

# Re: New Visual Fortran Product Survey

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Fortran/comp.lang.fortran/2006-07/msg00188.html>

---

- *From:* Tim Prince <[timothyprince@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:timothyprince@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 09 Jul 2006 05:42:41 GMT
- 

Gary Scott wrote:

eperea wrote:

Gary Scott wrote:

I still don't see how they can call it "visial fortran". Isn't that trademarked already? MS sure wouldn't allow somebody to put out a visual something that they produce without a \$ fight.

There is at least one commercial Visual Fortran out already:

<http://www.intel.com/cd/software/products/asmo-na/eng/compilers/278834.htm>

Version 9.1 is for Visual Studio 2005. I imagine Intel would object as much as Microsoft.

That's what I meant. I assume that MS authorized DEC to use the name, and that that authorization transferred to Compaq/HP and then to Intel (don't know that) when the compiler/components/rights were successively purchased by those companies. So I'd assume that the trademark belongs to Intel (unless Compaq/HP retained it, but I doubt that since they aren't using it). It is also strange to me that Portland thinks that it can compete and provide a better product than Lahey, Absoft, and Intel (and Salford/Silverfrost and Pathscale and ...). (meaning aren't there enough already?)

I work for one of those companies, and I have no idea what the answer is, beyond the public information, which is often misquoted. HP does own and retain the rights to DEC/Compaq Visual Fortran, and their disuse of it does not give anyone else a right to use it. Nor did Microsoft extend the agreement under which CVF was developed to any other successor.

Microsoft exercises a great deal of control over any integration of 3rd party compilers with Visual Studio, and it seems they may have negotiated a change in the rules again in this case. Those rules tend to restrict what

## Re: New Visual Fortran Product Survey

kind of debugging facilities will be available etc etc. I have no idea whether HP may have been a party to the naming or development of this product.

I might guess that PGI (as it appears to be responsible according to posted headers) has backing from certain hardware vendors. I believe the wording which says the product is only for Windows X64 EM64T and AMD64, for which only a minority of the vendors mentioned above have a product.

If I believe the most recent report that only 4% of licensed Windows copies are 64-bit (and I've never been offered a pirated 64-bit Windows), it does seem like a confined market. I suspect (as catalog listings appear to confirm) a vast majority of 64-bit capable computers are sold with 32-bit Windows installed, with the customer having no idea of the 64-bit option. I'll let others guess whether another available Fortran compiler will change that.

.