

## Re: Design question

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.networks/2006-01/msg00267>

---

- *From:* Droopy <[droopytoonospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:droopytoonospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 24 Jan 2006 11:07:53 GMT
- 

"Vadym Stetsyak" <[vadym\\_s@xxxxxxx](mailto:vadym_s@xxxxxxx)> wrote in  
[news:eOlrOTDIGHA.2012@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:eOlrOTDIGHA.2012@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):

>> In fact, the start phase is not that difficult to handle.  
>> The problem is that, for now, when a connection between 2 hosts is  
>> broken, a message is sent (via TCP connection) to every other hosts  
>> connections to keep each hosts table uptodate and an automatic re-  
>> connection between these 2 hosts is tried triggered by a timer.  
>  
> doesn't this introduce inefficiency? You'll get implementation  
> complexity, synchronization lag,  
> and ineffiecient network usage ( additional network traffic for table  
> sync ) for now you have 60 connections on each host, connection is  
> broken between 2 of them.  
> You have 60 machine tables, which can become desynchronized for  
> considerable timeout.  
>  
> With server-based approach you will have 1 ( several ) machine tables,  
> which will be synchronized.  
> Consider also traffic through the network, when machines need to  
> synchronize machine table.  
>  
> For failover you can introduce 2 or more servers: primary and  
> secondary. Hosts will know about the second one, but will work with  
> the 1-st. If primary server is down, they will automatically reconnect  
> to the secod one. Primary and secondary servers will have synchronized  
> machine table.  
>

I agree with you but it is not my design :-(  
But now, I am asked to improve/simplify, that's why I am looking for a  
better and more simple way to implement this.  
I like your "server" approach.  
The only thing I have a problem with is the "indirection" imposed by the  
server when sending a message.  
We send a lot of little messages.

I appreciate your help.

- **References:**

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

- Prev by Date: **Re: Is this allowed?**
- Next by Date: **Re: UDP's sendto() from two IP Addresses to IP Address from small LAN**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Design question**
- Next by thread: **Re: Design question**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**