around 10 – 12 virtual servers per site
  - 2 – 5 physical ESX hosts per site
- Not all servers required for DR
  - Only SQL, Exchange, file server and DMS related are critical
Implementation

- Storage
- Fiber Channel SAN or SCSI-based shared storage
- FalconStor IPStor
  - Storage presentation
  - Storage virtualization
  - Snapshots / Mirroring
  - Replication
- Replication
- CDP vs. Snapshots
- RPO vs. Transactional consistency
Implementation

- Storage Virtualization
  - Provide consistent storage presentation and management regardless of underlying storage type
    - SCSI, SATA, SAN, etc.
- Easily migrate between physical storage systems
- Add functionality to existing storage
  - Snapshots / Cloning
  - Replication / Mirroring
    - Synchronous
    - Asynchronous
    - Continuous
    - Periodic
**Implementation**

- **RDM vs. VMFS**
  - RDMs are more difficult to manage, but….
    - Much more practical in SAN environment where snapshots are used

- **VMFS**
  - Snaps on VMFS track I/O for all VMDKs, not just the one desired for the snap
  - Snaps can only be presented back to ESX hosts

- **RDM**
  - Snaps of RDMs only track I/O for one specific LUN/volume/drive
  - Snap can be presented to ESX or to a physical host

- **ESX needs better RDM management**
  - Need method to globally ID, track and manage an RDM independent of ESX host it was created on
Networking
Layer 4 Routing switch at network core
Each office subnetted into multiple subnets / VLANs
All servers on single, dedicated subnet / VLAN
Dynamic routing protocol (RIP v2)
VLAN / subnet transportable throughout network

Example:
- 10.1.1.x – Servers
- 10.1.2.x – Printers
- 10.1.3.x – User 1
- 10.1.4.x – User 2
- ......
Implementation

Scripting and Integration

- Used to facilitate talking to a number of dissimilar systems
  - ESX server
  - IPStor
  - Routing switches
- Tk/Tk with Expect
  - Easiest method to automate CLI interfaces
Implementation

- System Access after fail-over
- LAN/WAN access
  - No changes needed to existing systems
  - All failed-over servers have same names and IP addresses
  - Only change was network route

- Remote Access
  - Citrix Secure Gateway
  - Citrix Presentation Server 4
  - MS Outlook web access
  - Limited VPN access
Implementation

Failover process
- Shutdown source VMs
- Shutdown source ESX servers
- Flush any pending replication data
- Shutdown source router VLAN interface

(Planned)

(Planned or Unplanned)

- Activate target router VLAN interface
- Present replicated data to fail-over ESX hosts
- Perform any VM guest setting adjustments needed
  - RDM presentation, VMX tweaks, etc…
- Boot DR VM guest OS
Implementation Issues

- Replication
  - Know your data change rates
  - Identify and separate critical vs. non-critical data
  - WAN capacity
  - WAN latency
  - Data compressibility

- Storage capacity and I/O bandwidth
  - Space for snapshots and replicated data
  - Snapshots and/or CDP require extra I/O bandwidth
  - In fail-over mode, extra storage capacity needed (potentially) for efficient fail-back
  - Use RDM’s to isolate snapshot I/O
Implementation Issues

Effect of Latency on Bandwidth

Bandwidth (Mb/s) vs. Latency (ms) for different window sizes:

- 32K Window
- 64K Window
- 256K Window

VMWORLD 2006
Conclusions

- Storage virtualization together with VMware greatly facilitates DR replication and fail-over
- Storage level replication solves many replication issues
  - No resource utilization on replicated server
  - Replication not affected by server OS issues
  - Except (nothing is perfect!)
    - Disk defragmentation
    - Easy file/folder exclusion
- Entire subnet fail-over eliminates need to change server and client device settings
  - Single server can be failed-over with a little more effort
Conclusions

- Uses:
  - DR
  - Remote office maintenance
  - Upgrades
  - Office moves
  - Testing
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