

Re: Excel-RS232 via Cheapcomm: Where?

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.arch.embedded/2007-09/msg00816.html>

- *From:* Joerg <notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 27 Sep 2007 00:30:51 GMT
-

Clifford Heath wrote:

Joerg wrote:

I am not a fan of .NET. It seems to have serious backwards compatibility issues. Case in point: New scope SW came, must have .NET. Installed 2.0, did not work. Inquired -> Must use 1.1 because 2.0 is not compatible. Great. <shaking head>

You're missing the point entirely. For the first significant time that MS has done it, you can have all 3 versions of the .NET runtime installed at the same time without them interacting, and whatever products or components you install get the same version isolation. It takes more disk space (though not that much, it's only 40Mb or so), but it does avoid DLL hell.

40MB to get to the ports, wow ...

I've heard this whine from you multiple times, presumably all relating to the single occurrence, but it was **your** mistake because you installed the wrong version. Perhaps your supplier didn't give you enough info, but that doesn't make it MS's mistake.

I've heard the same whine from hardcore SW guys, except that some of them used words I could not repeat in public.

You should be congratulating MS for finally doing something positive about solving DLL hell, not castigating them for your mistake.

Re: Excel-RS232 via Cheapcomm: Where?

Your are probably right. However, that's a "version control" scheme that is totally foreign to me. And I bet in my line of biz (FDA regulated) the Federales wouldn't let that fly. With our SW newer versions must support the old stuff. Just imagine the ER doc loading a patient file because he urgently needs to get some info, then a message pops up "Requires DICOM version x.xx, please contact your IT administrator".

--

Regards, Joerg