

Re: Results of Altering Trigger NOT FOR REPLICATION

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.replication/2004-10/0031.html>

From: michelle (*michelle_at_nospam.com*)

Date: 09/30/04

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 15:06:14 -0500

Thanks. That's pretty much what MS said. We already had articles for the audit tables and they are therefore being kept in synch that way. We have altered the triggers so that they are NOT FOR REPLICATION.

"Paul Ibison" <Paul.Ibison@Pygmalion.Com> wrote in message news:OE933NypEHA.3396@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...

- > *Michelle,*
- > *altering your triggers and setting them to NOT FOR REPLICATION will mean*
- > *that they won't fire when the data change originates from the*
- > *synchronization process. However sometimes you want the data to be*
- > *consistent between 2 tables eg perhaps you have TableA which has an audit*
- > *trigger to update TableB. In this case the standard way round this is to*
- > *set*
- > *the trigger to NFR and replicate both tables. If there is a PK-FK*
- > *relationship at work, you might need to set the FKs to NFR also, because*
- > *the*
- > *parent might be processed after the child record.*
- > *HTH,*
- > *Paul Ibison*
- >
- > *(recommended sql server 2000 replication book:*
- > *<http://www.nwsu.com/0974973602p.html>)*
- >
- >