
Subject: Re: IDL Virtual Machine stealing licenses
Posted by [Jonathan Joseph](#) on Wed, 09 Aug 2006 17:06:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Though I didn't see it before, I just found a post that this is indeed a bug that was fixed in 6.1.

However, that post also claims that unsetting the LM_LICENSE_FILE environment variable is a workaround.

I tried doing an unsetenv LM_LICENSE_FILE, and even removed the .flexlmrc file, but it is still grabbing the IDL licenses.

Because we are not in charge of the system administration on the "broken" systems, a workaround is the preferable solution for us at this point.

Any advice appreciated.

Thanks.

-Jonathan

Jonathan Joseph wrote:

>
> We are seeing some strange behavior with one of our IDL installations.
>
> We have a linux box with a single node-locked IDL license (6 units). It
> is running IDL 6.0. If one user is running IDL, another user trying to
> run IDL will get the message that all the licenses are in use (as
> expected). That user could run the IDL virtual machine without any
> problem (again as expected).
>
> However, if no one is running IDL and a user runs the IDL virtual
> machine, it will hog the IDL license just as if run-time IDL was run. If
> another user then tries to run IDL, that user will get the message that
> all the licenses are in use.
>
> Imstat -a verifies that all 6 license units are in use by the user
> running the IDL virtual machine.
>
> In our other set up (a multi-user floating license, with IDL 6.2),
> Imstat verifies what I believe should be the appropriate behavior: that
> running the IDL virtual machine does not grab any licenses from the
> remaining available pool.
>

> I wasn't responsible for setting up the one that's not working, so
> before I get into trying to fix it, I'd like to know:
>
> Is this behavior due to a known bug? Either one that is inherent to 6.0
> (or the Imgrd that came with that release) that was fixed in a later
> release, or one that is inherent to node-locked licenses? If so, is
> there a workaround short of upgrading the IDL version?
>
> If not a known bug, has anyone else seen this type of behavior. If so,
> were you able to fix it or find a workaround short of upgrading or
> reinstalling IDL?
>
> If no one has seen this problem before, any clue as to where I should
> look to fix it?
>
> Thanks.
>
> -Jonathan
>
>
