Serving Users of Dassault Systemes Suite of Products, Including CATIA,® ENOVIA,™ DELMIA,™ and SMARTEAM.™
COE
educate
exchange information
learn techniques

COE Discussion Forum

This is an open forum for CATIA & CADAM users worldwide. Feel free to discuss any issues pertaining to CATIA/CADAM software, hardware platforms, Operating System software, Training & Support.

The intent is to provide a discussion area where users can help each other, no matter what time zone you're in! COE retains the right to delete any posting, which in the judgment of the Board of Directors, is not in the interest of the User Community.

Back Refresh Options Search Help

CATIA for Mac OS X ?

CATIA for Mac OS X ?	Ed M.	06/11/02
Re: CATIA for Mac OS X ?	Timothy J. Suhr	06/20/02
CATIA for Mac OS X ?	Ed M.	06/20/02
Re: Re: CATIA for Mac OS X ?	Jeff	08/01/02
Re: CATIA for Mac OS X ?	Timothy J. Suhr	06/20/02
CATIA for Mac OS X ?	Ed M.	06/20/02
End of my contribution to this pointless thread.	Timothy J. Suhr	06/20/02
Stop being ridiculous...	Ed M.	06/20/02
Profit	ian phillips	06/21/02
CATIA on Mac OS X	John Welch	06/21/02
I agree. Recompile CATIA to run under X-Window in OSX	Ed M.	06/25/02
Innovate or be obviated	David K. Every	07/07/02
Mac OS X Pro/E Port Survey @ Pro/E Digital Digest	David Chaney	02/07/03
sign me up	mikesch muecke	06/26/02
Re: sign me up	Bill Gates	06/26/02
Catia/SolidWorks?	Mick	06/26/02
Sign EVERYONE up!	Ed M.	06/26/02
Macintosh Platform Justification & Business Case	Timothy J. Suhr	06/27/02
CATIA on Mac OS X	Ed M.	06/27/02
Re: CATIA on Mac OS X	Timothy J. Suhr	06/27/02
CATIA on Mac OS X	Ed M.	06/27/02
RE: CATIA on Mac OS X	Timothy J. Suhr	06/27/02
CATIA for Mac OS X	Ed M.	06/27/02
RE: CATIA for Mac OS X	Timothy J. Suhr	06/27/02
CATIA Recompiled for X-window first	Ed M.	07/07/02
Argument makes sense to me...	Ed M.	07/10/02
Re: Argument makes sense to me...	Timothy J. Suhr	07/15/02
Re: Re: Argument makes sense to me...	Ed M.	07/18/02
CATIA on XDarwin/XWindows	Kelly McNeill	09/24/02
Take it easy	Eddy	07/23/02
Time to offer better options, more choice and become more divers	Ed M.	07/23/02
PTC to bring Pro/E to OS X? It sure looks like it....	Ed M.	07/31/02
Re: PTC to bring Pro/E to OS X? It sure looks like it....	Mike	08/01/02
"Some companies only exist as an example to others on what not t	Ed M.	08/01/02
"Some companies only exist as an example to others on what not t	Ed M.	08/01/02
Obviated	David K. Every	08/01/02
Re: Obviated	Mike	08/01/02
Why even develop a Windows version for that matter?	Ed M.	08/01/02
Re: Why even develop a Windows version for that matter?	Mike	08/01/02
Yes	ian phillips	08/19/02
Dependency	Ed M.	08/28/02
But what have you done for me lately?!?!	David K. Every	08/01/02
Re: But what have you done for me lately?!?!	Mike	08/01/02
Amusement	David K. Every	08/01/02
Mistakes	Ed M.	08/01/02
Re: Mistakes	bob	08/07/02

