

## Re: XPe headless user application

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.embedded/2004-08/0095.html>

---

**From:** Sean Gahan ([sean\\_at\\_optistreams.net](mailto:sean_at_optistreams.net))

**Date:** 08/03/04

Date: Mon, 2 Aug 2004 17:35:37 -0700

John,

I don't know if you plan on including the .net framework (don't laugh), but if you do then you might look at this web server; it is a modified version of the cassini project from asp.net, you can find it at [xpefiles.com](http://xpefiles.com):

<http://www.xpefiles.com/srOut.cfm?sortid=date&fileid=mss&selectid=109&commentRB=&fileRB=&bothRB=true>

with this solution you could have a web interface or use web services. Also

have you looked at Remoting, MSMQ, or COM+. MS recently had a webcast that covered some of the following topics:

<http://msevents.microsoft.com/CUI/EventDetail.aspx?EventID=1032256981&Culture=en-US>

Regards,

Sean Gahan

"John Keenan" <[john.keenan@\\_removeme\\_optimapowerware.com](mailto:john.keenan@_removeme_optimapowerware.com)> wrote in message [news:cemjru\\$e5n@dispatch.concentric.net...](mailto:news:cemjru$e5n@dispatch.concentric.net...)

> *KM,*

>

>> *Is your target device going to be headless?*

>

> *Yes.*

>

>> *Then have you considered RDP option?*

>

> *I am not completely familiar with the capabilities of RDP. I will have to*

> *read up on it and experiment with it to determine if it will satisfy my*

> *immediate needs. However, the application must eventually become a Windows*

> *service so I am still interested in how to dynamically attached a user*

> *interface to a headless application running on a remote, headless, XPe*

> *device.*

>

>> *Btw, DCOM approach may not be a bad choice if you properly designed...*

>

> *The application is well architected objects.*

>

>> *Also, if the communication between the UI and calculation threads are*

> *simply data transfers...*

>  
> *The communication is not really simple data transfers. It is well  
> architected objects talking to each other. I can see how to write  
interface  
> objects to transform the communication to simple data transfers. I am  
> curious if others have found this approach beneficial to DCOM.*  
>  
> *John*  
>  
> *"KM" <konstmor@nospam\_yahoo.com> wrote in message  
> news:%23\$gEyDNeEHA.3132@TK2MSFTNGP11.phx.gbl...*  
> > *John,*  
> >  
> > *Is your target device going to be headless?*  
> > *Then have you considered RDP option? I mean without changes to in your  
app  
> you can just RDP to the target box and see the app UI and  
> > current state.*  
> >  
> > *Or did I miss anything from your requirements?*  
> >  
> > *Btw, DCOM approach may not be a bad choice if you properly designed your  
> app at first place.*  
> >  
> > *Also, if the communication between the UI and calculation threads are  
> simply data transfers, you can think of two apps network  
> > separated. The communication channel between the apps could be  
implemented  
> with a network named pipe, a TCP/IP connection, a shared  
> > mapped file, a database, DCOM, etc.*  
> >  
> > --  
> > *Regards,*  
> > *KM, BSquare Corp.*  
> >  
> >  
> > > *I have an existing application with a MFC user interface on one thread  
> and  
> > > some continuously running calculations on another thread. I am toying  
> with  
> > > the idea of splitting this application so the continuously running  
> > > calculations run as a headless user application on a headless XPe  
> system.  
> > > The embedded user application would need to support a remote user  
> interface  
> > > that would connect to it for monitoring and configuration purposes. I  
am  
> > > trying to determine what options are available for a headless XPe user  
> > > application to support a remote user interface (what has worked well;  
> what  
> > > looked good but added too much overhead to the embedded system; etc.).*

> > >  
> > > *I believe the quickest time-to-market solution would be to place a COM*  
> > > *interface between the existing MFC user interface and the continuously*  
> > > *running calculations. The user interface would become a standalone*  
> > > *application that would use COM to remotely connect to the embedded*  
user  
> > > *application.*  
> > >  
> > > *An alternative would be for the embedded user application to support a*  
> *web*  
> > > *server allowing a web browser to be the user interface. Of course this*  
> *would*  
> > > *entail new development to support the web interfaces.*  
> > >  
> > > *I would appreciate any references/comments/suggestions of these*  
options  
> *and*  
> > > *alternative options and their pros and cons.*  
> > >  
> > > *John*  
> >  
> >  
>  
>