

## Re: D64, or Why Borland Ought to NOT Work on a 64-bit Version of DelphiRight Now

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2005-02/0748.html>

---

*From:* Thomas Miller ([tmiller\\_at\\_bss-software.com](mailto:tmiller_at_bss-software.com))

*Date:* 02/01/05

Date: Tue, 01 Feb 2005 15:14:25 -0500

Bob Dawson wrote:

> *"Dennis Landi" wrote*  
>  
>>*If your are using this as a reason not to build a 64-bit compiler*  
>>*then its a red-herring.*  
>  
>  
> *Actually I've explained before that software sales do not necessarily track*  
> *hardware sales in a linear relationship. 64bit PC sales constitute a cap on*  
> *the 64bit software market, nothing more. The market cap may be considerably*  
> *higher than the actual market.*

Agreed.

>  
>  
>>*Borland just needs enough sales to justify*  
>>*the cost of the compiler.*  
>  
>  
> *Borland needs expectation of enough sales that would not otherwise occur to*  
> *more than (profit) justify the cost of the compiler. That means the actual*  
> *market demand for 64bit software that is not already satisfied by .NET's*  
> *ability to jit as 64bit on demand. Simply talking machine numbers misses*  
> *both of these issues.*

Let's assume that there will be 1 billion x64 pc in the world by 2010. This is pretty close to what the number bear out in both of the reports.

Let's say that 2/3 actually want 64 bit software to run on their 64 bit chip/OS. That leaves us with 667 million PC. Let's say that the split between .Net and Native is split 50/50. The last market research I saw said that only about 15% of the business market place had bought into .Net. I am

conceding that over the next 5 years and before Longhorn is really even being adopted, that is has risen from 15% to 50%. Gartner doesn't think it is going to raise that much.

That leaves ~334 million PC for .Net and ~334 million PC for native. I don't think Borland would be wise to leave out either.

>  
>  
>> *We need to show that a the transition from 32-bit to 64-machines  
>>is happening at a certain rate to prove that there will be a market  
>>for a 64-bit compiler.*  
>  
>  
> *Again, no one really doubts that this is going to happen.*  
>  
>  
>> *We don't have to show that the "installed base" is  
>>replaced, entirely; but that enough of the transition has occurred;*  
>  
>  
> *What, in your view, constitutes 'enough'? In what approximate time frame  
> will this critical mass occur, for which market segments, and how do those  
> segments align with current or expected Delphi market penetration?*

That is why I asked John Kaster to clue us in on the basic reasons Borland has decided "no". Just the top three would be sufficient for us to have a "real" discussion.

>  
>  
>> *that's not all. It is also true that a significant portion, certainly  
>>the overwhelming majority, \*will\* upgrade their Win32 compiler  
>>to a Win64 compilation, given the opportunity to do so.*  
>  
>  
> *That's possible, but nowhere near as certain as you seem to think. For  
> example, would I as an individual developer and hobbyist like to upgrade to  
> D64? Sure--new toy; why not? Do I think I have a business case for it that I  
> can take to the CIO? No. Not even close to it.*

That is your CIO. I am the CIO here and we would definitely pay for the compiler. I also think if they add this, it should be an Enterprise / Arch. SKU to help pay for the initial cost. In a version or 2 they could bring it down to the Pro SKU.

And again, I am not saying your CIO is wrong and I am right.

I am trying to say we are both right. The question is Borland going to abandon us native EXE folks just because MS

says to? That is the way most of us "native" programmers view things.

I still think the right thing for Borland to do is release a D2005a with .Net 2 support and then work on a 64bit open beta 64 bit compiler, starting with non visual objects only. The last thing we need is the visual stuff. Servers first, client stuff second. If they do it, let's not make the same mistakes they did with Kylix.

>  
> *bobD*  
>  
>

--  
Thomas Miller  
Wash DC Delphi SIG Chairperson  
Delphi Client/Server Certified Developer  
BSS Accounting & Distribution Software  
BSS Enterprise Accounting FrameWork  
<http://www.bss-software.com>  
<http://www.cpcug.org/user/delphi/index.html>  
<https://sourceforge.net/projects/uopl/>  
<http://sourceforge.net/projects/dbexpressplus>