

Re: Response.Flush: Differences between IIS 6.0 and 5.0?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Internet-Server/microsoft.public.inetserver.iis/2004-09/1723.html>

From: Bernard (*qbernard_at_hotmail.com.discuss*)

Date: 09/20/04

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 23:54:18 +0800

In your previous posting, since IIS 6.0 is now on top of http.sys, smaller buffer and so on, each flush cause the packet to send...

won't this a nice things to have ? I mean much faster instead of sending a big buffer one shot ?

.flush() combine with .buffer = true , not a good deal ?

also you mentioned before about a hot fix in sp1.
what was it intent to change ?

--

Regards,

Bernard Cheah

<http://www.tryiis.com/>

<http://support.microsoft.com/>

<http://www.msmvps.com/bernard/>

"David Wang [Msft]" <someone@online.microsoft.com> wrote in message
news:u4w0lZwnEHA.608@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...

> I can check on the behavior with the ASP/HTTP.SYS team.

>

> I actually think that IIS6 does not violate your following statement:

> "In other words, I do not expect my ASP script to continue running until the

> entire response buffer has been sent to the client."

>

> ASP did send the entire response buffer to the client prior to continuing

> running. You are expecting ASP to wait until the client has ACK'd the

> receipt of the response -- something quite impractical for a network

> application. The important thing is that ASP maintains the integrity of the

> network packet order -- but you can never make any assumptions about

> networking timing.

>

>

> The networking stack used by IIS6 (HTTP.SYS) is radically different than

> IIS5 (Winsock), so differences are likely and may not be reconciled

> depending on how serious they are.

>

> --

> //David

microsoft.public.inetserver.iis: Re: Response.Flush: Differences between IIS 6.0 and 5.0?

```
> IIS
> This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no
rights.
> //
> "Anthony Marchesini" <Arm07470@newsgroup.nospam> wrote in message
> news:%2335huslmmEHA.3464@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...
> It has always been my expectation and observation that Response.Flush is a
> synchronous operation. In other words, I do not expect my ASP script to
> continue running until the entire response buffer has been sent to the
> client.
>
> It appears that this is no longer the case under IIS 6.0. Here's an ASP
> page that I created to document this unexpected (and, for my application,
> undesirable) behavior:
>
> <%
> With Response
> 'Buffer 1 MB of HTML output
> .Buffer = True
> .Write "<html><body><!--" & String(1048559, "-") & ">"
>
> 'See how long it takes to Flush to the browser
> StartTime = Timer()
> .Flush
> StopTime = Timer()
>
> 'Output result
> .Write "Flush took "
> .Write FormatNumber(StopTime - StartTime, 3, -1)
> .Write " seconds to send 1 MB to the browser.</body></html>"
> .End
> End With
> %>
>
> Browsing to this ASP page hosted on an IIS 5.0 server yield the following
> output in the browser:
>
>     Flush took 5.938 seconds to send 1 MB to the browser.
>
> With the following response headers:
>
>     HTTP/1.1 200 OK
>     Server: Microsoft-IIS/5.0
>     Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 16:29:27 GMT
>     X-Powered-By: ASP.NET
>     Connection: close
>     Content-Type: text/html
>     Cache-control: private
>
> Hosted on an IIS 6.0 server, I get this output in the browser:
>
>     Flush took 0.016 seconds to send 1 MB to the browser.
>
> With the following response headers:
>
>     HTTP/1.1 200 OK
>     Connection: close
>     Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 16:31:22 GMT
>     Server: Microsoft-IIS/6.0
>     MicrosoftOfficeWebServer: 5.0_Pub
>     X-Powered-By: ASP.NET
>     Content-Type: text/html
```

microsoft.public.inetserver.iis: Re: Response.Flush: Differences between IIS 6.0 and 5.0?

> Cache-control: private
>
> The headers don't seem to reveal anything interesting. I have included
them
> just to prove that there's no transfer encoding or compression going on
that
> would explain the different results from the two servers.
>
> The interesting result is that Flush took almost no time to execute on IIS
> 6.0 and it took nearly 6 seconds on IIS 5.0. The 6 second result is
> expected if Flush is a synchronous operation since that's about how long
it
> took to receive the page in my browser from both of the servers. The only
> explanation for the 0 second result on the 6.0 server is that
Response.Flush
> is behaving asynchronously on that server.
>
> While I'm sure that asynchronous flushes would be desirable for many
> applications, it is highly undesirable for mine. I won't make this post
any
> longer explaining why (unless someone really wants to know), just trust
that
> I have a good reason.
>
> All of this boils down to two questions:
>
> 1) Is this change in behavior documented and expected?
> 2) Is there a way to get the old behavior back?
>
> - Anthony Marchesini
>
>
>