RE: WHY?	David K. Every	08/07/02
RE: WHY?	David K. Every	08/07/02
Autodesk's revenues, profits fall in Q2	Ed M.	08/16/02
Still opportunities for Dassault	Ed M.	09/15/02
New IBM PPC 970 developed with Apple in mind?	Ed M.	10/17/02
Re: New IBM PPC 970 developed with Apple in mind?	Bill Gates	10/17/02
Why is the thread useless?	Ed M.	10/18/02
RE: Why is the thread useless? One Possilbe Answer!	Timothy J. Suhr	10/21/02
RE: zealotry	David K. Every	10/21/02
Re: RE: Why is the thread useless? One Possilbe Answer!	Kelly McNeill	10/21/02
Not useless	ian phillips	10/22/02
Not useless	Kelly McNeill	10/22/02
Caution can pay off.	ian phillips	10/22/02
Re: Caution can pay off.	Kelly McNeill	10/22/02
Tell us more..	ian phillips	10/23/02
Re: Tell us more..	Kelly McNeill	10/24/02
Re: Not useless	Mike Spellacy	10/22/02
WHO CARES!!!!!!!	Robert J. Fink	10/22/02
Who cares?	Kelly McNeill	10/24/02
Re: Re: New IBM PPC 970 developed with Apple in mind?	Phil Harrison	10/19/02
People don't care about the OS??	Ed M.	10/22/02
It's not really a Port	Jim Strawn	10/23/02
Re: It's not really a Port	Kelly McNeill	10/23/02
What are the next steps?	ian phillips	10/24/02
Re: Re: It's not really a Port	Jim Strawn	10/24/02
Ian, Jim and others...	Ed M.	10/26/02
Re: Ian, Jim and others...	Robert M Petersen	10/30/02
Don't you think OS X is worth looking into?	Ed M.	11/12/02
FEI	Ed M.	12/10/02
FEI	Ed M.	12/10/02
Re: FEI	Jonathan Langton	12/11/02
X-11 integrated right into OS X and more...	Ed M.	01/09/03
X-11 and PowerPC 970	Brett Patching	01/29/03
Speed isn't the issue	Ed M.	01/29/03
Speed wasn't the issue	Brett Patching	01/29/03
Re: Speed wasn't the issue	Jim Strawn	01/29/03
What would be the minimum Mac system?	Ed M.	01/29/03
Re: What would be the minimum Mac system?	Jim Strawn	01/30/03
OK, but what about the Mac??	Ed M.	01/30/03
Re: OK, but what about the Mac??	Jim Strawn	02/04/03
OK, if not Mac, what about IBM 970/Linux? ;-)	Ed M.	02/04/03
Re: OK, if not Mac, what about IBM 970/Linux? ;-)	Jim Strawn	02/05/03
What makes for a usable desktop system?	Ed M.	01/29/03
Designers on Macs	Brett Patching	01/29/03
Design on Mac vs. Speed with bonus goodies	Mick	01/29/03
Alias Studio on Mac?	Brett Patching	01/30/03
Maya on OSX	Mick	01/30/03
More Mac OS X discussion on the LINUX thread.	Ed M.	01/21/03
Mac OS X and MCAD	David Chaney	02/10/03
Intel: No rush to 64-bit Desktops (you guys seem to be in a bind	Ed M.	02/25/03
Re: Intel: No rush to 64-bit Desktops (you guys seem to be in a	Julian Laxton	02/25/03
No 64-bit Wintel destop until end of decade	Ed M.	02/25/03
Re: No 64-bit Wintel destop until end of decade	Julian Laxton	02/25/03
Apple updates X11 public beta	Ed M.	03/17/03
Apple releases Mac OS X 10.2.5	Ed M.	04/15/03
LightWorks update adds AltiVec optimization	Ed M.	04/16/03
Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing!	Ed M.	05/15/03
Re: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing!	Jim Strawn	05/15/03
Re: Re: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing!	Ed M.	05/15/03
Re: Re: Re: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing	Jim Strawn	05/15/03
World Wide Developers Conference (WWDC 2003)	Ed M.	06/11/03
OS-X	B O Lox	06/12/03
64-bit G5 (IBM 970), 64-bit OS X (Panther), gobs of additional d	Ed M.	06/26/03
Re: 64-bit G5 (IBM 970), 64-bit OS X (Panther), gobs of addition	Julian Laxton	06/26/03
Power? Who needs it?	ian phillips	06/30/03
RenderMan Coming to OS X	Ed M.	07/01/03
RenderMan Coming to OS X!	Ed M.	07/01/03

Kerris of Apple Still Insists That Major CAD Developers Are Inte	Ed M.	07/02/03
Kerris of Apple Still Insists That Major CAD Developers Are Inte	Ed M.	07/02/03
Qt comes to Mac OS X	Ed M.	07/14/03
Qt comes to Mac OS X	Ed M.	07/14/03
PTC launches Pro/Concept 2.0 for Mac OS X	Ed M.	07/16/03
Renderman	Ed M.	08/11/03
Renderman	Ed M.	08/11/03
More G5 news: Virginia Tech Building G5 Supercomputing Cluster	Ed M.	09/02/03

Post new message in this thread

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 11, 2002 04:03 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA for Mac OS X ?

