

Re: OO-COBOL for Unisys IX

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Cobol/comp.lang.cobol/2004-09/1410.html>

From: LX-i (lxi0007_at_netscape.net)

Date: 09/24/04

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 18:04:24 -0500

L ko Willms wrote:

> *On Mon, 20 Sep 2004 17:00:54 -0500, LX-i wrote:*

>

>> *Our biggest problem is that our configuration management system has been
>> scripted (with ECL and whatnot) to automate a mainframe compile from a
>> web page. The PC-based preprocessor hasn't shown enough benefit yet for
>> us to try to script that, then send the intermediate results up to the
>> mainframe to let UCOB and LINK finish them off.*

>

>

> *This is a misunderstanding. OO-COBOL is not a preprocessor for UCOB. At
> least according to the manuals, you could use OO-COBOL _instead_ of UCOB, and
> providing all the extensions like Embedded SQL, DMS access, and IBM Tape
> processing.*

>

> *The PC produces intermediate code which is sent to the host and is
> processed there by @OCOB, with an O, not by @UCOB. @OCOB produces an Omnibus
> which could be directly @XQTeD or @LINKed.*

>

> *The transfer of this intermediate code from the NT-workstation to the
> host is done automatically by the workstation program.*

Have you had any luck automating that from another system, or do you use it in the classic "human intervention" method?

>> *It would take a big*

>>> *change in policy to let it work. That's why I'd LOVE for Unisys to port
>>> some OO COBOL to the mainframe compiler, even if it's still a
>>> preprocessor for UCOB.*

>

> *Probably the compiler licenced from Hitachi is too much tied into WinNT
> that it can easily be ported to OS/1100.*

>

> *Also, I think that a workstation based editor can be more productive --
> OO-COBOL comes with a COBOL editor with syntax highlighting, and I doubt that
> this can be done as effectively with @IPF. See Vol. 4 of the OO-COBOL manuals
> (publication number 7851 5855-001).*

