Subject: Transactional tables or not?
Posted by martin on Thu, 11 May 2006 15:01:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

I'm developing a Java version of this framework and just finished upgrading it to the newest Audit Database schema (i.e. AUDIT_SSN, AUDIT_TRN, AUDIT_TBL, AUDIT_FLD).
When I was done with the programming I wrote a lot of tests to verify correct behavior.
I then noticed that the tables are created with the non-transactional table type MyISAM. So when I did rollback tests after simulating broken update of application data it did not rollback audit logs.
I changed all tables to use the transactional INNODB table type and then everything works okay.
So my question is: In these kind of administrative systems is it better to have the slighter higher speed and better performance with MyISAM tables or will people be requiring the transactional tables?
I mean if you have invalid audit logs hanging around or invalid application data hanging around that can't be good.
Or do we believe that these situations are so rare so it is better to go with the MyISAM tables?

Subject: Re: Transactional tables or not?
Posted by AJM on Thu, 11 May 2006 16:13:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I use MYISAM tables by default, but I think for the audit tables it would be better to use INNODB tables for their transactional facilities. I shall change that in the next release.

You should also be aware that the Radicore framework surrounds every transaction with a 'start/begin' and 'end/commit' by default, so you can switch between non-transactional and transactional tables without any ill effects. You can even switch to other database engines, such as PostgreSQL and Oracle, where all the tables are transactional.