

Re: A2007 ADPs

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.adp.sqlserver/2007-06/msg00109.html>

- *From:* "Sylvain Lafontaine" <sylvain aei ca (fill the blanks, no spam please)>
 - *Date:* Tue, 19 Jun 2007 02:53:17 -0400
-

Sorry for the delay, I was away.

Passthrough queries can be good for complex reports but except for the cases when you need to have complex sub-reports, too. I don't remember exactly but my guess is that trying to manage sub-reports with passthrough queries is probably a very big hassle; particularly but not limited to the cases when these sub-reports will flow/span over more than a single page.

--

Sylvain Lafontaine, ing.
MVP - Technologies Virtual-PC
E-mail: sylvain aei ca (fill the blanks, no spam please)

"Guy" <Guy@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:udVEZ8XrHHA.2152@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Sylvain,

Sorry, was rushing out to lunch and wanted to finish my last posting quickly.

You did make a very good point that you have the option to use passthrough queries with an MDB and these are ideal for complex queries and reports which are read-only.

I admit I had forgotten about this feature, not having done much MDB work recently (being an ADPer).

I won't forget in future.

Your comments appreciated.

Cheers
Guy

Re: A2007 ADPs

"Sylvain Lafontaine" <sylvain aei ca (fill the blanks, no spam please)>
wrote in message news:uF0Iy2VrHHA.4548@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

With your comment about MDB and crosstab reports against a SQL-Server, you are hitting one of the main point of using passthrough queries.

When the schema of the database is not too complexe, ODBC linked tables will work well because JET is able to translate sql queries into T-SQL and execute them directly against SQL-Server. However, when these queries become too complexe, JET can no longer do this and the performance will drop like an airplane in flames. On many occasions, it's with reports that you will be hit first with this problem first because queries for reports are often (but not always) more complexe than the queries for the forms. Because reports are read-only, the use of passthrough queries are then a perfect solution.

However, if you add another level of complexity to your schema, queries for the forms will become themselves too complexe and the speed of ODBC linked tables will look like a turtle. Of course, there are solutions to this (there is always some solution to a problem) but the simplicity of using JET with ODBC linked tables is now gone. The only reason of using JET when working against a SQL-Server is to remain inside its range of simplicity. If you have to wander beyond that, the amount of work required to redesign your schema and your forms to circumvent these problems (if and only if these changes are acceptable to your client, which is not always the case) make you loses any advantage of using JET in comparaison of other solutions.

--
Sylvain Lafontaine, ing.
MVP - Technologies Virtual-PC
E-mail: sylvain aei ca (fill the blanks, no spam please)

"Guy" <Guy@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:%236SCC3UrHHA.1172@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hi All,

What a response... not sure who to respond to, but just to add another 2 cents worth based on my own on historical experience.

I've tried using Linked tables to both Oracle and SQL Server in A2/A95 and A97 and frankly the performance and reliability problems I experienced were insurmountable. In one case I had quoted the client to build a A97/SQL Server combination and after 4 weeks of issues (sorry

Re: A2007 ADPs

too long ago to give specific information) I gave up and used VB instead. Now I accept that this was many versions of Access ago and I hope that the problems I experienced have since been ironed out (comments please), but as they say once your fingers have been burned...

The application I am currently upgrading was upsized, for performance, reliability and scalability reasons, to an ADP from an MDB when A2000 appeared. Despite the initial agnst I incurred due to it being a new "product" ie. the learning curve and bugs (I accept Dave that most have now been corrected) the objective was eventually achieved and the results have been and continue to be outstanding.

Frankly whilst I know some Access developers don't like ADP's, thinking them inflexible, I think there terrific for your standard client/server application.

The performance and reliability is as good as any VB6 (haven't used .NET yet for client/server) application I've developed and once you know what your doing easier and quicker too.

I recently developed a simple Financials Consolidation package for a client using an MDB, the only issue was the volume of data involved and the complexity of the few reports (all with 15/20 crosstab sub reports). The performance however was less than startling (as in minutes to generate each report). I upsized it to an ADP/SQL Server 2000 with all the additional work involved in creating the crosstab queries and the performance to generate each report went from minutes to sub 5 seconds.

Please convince me that Linked Tables work as well as an ADP.

Re: A2007 ADPs

Cheers
Guy

"Robert Morley"

<rmorley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:uU13OOUrHHA.4764@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

It also addresses the need not to have to manually or programmatically link every single table/view/SP/function that you need. You simply open an ADP and they're all there. Accomplishing a similar feat in MDB or ACCDB is a somewhat lengthier and more laborious process.

MS can recommend MDB or ACCDB all they want, but at the moment, ADP is serving my needs far better.

Rob

"Sylvain Lafontaine" <sylvain aei ca (fill the blanks, no spam please)>

wrote in message

news:eOHHuAUrHHA.2152@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

The only objective of ADP was to have the capability to directly bind a passthrough query to a form and have it read/write instead of read only, as it is actually the case with MDB.

With MDB against a sql-server, you have to use a passthrough query when your design become too complicated or too slow but these queries are read-only and cannot be binded directly to a form/report. ADP was

Re: A2007 ADPs

developed to correct this deficiency but beside this point, they have done absolutely nothing beyond that. For example, it's impossible to manipulate your insertings, updatings and deletings using stored procedures or to control the refreshing of the current record with anything but a primary key. I won't pass any comment on all the other limitations.

From the point of view of a programmer working against a SQL-Server, ADP is incredibly limited and offers nothing more than the possibility of directly reading the result of a SP into a bound form; nothing else. In comparaision to other database interface tools, MDB and ADP are more like twins than anything else.

(Of course, I talking here about the use of bound forms and not about the direct manipulation of ADO objects with VBA code; because you can do the later as easily with MDB than with ADP or with any other VBScript compatible language like ASP.).

--

Sylvain Lafontaine, ing.
MVP – Technologies
Virtual-PC
E-mail: sylvain aei ca (fill
the blanks, no spam please)

Re: A2007 ADPs

"David W. Fenton"

<XXXusenet@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in message

news:Xns994D92A168426f99a49ed1d0c49c5bbb2@xxxxxxxxxxxxx

"Sylvain
Lafontaine"

<sylvain aei

ca (fill the

blanks, no

spam

please)>

wrote in

news:#Bc78dLrHHA.4624@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

ADP
has
been
cancelled
because
it
offers
no
real
advantage
over
MDB
file
but
this
conclusion
is
not
based
on
performance
but
on
functionality.
The
capabilities
of
ADP
are
so
closely
related
to
MDB

Re: A2007 ADPs

that
if
you
cannot
do
it
with
MDB,
chances
are
high
that
you
cannot
do
it
with
ADP
either.

I always felt
that one of
the chief
motivations
for creating
the ADP
was the
unreasonable
prejudice
among
many
outside the
Access
community
against Jet,
either as
data store or
as data
interface to
server back
ends.

--

David W.
Fenton
<http://www.dfenton.com/>
usenet at
dfenton dot
com
<http://www.dfenton.com/DFA/>

Re: A2007 ADPs

Re: A2007 ADPs