Subject: Re: Skylark timer jobs...
Posted by mirek on Tue, 08 Oct 2013 17:55:33 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

dolik.rce wrote on Tue, 08 October 2013 12:13mirek wrote on Mon, 07 October 2013 09:23Well, do we really need to communicate commands back?

I mean, jobs started before prefork can stay in the main process. Each forked process then can start its own timer queue. The only thing impossible then would be killing job created in the main process in forked process or job id that is somehow transfered (via IPC) from another process. But there is a simple solution to that: make it illegal Wouldn't separate timer in each preforked process could cause same job running in each process?

Well, of course, you would have to somehow make sure that jobs scheduled before prefork are not inherited to child processes. Other than that, I think everything is OK (or not?

Quote:
What do you think about the solution I proposed in RM? Do you have any specific arguments against this?

Well, perhaps, but it sounds quite complicated and 'feels' error-prone.

Quote:
mirek wrote on Mon, 07 October 2013 09:23Related question (issue?): for the task you suggest (deleting obsolete sessions), I would normally use standard cron job. I mean I really do not see advantage of proposed job queue to normal cron job. Is there any?Simplicity Many users (including me) like that U++ allows you to deploy whole application by deploying single executable.

Thats not mutually exclusive. We run many cron jobs in our server environment. All are implemented with single binary, which has many modes represented on commandline... That way, all code is easily shared.

Mirek