

Sage 300 Performance Measurements

How do you diagnose Sage 300 performance problems on a network when there are a large number of software and hardware interactions going on every second? Answer: It may be necessary to spend more time understanding the network and less time trying to find a quick fix.

Characterize the performance problem. Are some users always "fast" and some users always "slow"? Is the performance "fast" at 7am when 3 users are active and "slow" at 2pm when 30 users are active? Is the performance "adequate" most of the time, but suddenly "falls off a cliff" for no apparent reason and stays that way until computers are re-booted?

Take baseline measurements appropriate to the characterization. Why? Suppose launching O/E Orders is reported "to sometimes take 30 seconds". If the goal is to launch in 3-4 seconds, the difference between 25 and 30 and 35 seconds may be significant when all bottlenecks have been found (see our previous memo, Sage 300 Performance Explained).

How many measurements are needed to get a baseline? Let's avoid mathematical statistics (confidence interval, confidence level, sample size, population size). In the end this boils down to "more is better". If you are measuring O/E launches, then 10 measurements per day per situation is a good start. Here "situation" depends on your characterization (e.g. when fast, when slow).

In a one-user-is-slow scenario, measure the network throughput. Yes, the bandwidth is 1Gbps. That is the theoretical limit to throughput on a 1Gb network. But what is the actual throughput between client and server? You might expect numbers between 200Mbps and 600Mbps on a 1Gb network, depending on load. There is a free tool called jperf that will measure throughput. This tool is simple to use and does <u>not</u> modify your registry or path settings. An internet search will provide how-to-use details.

There can never be an exhaustive "Sage 300 Performance Checklist". Hardware and software are always changing. However, a list of "Sage 300 Performance Bottlenecks We Have Seen" would be useful ... and that's the topic of another memo.