

Re: EU is on the loose.

Re: EU is on the loose.

Source:

<http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2008-01/msg02032.html>

- *From:* Stig Johansen <aaa@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 17 Jan 2008 02:44:45 +0100
-

Chris Rolliston wrote:

I'd rather say: MS should be split up into the OS division and the application division. Then the OS division should be required to publically provide meaningful documentation about ALL APIs and the app. developers can/must use it. So none of them would get any information advantage over others.

The 'Samba' case was exactly a demand of giving _nessecary_ documentation. But this was about the _protocol_. MS are using their 'own' kind of SMB/CIFS in their desktop and file servers. Samba has(had?) to reverse engineer the protocol in order to get MS 'compatibility'. They will allways be behind, so it is 'easier' to use MS File servers. I have a customer, who have quite a lot of MS file servers. They could save quite a few buck by being _able_ to _choose_ a competitors product.

IFIRC, there was a similar case in US in the 80's. IBM used their SNA monopoly in the same way, leaving competitors to reverse engineering.

It's slightly changing the topic of the thread I know, but I don't buy that line about 'secret APIs', for more than one reason. Firstly, MS Office (say) has always used far less of the API than it might have – it has often (always?) used its own toolbar implementation, for instance.

And by using their _own_[1] protocol in Outlook, you _need_ to buy MS Exchange Server as well, or vise versa. So i _could_ be a reality, that MS is forced to document their interface.

[1] I have seen various warnings about using Outlook against 'other' IMAP servers.

—

Best regards

Re: EU is on the loose.

Re: EU is on the loose.

Stig Johansen

.