

Re: Design question

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.networks/2006-01/msg00215>

- *From:* Droopy <droopytoonospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 20 Jan 2006 15:21:27 GMT
-

"Vadym Stetsyak" <vadym_s@xxxxxxx> wrote in
news:ei4lpCSHGHA.3116@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

- > IMO the good approach is to introduce server, in which clients will
- > "register" or connect.
- > Server will have the list of connections (machines table).
- >
- > Then you send data to the server, and server routes it to the clients
- > that are present in the connection list.
- >
- > If you want design a failover mechanism then 1 server will be not
- > enough.
- >

This is the way I want to do it.

But the "consumers" of my application don't like the server approach for 2 reasons :

- 1) if only 1 server = single point of failure
- 2) performance is lower (because message is not sent directly)

Thanks a lot for your answer.

.

• **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Design question**
◇ *From:* Vadym Stetsyak

• **References:**

- ◆ **Design question**
◇ *From:* Droopy
- ◆ **Re: Design question**
◇ *From:* Vadym Stetsyak

- Prev by Date: **Re: Design question**
- Next by Date: **Re: Design question**

Re: Design question

- Previous by thread: ***Re: Design question***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Design question***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***