Hello everyone, I've been curious to know if there are any plans to bring CATIA over to the Macintosh platform. With the advent Apple's new UNIX-based operating system many UNIX apps have already made their way over; especially in the field of medical research, genetics / genomics and bioinformatics. What got me thinking about CATIA possibly making it's way over to the Mac was this little tidbit:

LIGHTWORK DESIGN: LightWorks for Mac OS X - LightWorks, the industry's fastest rendering engine, has been released for MAC OS X platform. To view an image illustrating the LightWorks Application Development System in action on Mac OS X, go to this link: www.lightworkdesign.com/products/lightworks/Media/MacOSXimages.htm.

The LightWorks rendering engine is used in more than 80 software applications worldwide, including products from Unigraphics Solutions, SolidWorks Corporation, Matra Datavision, Parametric Technology Corp, Msc. Working Knowledge, Diehl Graphsoft, Nihon Unisys, think3, Fukui Computer Inc. Auto-des-sys Inc., Caligari, Configura Sverige AB, Digital Immersion, Nemetschek North America, GESTEL and M2 Research. www.lightwork.com

And get this, a while back, Dassault Systemes announce their Original Software Development Partnership with LightWork Design...

Hmmmm...

Anyway, it was stated that:

[[["Under the agreement, LightWork Design's market leading MachineWorks technology will be embedded into the open Version 5 Architecture, including CATIA, DELMIA and other Dassault Systemes Solutions.

Mike Payne, Dassault Systèmes Executive Vice-President of Technology said of the partnership, "LightWork Design has worked with Dassault Systemes for a number of years, adding valuable technology into a variety of projects. By significantly extending the agreement and integrating MachineWorks technology into CATIA we are ensuring that we continue to force the progress in an area we have identified as being critical to the advancement of our customers operation".]]]

Again, Apple is providing the necessary means for developers to bring their wares over. PTC, Dassault and others have very little reason NOT to bring their wares over. Keep in mind that many of those companies that use LightWorks either have UNIX versions along with Windows and LINUX versions or their software or is UNIX-only. And we all know that OSX *is* in fact UNIX-based. However, I'm sure many of you are skeptical of the ease at which porting Unix apps over to other variants is. Well, I provided this little gem that I intercepted while reading up on some Bioinformatics news and happenings... Check the articles below. Also keep in mind that even though they don't specifically discuss UNIX-based CAD/3D apps, it does mention the relative ease at which such UNIX apps can be ported to run on Mac OS X.)

http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/mac/2001/12/14/macbio.html

http://www.wired.com/news/mac/0,2125,50078,00.html

In any event, any interest to support the Mac and OSX should be immediately forwarded to Apple. For more information on Apple's new UNIX-based OS, I encourage all of you to spend some time at these URL's:

http://developer.apple.com/macosx/ (about Mac OS X)

http://developer.apple.com/darwin/
(Darwin = open source = core of OS X = Mach 3.0 and FreeBSD)

Likewise, OS X being UNIX-based is literally LOADED with open standards making interoperating with the rest of the world incredibly simple.

http://www.apple.com/scitech/research/
(This site is dedicated to how Macs are being used in industry and research)

In any case, make no mistake. OS X *is* a UNIX variant and Apple is now the worlds largest distributor of a commercial UNIX. Likewise, it's the worlds easiest-to-use UNIX, yet it still retains all the features that a dedicated UNIX programmer is familiar with. I'd be interested in any opinions or feedback any of you might have. Perhaps a few of you could pass this information on to the necessary people over at IBM / Dassault to see if it prompts any interest. My e-mail address is:

EdsLab2@aol.com

Anyone seriously interested in seeing CATIA come to the Mac should contact John Martellaro, Apple's senior marketing manager for the Science, Technology and Engineering Markets. He'll get you in contact with the right people.

martellaro@apple.com

Thanks

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72165)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 20, 2002 08:33 AM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: Re: CATIA for Mac OS X ?

