

Re: Tuning for PostgreSQL Database

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/performance/2003-07/0057.html>

From: Sean Chittenden (sean_at_chittenden.org)

Date: 07/21/03

Date: Mon, 21 Jul 2003 12:26:45 -0700

To: Jason Stone <freebsd-performance@dfmm.org>

> > *Softupdates on, async off. Softupdates is just a better async.*
>
> *postgresql fsync's all its files before returning from a commit in*
> *order to ensure durability, right? Does softupdates interfere with*
> *the functioning of sync(2)/fsync(2)?*

It can, yes, but that's the risk of soft updates. From tuning(7):

Softupdates drastically improves meta-data performance, mainly file creation and deletion. We recommend enabling softupdates on most file systems; however, there are two limitations to softupdates that you should be aware of when determining whether to use it on a file system. First, softupdates guarantees file system consistency in the case of a crash but could very easily be several seconds (even a minute!) behind on pending write to the physical disk. If you crash you may lose more work than otherwise. Secondly, softupdates delays the freeing of file system blocks. If you have a file system (such as the root file system) which is close to full, doing a major update of it, e.g. ``make installworld'', can run it out of space and cause the update to fail. For this reason, softupdates will not be enabled on the root file system during a typical install.

> > > *I would recommend 4.8 over 5.1. Especially if you intend this*
> > > *to be a production server. 5.1 is not ready for public*
> > > *consumption.*
> >
> > *Public consumption, yes. Production consumption, no.*
>
> *I recently decided to take up the issue of migrating towards 5.1 at*
> *my company. The way I dealt with it was to publish all of my*
> *services to 5.1 boxes and run regression tests. For me, 5.1*
> *provided adequate performance, and since 5.1 is on the branch where*
> *all new dev work is going on and 4.x is going to be end-of-lifed in*
> *the not-too-distant future, I decided to go with 5.1.*
>

freebsd-performance: Re: Tuning for PostGreSQL Database

- > *Personally, I would only go with 4.8 if testing showed 5.1 to be*
- > *inadequate for your particular situation with your particular apps,*
- > *hardware, load, etc. But you can only tell that by testing.*

Glad to hear that 5.1 is getting used in the work place. Were there any places where your testing showed huge gaps in performance? -sc

--

Sean Chittenden

freebsd-performance@freebsd.org mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-performance>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-performance-unsubscribe@freebsd.org"