

Re: ASP.NET requirements? This CAN'T be true

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.general/2005-05/msg01229.html>

- *From:* "gabe garza" <gagarza@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 19 May 2005 01:05:30 GMT
-

FAQ for .NET

<http://msdn.microsoft.com/asp.net/support/faq/default.aspx>

EULA for .NET Framework 1.1

http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/dnnetdep/html/dotnetfxredisteula1_1.asp

Deployment Guide for .NET Framework

http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/dnnetdep/html/dotnetframedepguid1_1.asp

As long as you have a properly license copy of Windows and accept the EULA, .NET is free.

ASP and ASP.NET are two different applications, see FAQ.

The Web Matrix program at www.asp.net is a free tool where you can create ASP.NET applications in VB, C# or J#. The main difference with the Matrix program and Visual Studio .NET is Matrix doesn't create "code-behind" dll's, it's all source files. Get a copy of it and you'll see what I mean.

Good luck on that anti-microsoft type person. :)

"Scott Lee via .NET 247" <anonymous@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:eoUFW78WFHA.3884@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
(Please pardon me if this is a duplicate ---- not sure if message posted)

Hello,

I have been working my tail off developing an ASP.NET application. Now that the project is nearing completion, an anti-microsoft type has complained that "much of .NET in a web server environment is based on ASP (active server pages) which we forcibly disable, and which is one of our key selling points from a security standpoint as ASP has been an Achilles heel in terms of security," and ".NET is neither cheap nor secure"

It is my understanding that ASP.NET neither requires that ASP pages are enabled in order to run ASP.NET applications, nor does it mandate that additional royalties be paid to microsoft.

Also, it is my understanding that the .NET framework is free to install on

Re: ASP.NET requirements? This CAN'T be true

any properly licensed Windows machine, be that XP or Server 2003, etc.

I have argued that the only costs associated with ASP.NET applications are the web server (os and IIS), and the copy of visual studio .net that we bought to write the application, and that only plain HTTP is needed to run the application. Am I mistaken??

Please, if you can, provide me with solid evidence so that I can properly argue my case.

Thanks,

Scott

From: Scott Lee

Posted by a user from .NET 247 (<http://www.dotnet247.com/>)

<Id>HBd8Xf/hz06y1V6+rQ3WBw===</Id>

• **References:**

- ◆ **[ASP.NET requirements? This CAN'T be true](#)**
◇ From: Scott Lee via .NET 247

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Accessing the Global.asax](#)**
- Next by Date: **[RE: issue with split function in vb.net](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: ASP.NET requirements? This CAN'T be true](#)**
- Next by thread: **[vb to vb.net functions](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**