I will say during the last CATIA Operators Exchange the question was asked about a LINUX version and who wanted one and the response was not very encouraging. Apple MAC & OS X pose a greater question to the software developers - namely "Does the investment justify the return." Most engineering houses use UNIX or Intel based computers for their CAD Solutions. The task related to recoding many platforms and operating systems needs to justify it self. Can the OS X followers show a great enough demand to justify this investment?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72338)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 20, 2002 04:48 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA for Mac OS X ?

[[[I will say during the last CATIA Operators Exchange the question was asked about a LINUX version and who wanted one and the response was not very encouraging.]]]

That's actually understandable since LINUX in my opinion is a great *hoby* OS. (sorry if I offend anyone) The truth is, LINUX is a great mid-range server OS. It really isn't intended for desktops. There is just too much variation. Likewise people (engineers and all) have to consider that the ultimate operating system is not a command line with a thin graphics shell on top.

You see, there's sort of a fallacy. LINUX never has been, nor never will be a viable desktop solution for the mainstream or in my opinion serious engineering; (especially when work NEEDS to get done and there are deadlines to meet. Considering most engineers don't really want their tools to get in the way of what they want to do, wasting time configuring an OS to suit their needs seems like an incredible waste of time. In any case, for LINUX to be such a solution, it would have to be designed with those particular purposes from the beginning... It was not.

LINUX is what it has always been -- a reasonable implementation of a UNIX based operating system, that is not bad as a low-end server (that has grown into the mid-end -- and may someday grow into the high-end thanks to IBM et al). It is not a bad foundation to build a turnkey server system for some enterprises to use (as turnkey solution). But that is not the same as "consumer-level / user-friendly / everyday desktop solution". Therefore, I'm not convinced that LINUX has ever been anything close to a consistent, predictable user-friendly desktop solution. As for the usability and interface -- I believe that a colleague of mine summed it up best when he said:

[[[We have to remember that Linux, (and Unix interfaces in general) are designed by committee. Large groups of people hashing, arguing, testing ideas, until they get the one that they can all agree on.

Examples of this are:

KDE
CDE
OpenWindows
WorkPlace Shell
Gnome
Windows

Blech!

To design a good interface, you need talent, but you also need *vision*.
Committees never ever have vision. They have meetings.]]] - JCW

My friend Del Miller also has some interesting points to make. Del is an aerospace engineer (among other things). He prefers to use the Mac whenever possible because it simply works better for a lot of engineers, He only uses Wintel / Lintel solutions when there is absolutely no other choice. Here is how he describes it:

[[[We as engineers, as well as those in the design and engineering fields have to start to realize that there is a lot more to a desktop platform than just the OS; it's the entire infrastructure that matters. A solid desktop OS needs all manner of support from font foundries, file conversion utilities, installers and a general ability to open and work with documents across all other platforms in friendly fashion. Mac OS X provides this and is getting better with every release. The situation is quite different with LINUX.

In general Linux has been fairly grim when it comes to these issues (seriously speaking). OSX provides an answer to all this that is so strong that the question of desktop Linux has gone from "How?" to "Why?"]]] - Del Miller

In other words, OS X offers everything that LINUX offers except it has the necessary functionality with dedicated, dependable support along with being incredibly useful across ALL platforms. Now that Apple has released their Xserve server systems and soon to be fiber channel version -- It has become an even stronger possibility for enterprise use. Apple is now, by far the worlds largest distributor /

developer of a UNIX-based operating system. Please, I encourage you to visit the articles and information linked to the URL's that I posted in my initial thread.

It's understandable why there was some reluctance with respect to LINUX. OS X on the other hand is a little more robust and far more viable a solution.

[[[Apple MAC & OS X pose a greater question to the software developers - namely "Does the investment justify the return."]]]

Well, I've been looking at that argument for some time. It seems to be a variation of the "what comes first, the chicken or the egg" question. My conclusion is that this argument makes little sense when you get deeper into it. And to be quite frank, I never saw this argument as anything but an excuse. Forgive me, but I simply find the logic lacking -- It escapes me.

If you really look at both LINUX and OS X, surely you could see the advantages of embracing an operating system that actually has a dedicated level of support, rather than the mishmash that comprises the LINUX world as it is -- we covered this already. LINUX makes for an effective server OS, but nothing more. It lacks total consistency.
However, aside from that fact, this whole argument seems to spawn the very question that is at it's heart and hence, has been keeping back development for the Mac. That is -- How can one use market share or rather the "return on investment" as an indicator if these wares aren't being made available as a choice to begin with?

