

Thursday, August 27, 2009

Oracle and SPARC

Looks like Oracle starts to put some weight behind SPARC with a teaser for an announcement taking place on October the 14th at the Oracle World - Performance - Sun plus Oracle is faster.:Oracle and Sun together are hard to match. Just ask IBM. Its fastest server now runs an impressive 6 million TPC-C transactions, but on October 14 at Oracle OpenWorld, we'll reveal the benchmark numbers that prove that even IBM DB2 running on IBM's fastest hardware can't match the speed and performance of Oracle Database on Sun systems. Check back on October 14 as we demonstrate Oracle's commitment to Sun hardware and Sun SPARC.

Posted by Joerg Moellenkamp in English, Oracle, The IT Business at 18:51

about time!

Anonymous on Aug 27 2009, 19:38

So Sun is going to do a TPC-C on SPARC. Wow.

Anonymous on Aug 27 2009, 23:15

Hmm US, SPARC64 or T1? I guess the later?

Anonymous on Aug 28 2009, 02:23

Should be the T2+ CMT Chip

Anonymous on Aug 28 2009, 06:29

How about Rock >:->

Anonymous on Aug 28 2009, 11:54

Rock is dead . Maybe we should ask Marc Tremblay the reason why he lefted Sun and moved to Microsoft. What ? Microsoft ???

Anonymous on Aug 28 2009, 17:10

<http://www.heise.de/newsticker/Sun-in-den-roten-Zahlen--/meldung/144494>

Seems more like 'dead by dawn' if HP buys Sun hardware.

Anonymous on Aug 29 2009, 11:24

Hmm, why should Orace put an ad on Page One WSJ, if they want to sell ...

Anonymous on Aug 29 2009, 18:42

I'd like to see a better benchmark comparison. Oracle RDBMS 11g runs on AIX, so why not pit SUN vs IBM hardware?

Also, how much more \$\$ is the Oracle licensing on the SUN system compared to the IBM system?

Anonymous on Aug 31 2009, 23:17

FYI, SUN doesn't currently make the list...

http://www.tpc.org/tpcc/results/tpcc_perf_results.asp

Anonymous on Aug 31 2009, 23:22

Yes, because Sun doesn't publish TPC-C results, because of the inherent shortfalls of TPC-C. But many customers, Oracle and at foremost IBM like TPC-C. As a vastly more intelligent person said "TPC-C is a function over the number of harddisks".

I can just assume, that this decision to publish a TPC-C benchmark was made by Oracle.

Anonymous on Sep 1 2009, 08:32

Because nobody does that ... you could say the same to IBM: Why did they published no results for DB2 on Sun hardware?

The nature of TPC-C is to provide an optimized configuration for the task of TPC-C. Due to the nature of TPC-C the impacts doesn't stop at the database. The storage has to be equal, too and so on. This ends up in configurations with 3600 hard disk for example with the IBM configuration.

To say it short: TPC-C isn't a benchmark of a system. It's a benchmark of an architecture to solve the job defined in the benchmarks.

Blog Export: c0t0d0s0.org, <http://www.c0t0d0s0.org/>

At the end i consider TPC-C inferior to benchmarks like SAP-SD, which has a vastly better model to simulate workload. But, and that's the kicker, customer like it (i still see RfP with TPC-C to define systems) and other companies still use it. So I appreciate this benchmark for exactly one thing: To show that we didn't published TPC-C, because we were slow. After such a benchmark we can say: Look, we have the best result, and now we talk to why this doesn't matter for your workload.

Anonymous on Sep 1 2009, 08:43