

2007

Virtualization at Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County

SELECTING THE RIGHT SOLUTION



VIRTUALIZATION AT CATHOLIC CHARITIES
OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY
SELECTING THE RIGHT SOLUTION

Prepared by TUNG MAI

Committee Members

Professor John Biros, Advisor

Dr. Venkat Gudivada

Professor J. Joseph Fuller

November 15, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Many organizations are still struggling with the legacy of the IT boom in the 1990s, which left behind a lot of high costs, low response times, and inconsistent mixed infrastructure. Additionally, “the migration of application architectures to thin-client multi-tier architectures, the introduction of several generations of Microsoft Windows servers and the rapid growth of Linux has led to excessive growth in server counts, network complexity and storage structure throughout geographically distributed organizations” (Newman, Wiberg, & Braswell, 2005).

Virtualization has been becoming more and more popular among IT organizations as it provides IT solutions to reduce the infrastructure costs through the more efficient use of resources, to respond faster and to increase the consistency and predictability of operations.

Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County (formerly known as Catholic Charities of San Jose (CCSJ – <http://www.ccsj.org>), California is a non-profit organization which has been in operation for more than 50 years, serving families and individuals in need in Silicon Valley and Santa Clara County. Catholic Charities offers more than 45 services in many areas including Behavioral Health, Economic Development, Older Adults, Educational Services, and Youth and Family Services. Because of its variety of services, Catholic Charities has more than 20 offices spreading in more than 10 different locations in Santa Clara County. Being a non-profit organization, Catholic Charities does not have a big budget for IT and it has grants, donations from several companies. As a result the IT environment is a mixed and inconsistent environment of Novell, Linux and Microsoft systems running on new and legacy hardware. The IT Department is facing many difficulties supporting users from different locations because they have different computers with different configurations and different applications deployed for different programs. Besides, many servers are setup for dedicated programs and some of the programs have only a few users. The fact that servers (mainly Dell servers) are not fully deployed to their capacity is a waste to the organization and increases total cost of ownership (TCO). This paper is looking at the possibilities of moving Catholic Charities’ IT infrastructure to the right virtualization solution to improve IT efficiency and reduce TCO so that IT can support the organization better in achieving its goals with its limited resources.

TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF CONTENT	i
TABLE OF FIGURES	iv
TABLE OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CATHOLIC CHARITIES OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY AT-A-GLANCE	2
MISSION	2
TECHNOLOGY VISION	3
DIVISIONS AND SERVICE AREAS	3
LEADERSHIP	5
SERVICE SITES	6
REVENUE	7
EMPLOYEES	7
CURRENT SYSTEM OVERVIEW	8
INFRASTRUCTURE	8
IT STAFF/SUPPORT	11
PROJECTS	11
FUNDING	13
CHAPTER 2: ISSUES	14
CURRENT SYSTEM ISSUES	15
I. Mixed Computing Environment	15
II. Distributed Data Management	16
III. Under-capacity Server Deployment	17
IV. Business Continuity	19
V. System Security	19
VI. High Total Costs of Ownership	22
CHAPTER 3: WHY VIRTUALIZATION?	23

WHY VIRTUALIZATION?	24
I. Decrease Hardware Costs	24
II. Increase Servers Utilization	24
III. Reduce Server Provisioning Time	24
IV. Remote Management Capability	25
V. Increase Flexibility, Scalability and High Availability	25
VI. Increase Productivity and More Control over Configuration Change Management	25
VII. Tight Application Security	26
SERVER VIRTUALIZATION OVERVIEW	27
STORAGE VIRTUALIZATION OVERVIEW	32
SERVER VIRTUALIZATION PRODUCTS OVERVIEW	36
CHAPTER 4: SELECTION PROCESS	39
SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESS	40
I. Performance	40
II. Capability	40
III. Manageability	41
IV. Stability	42
V. Support.....	42
VI. Software License	42
VII. Security	43
VIII. Selection Process	43
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	51
CHALLENGES	52
RECOMMENDATIONS	54
CONCLUSION.....	57
REFERENCES	59
APPENDICES	67
Appendix A – Products Data Used for Selection Process	67
Appendix B – Other Virtualization Technologies List (Williams, 2007)	71
Appendix C – List of Guest OS Supported.....	77

Appendix D – Hardware Compatibility Lists	83
GLOSSARY.....	94

TABLE OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1: Headquarter Network</i>	9
<i>Figure 2: Remote Sites</i>	10
<i>Figure 3: Current Systems</i>	16
<i>Figure 4: System Idle Process</i>	18
<i>Figure 5: Simple Firewall Topology</i>	20
<i>Figure 6: DMZ Topology</i>	20
<i>Figure 7: Multi-DMZ Topology</i>	21
<i>Figure 8: A virtualized environment enables flexible, efficient and scalable utilization of resources (Source: Novell, Inc.)</i>	26
<i>Figure 9: Privilege Rings of the x86 Architecture (Williams, 2007)</i>	29
<i>Figure 10: Where the VMMs Reside</i>	30
<i>Figure 11: Virtual Storage in Server virtualization</i>	33

TABLE OF TABLES

<i>Table 1: TCO Cost Category (VMWare, Inc., February 16, 2006)</i>	22
<i>Table 2: Forms of Server Virtualization (Williams, 2007)</i>	31
<i>Table 3: Storage Virtualization Technologies</i>	35
<i>Table 4: Virtualization Products that support MS Windows OSs as Guest OSs</i>	38
<i>Table 5: Capability Evaluation Matrix</i>	44
<i>Table 6: Performance Evaluation Matrix</i>	45
<i>Table 7: Stability Evalutaion Matrix</i>	46
<i>Table 8: Manageability Evaluation Matrix</i>	46
<i>Table 9: Support Evaluation Matrix</i>	47
<i>Table 10: Costs/Licensing Evaluation Matrix</i>	48
<i>Table 11: Security Evaluation Matrix</i>	48
<i>Table 12: Product Selection Matrix</i>	49