

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.kernel/2005-12/msg00168.htm>

- *From:* "Tony Proctor" <tony_proctor@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 7 Dec 2005 20:22:02 -0000
-

My point exactly. The problems I'm referring to can manifest themselves in different ways. This is just one

Tony Proctor

"Ivan Brugiolo [MSFT]" <Ivan.Brugiolo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:#rmp6o2#FHA.344@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

- > You have just described a problem of upward compatibility
- > form the point of view of the OS.
- > How can an OS with only version 2.7 installed,
- > run an application compiled against 2.8 ?
- > If it were able to do so, the OS could be used to win the lottery.
- >
- > On top of that, you may have the infamous *.tlh problem,
- > where the build process depends on the build machine,
- > that is always wrong.

- >
- > --
- > This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.

- > Use of any included script samples are subject to the terms specified at
- > <http://www.microsoft.com/info/copyright.htm>

>

> "Tony Proctor" <tony_proctor@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

- > news:Oiplc%231%23FHA.912@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
- >> Thanks Hector. In fact, the problem isn't just with the language tools,

or

- >> even the header files. We recently found a problem with typelib versions.

- >> For instance, code that was compiled under W2K against msadomd 2.7 would
- >> happily run on W2003, even though *only* 2.8 is available there.

However,

- >> if
- >> the same program were compiled on W2003 then it was bound against the 2.8

>> version, and this would not run under W2K if only 2.7 were available.

>> Worse

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

>> still, depending on how the code made references to the msadomd
>> interfaces,
>> we saw a situation where the code (an ActiveX EXE) would not even
register
>> itself, instead just emitting an uninformative BEEP.
>>
>> Tony Proctor
>>
>> "Hector Santos" <nospamhere@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:#7TBG11#FHA.916@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>> Tony, you been around. You know the drill.
>>>
>>> MS made a very profound statement about WIN32 compatibility many moons
>>> ago during the 16 bit to 32 bit transition days. I expect MS to hold
>>> this fundamental statement of WIN32 compatibility guarantee. Hundreds
>>> of thousands, if not millions, of companies and applications world wide
>>> are financially at stake and it needs to be made very clear to MS that
>>> they realized how important this is.
>>>
>>> I'm sure they realize this, but I can't help but feel MS is forcing the
>>> "issue" some how. It is making me worry.
>>>
>>> That said, I have been thinking about the same thing with the latest
>>> renditions of the OS with or with the .NET foundation, and/or with
>>> VS2005.
>>>
>>> Just the other day, I compiled a old C/C++ console utility, something I
>>> can do very quickly with VS2005 (version 8 of CL.EXE), to test the
>>> theory. No compile errors or warnings and I was able to run it all
>>> WIN32 test machines we have. I asked in MSDN support forums about
>>> VS2005 MFC/C/C++/RPC development as the response was that it was still
>>> supported. I was wondering if we would need to have both VS 6.0 and
>>> VS2005 development environments.
>>>
>>> I think we should expect BACKWARD compatibility if you are compiling
for
>>> WIN32 on a newer OS. Distribution to any WIN32 OS should work.
>>>
>>> Yes, I agree. I think it is extremely and vitally important that
>>> Microsoft take a step back and comfort their long term developer base
>>> and not got lost in all this wishy washing, glorified, .NET, C#
>>> dependency. That's all good, but they need a commitment (and as I will
>>> go as far as saying LEGAL commitment) to their WIN32 developer base.
>>>
>>> The link would be the WIN32 support statement. I am now interested in
>>> googling it so I can have a copy on record. They should restate it and
>>> make it clear what are the plans.
>>>
>>> The same goes for the WIN 3.1 SUB-SYSTEM and DOS SUB-SYSTEM.
>>>
>>> —

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

>>> Hector Santos, CTO
>>> Santronics Software, Inc.
>>> <http://www.santronics.com>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Tony Proctor" <tony_proctor@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
>>> message
>>>
>>>> Does anyone know of a link that describes Microsoft's official stance
>>>> on
>>>> backwards compatibility?
>>>>
>>>> The terms upwards and backwards compatibility are a little ambiguous,
>>>> and
>>>> depend on which way you're looking through the telescope. In this
>>>> context, I
>>>> refer to the expectation that products compiled on a higher O/S
>>>> version can
>>>> be distributed and run on older O/S versions.
>>>>
>>>> Most people would expect upwards compatibility. For instance, if you
>>>> compiled a well-behaved program under W2K then it should run under
>>>> W2003.
>>>> Few people who have been involved in large-scale software
development,
>>>> across different platforms (e.g. UNIX), would expect the latter. For
>>>> instance, if a "versioned" struct had been changed in size then older
>>>> versions of the O/S may not know how to handle it.
>>>>
>>>> I personally would not expect backwards compatibility (as defined
>>>> above)
>>>> because I've seen the issues that can arise. However, I'm looking for
>>>> a link
>>>> to any statement on the subject in relation to the Windows O/S
>>>>
>>>> Tony Proctor
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>
>>
>
>

-
- *References:*
 - ◆ [Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)

Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?

◇ *From:* Tony Proctor

◆ **[Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)**

◇ *From:* Hector Santos

◆ **[Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)**

◇ *From:* Tony Proctor

◆ **[Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)**

◇ *From:* Ivan Brugiolo [MSFT]

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Debug microsoft API](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Statement on backwards compatibility?](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**