

## Re: Contemplating A97 to A2003

**Source:** <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.conversion/2005-02/0056.html>

---

**From:** Allen Browne (*AllenBrowne\_at\_SeeSig.Invalid*)

**Date:** 02/08/05

Date: Tue, 8 Feb 2005 16:46:49 +0800

Replies embedded.

--

Allen Browne - Microsoft MVP. Perth, Western Australia.  
Tips for Access users - <http://allenbrowne.com/tips.html>  
Reply to group, rather than allenbrowne at mvps dot org.  
"Leslie Isaacs" <leslie.isaacs@gp-n85011.nhs.uk> wrote in message  
news:%23tqZfUTDFHA.1836@tk2msftngpl3.phx.gbl...  
>  
> Having read it all - and understood about half of it! - I'm somewhat put  
> off  
> converting at all.  
> Mainly it was the bit about "Learning Access is more difficult" -  
> interface,  
> DAO and ADOX mean nothing to me, and as I'm not a professional developer  
> I'm  
> unlikely to get to grips with it all.  
You probably don't need to learn it all. If you are already coding in DAO,  
you can convert your database, and just continue to use DAO code. IMHO,  
that's still the best way to do it anyway if your data is in Access tables.  
> My reasons for contemplating conversion are (were!):  
>  
> 1) my assumptions that the later version would be more stable, less buggy  
> and faster (call me naive?)  
Correctly set up, A2003 is more stable than A97 to develop in. During heavy  
development, I expect a corruption every few days in A97, and every few  
weeks in A2003.  
Once the development is complete (not adding or modifying forms, code,  
reports, etc), both versions are extremely stable. On reliable hardware with  
reliable power and a reliable network and reliable users, you could go for  
years and not see a corruption.  
Performance-wise, most new versions are slower than older versions, and  
A2003 will be a little slower than A97, e.g. because of the Unicode support.  
Some things are much slower in A2003, e.g. VBA functions called in a query.  
> 2) my assumptions that the new features would be useful in establishing a  
> web interface between my payroll agency (which uses the mdb) and our  
> clients  
Although A2000 and later have Data Access Pages (DAPs), they are not very  
useful IME, certainly not beyond a local intranet. Better to use another  
technology such as PHP (or ASP) to read/write the Access database. Of  
course, none of these including DAPs give you the rich environment that  
makes Access such as joy to work with.  
> 3) a developer whose services I would like to use for some small projects  
> no  
> longer works with A97  
Good people you can trust and work with - yes, that's a very important

microsoft.public.access.conversion: Re: Contemplating A97 to A2003

consideration.

> 4) the XML file format would be useful for Inland Revenue end-of-year  
> returns

If you need XML support, then that's an important aspect as well.

> 5) a general, ill-defined but definite feeling that upgrade = progress =  
> good

:-)

> ... Your initial reply (that I should be able to update with  
> a minimum of fuss) was very encouraging, but the information in the link  
> had  
> the opposite effect.

Leslie, I think there are 2 questions here:

1. How hard is it to learn to use A2003 so that it's usable?

Expect a bit of a learning curve, so you know how to:

- turn off the stuff that corrupts the database (e.g. Name AutoCorrect),
  - get rid of the stuff that slows it to a crawl (e.g. Subdatasheets),
  - work around the new bugs (e.g. an AccessField in the LinkChildFields),
  - get used to the new frustrations (e.g. having to turn AllowZeroLength off every time you create a Text field),
  - solve the interface problems (e.g. controls that flicker on tab controls),
- and so on. These obstacles are not huge: we have come a long way since the days when A2000 was first released and we suggested not to use it.

2. How hard is it to convert an A97 database?

The answer is that once you have #1 down, this one is usually pretty simple.

(There are exceptions: e.g if you database was originally written in Access 2 and uses the 2.5/3/5 compatibility layer, you have work to do.)

Hope that clarifies it for you.