

## Re: Distributed Access references

**Source:** <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.devtoolkits/2004-03/0141.html>

---

**From:** Bruce M. Thompson (*bthmpson\_at\_big\_NOSPAM\_foot.com*)

**Date:** 03/17/04

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2004 12:40:50 -0500

> *What you are saying would seem inconsistent w/ what the  
> packaging wizard does.*

\*\*\*Any packaging product will do pretty much what you tell it to. If you specify files to be included, they will generally be included.

> *And for sure its not what I  
> understand from trying to package an app and working w/  
> no less than 3 MS access professionals who helped create  
> my first distributed access.*

\*\*\*It's possible that they do not fully understand the principles behind distributing an application, or you have misunderstood what they have demonstrated to you.

> *Although it appears that the excel does get packaged by  
> the wizard, as I said it will not run on the target  
> computer. So my app relies on the user having their own  
> excel to be run from my app. My understanding was I was  
> not shipping excel so much as library functions that  
> would only work if the user had their own working copy.*

\*\*\*If Excel is installed on the target machines, then there is no need to install any of Excel's libraries. They are already there. From what you have told me, you *are* distributing numerous files that you don't need to distribute and that you have no legal right to distribute.

> *About the other libraries, if I cannot include them, then  
> that would mean I can only distribute the simplest of  
> applications. This is not the message I got working w/  
> MS pros.*

\*\*\*You can generate and distribute surprisingly complex and powerful applications without distributing *any* of the executables or libraries that you mentioned. As I said, to include MS Office product functionality beyond Access, the client needs to have at least MS Office Standard installed. If they don't have that installed, they will need to do so or you will need to work around

that limitation the best that you can \*without\* attempting to distribute the related files. I have \*\*\*never\*\*\* distributed any such files and I have only run into problems when the target machines have the libraries listed in the application's references in locations other than what my references have specified. Such a dilemma is normally overcome by using `_late binding_`, which, again, was suggested by Doug Steele in your original thread.

- > *So relative to the files below you say I should not*
- > *package, I do not understand what my recourse is ? I*
- > *cannot use them ? So a huge chunk of my application will*
- > *not work ?*

\*\*\*I believe that I have provided a satisfactory explanation regarding this subject. I suggest that you read my responses more carefully.

- > *Bottom line relative to all my references is if I do not*
- > *reference them, my app won't compile. And if I do not*
- > *ship them my app will not run on target computer.*

\*\*\*Again, I have already addressed this – references \*are not\* files and your references are stored in the MDB/MDE. There is no "referencing" them in the PDW.

- > *I am following the suggestion to late bind excel. Since*
- > *I really do not use any special functionality that would*
- > *not be in excel 95, I guess that means any target*
- > *computer that has excel should be able to run ok.*
- >
- > *As for the other references I am not sure what to do ?*
- > *Can they all be late binded ?*

\*\*\*If you are speaking of applications (MS Office applications, particularly, but not limited thereto) – generally speaking, if they can be referenced, they can be late-bound.

- > *I would like to hear someone from MS explain why they*
- > *would build a software package and allow it to illegally*
- > *package their own software to re-distribute w/ access,*
- > *which I paid over \$1000 for the right to re-distribute.*

\*\*\*Anyone willing to spend that kind of money for a product should at least read the End User License Agreements that comes with it (there is one for the Office Suite and there is one for the developer tools/runtime). And keep in mind that most of that money you paid was for the MS Office Suite, not for the runtime files and license.

- > *Thanks for the discourse*
- > *its more than I can get out of MS anymore.*
- > *I have used up my two free helps, and now I would have to*
- > *pay to have them explain how their software works.*

\*\*\*Well, I can't, and won't, charge you for the "helps" I have given you, but you have used up your allotment, so re-read our entire conversation until you understand it.

> *That*  
> *lights me up every time I even think about it. I liked*  
> *the old days when you got a manual !*

\*\*\*Personally, I don't mind not having a printed manual. With all the free resources available to users online, there really isn't a need for a manual. If you can send email and communicate through the newsgroups, then you can expend a nominal effort to take advantage of the resources available online. These resources are far more extensive than you ever got with a manual.

This thread is closed. Good luck,

--  
Bruce M. Thompson, Microsoft Access MVP  
bthmpson@mvp.org (See the Access FAQ at <http://www.mvps.org/access>)  
>> NO Email Please. Keep all communications  
within the newsgroups so that all might benefit.<<