

## Re: Older QC reports

---

*Source:*

<http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2007-11/msg04137.html>

---

- *From:* "Brion L. Webster" <[brion.webster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:brion.webster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 27 Nov 2007 11:06:53 -0700
- 

Wayne Niddery (TeamB) wrote:

"Doug Chamberlin" wrote...

After about 3 months it was finally posted to the internal db. After about 6 months a result of "will not fix" (or something similar) was posted. I gave up watching it at that point.

So because of one bug that did not get addressed correctly early in the development and acceptance phase of QC, you do not intend to ever allow for the possibility that, for the most part at least, it works well?

There are still lots of older reports that have not been addressed, that is true, but there are far less than there was because there has been much increased participation from both customers and CG staff since its inception and an explicit effort to address many of the older reports (it very naturally took some time to really start becoming effective, but that is already quite a while ago now – again that depends on participation).

For me, the older reports are a big problem. Now that CodeGear's announced a return to Win32 roots, so to speak, focusing on Delphi for Win32, dropping C#, giving up on fully supporting VB.NET, possibly giving up "native" Win64 and unicode Win32 in our lifetimes, the old Win32 stuff needs to be fixed.

SOAP, for example. Or, in my personal case, the old, old database stuff. Give me an updated ADO. Not ADO.NET, not dbx4 drivers to bridge things, How about ADO 2.1 bug fixes, or ADO 2.5 Win32 component features?

How about finally taking some of Thomas Millers dbExpress Plus enhancements and rolling them into the base products?

Even if these aren't the "shiniest toy" CodeGear wants to put forward, they're still bread and butter to some of us, and continuing to ignore them is continuing to ignore us. Ah, well, that's my emotional feeling. Hard to be rational on emotions, I suppose.

I'm not arguing that QC works or doesn't work. I think community feedback is vital, and QC allows for that. I don't think QC has had enough internal resources and priority at Borland in the past, nor do I think CodeGear

Re: Older QC reports

takes fixing "legacy" code as importantly as it should.

In all honesty, I think presenting a "release candidate" list of items, with some items carrying 1000 vote weights, some carrying 1 vote rates (engineers estimates of difficulty to implement), then letting us vote on things to include in Delphi X, would be more useful, and garner more effective feedback.

--

-Brion

There's no such thing as 'one, true way;'

- Mercedes Lackey

.