# Mulgara - Feature #23

## We must find a more descriptive way of expressing the cost of iteration than getRowUpperBound()

09/26/2006 11:08 AM - Andrae Muys -

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Status:** | New | **Start date:** | |
| **Priority:** | Normal | **Due date:** | |
| **Assignee:** | Andrae Muys - | **% Done:** | 0% |
| **Category:** | Mulgara | **Estimated time:** | 0.00 hour |
| **Target version:** | | | |
| **Resolution:** | | | |

**Description**

An increasing number of resolvers (relational, federating, distributed) cannot provide a meaningful upper-bound to their row-count.
<br/>

<br/>
Also row-count assumes a uniform cost of iteration, when iteration (as opposed to resolution) entails network latency this is unrealistic.
<br/>

<br/>
How do we handle this?  Do we need some sort of bogomips-like timing constant to provide a baseline for comparison?  Can we use this to also provide selectivity data that would also improve our join performance?