For instance if I'm weighing the various platforms against each other how can I make a fair judgment when certain apps that I require are absent from the choice? The Mac very well be a platform that people would love to use, you just have to be willing to let the user decide and the user can't make a reasonable decision if one platform is at a disadvantage because of lack of software. It's like buying a BMW and finding out that Goodyear doesn't plan on manufacturing tires for it. As anyone well knows, Goodyear never looks at market share. In that I mean that Goodyear doesn't only sell tires for Chevrolets and Toyota Corollas. They provide solutions for everyone. OS X *is* UNIX. period. Porting existing UNIX apps over wouldn't be difficult at all judging from the other articles on Bioinformatics software (and many others types) that I posted earlier. Apple would undoubtedly provide all the assistance that is required. Again, I'm not convinced there would be too large an initial investment as most developers would have us believe. Simply because these ports are already being done. As a matter of fact, I'm willing to bet that you could run CATIA through X-Window right on the OS X desktop after some minor tweaks and a recompile. Again, this type of thing is already being done. See here:

http://osx.hyperjeff.net/Apps/

http://osx.hyperjeff.net/Apps/Unix.html
http://osx.hyperjeff.net/Apps/Xwin.html

[[[Most engineering houses use UNIX or Intel based computers for their CAD Solutions.]]]

And? They also upgrade these machine quit often as I understand it.

[[[The task related to recoding many platforms and operating systems needs to justify it self.]]]

If you took the time to explore my earlier post, these types of things are trivial. Again, to test the waters, the ideal thing to do would be to allow CATIA to run through X-Window on the OS X desktop. Remember, OS X *is* UNIX-based. If this sparks a following then it would signify a more *platform specific* version is desirable. In that case, CATIA, with the assistance of Apple could make it a completely compliant OS X application, but the key is to at least make some attempt to test the waters. How difficult would it be to recompile the existing code to run on Darwin? Think about it.

[[[Can the OS X followers show a great enough demand to justify this investment?]]]

There's that question again... How can someone ask that question if the App was never made available in the first place? In order to ask that question one has to test the market for that demand, otherwise it's a silly question. Market share is very misleading. When someone hears 5% market share they think

small, forgetting the fact that 5% could amount to 40 million potential users... Not to mention the users who couldn't answer that question relating to demand because they were never given the option to decide between CATIA on OS X or CATIA on some other platform. One cannot know the level of demand unless it id actually put to the test. One way to spark an interest would be to recompile the code and at the very least get it to run on OS X.

http://osx.hyperjeff.net/Apps/

http://osx.hyperjeff.net/Apps/Unix.html
http://osx.hyperjeff.net/Apps/Xwin.html

Best
--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72359)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 03:59 PM
Author: Jeff (*jeff@afe.net*)
Subject: Re: Re: CATIA for Mac OS X ?

[[I will say during the last CATIA Operators Exchange the question was asked about a LINUX version and who wanted one and the response was not very encouraging. Apple MAC & OS X pose a greater question to the software developers - namely "Does the investment justify the return." Most engineering houses use UNIX or Intel based computers for their CAD Solutions. The task related to recoding many platforms and operating systems needs to justify it self. Can the OS X followers show a great enough demand to justify this investment?]]

Since OS X is now another (POSIX-compliant) UNIX variant, and lives comfortably amongst UNIX networks, isn't the above a good argument for a generic UNIX port? One which would then also run on OS X? Many large scale UNIX packages (not merely the GIMP, but real computational physics applications, etc) run on OS X. One need not make an Aqua-compliant version, since XFree86 is already widely used on OS X. That being said, wrapping UNIX apps in an Aqua interface is a relatively small programming task. As well, Tk is now an Aqua interface option.

I worked at an engineering firm for years which was almost exclusively Windows-based. Still, there were engineers who use only Macs for their work. They use CAD/CAM and other FEA packages. Having the option of something like CATIA would be very welcomed. Don't ask the managers whether or not there's a demand for an OS X version, ask the engineers, many of whom are OS X users. Unfortunately, few engineers are actually asked what they would like to see in practice.

If the code is written to be platform agnostic (as many professional UNIX apps are), this could provide a CATIA port for LINUX/OS X/Solaris/BSD/etc all on a single code base.

Just some thoughts on the issue.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73072)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 20, 2002 05:37 PM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)

Subject: Re: CATIA for Mac OS X ?

[[[There's that question again... How can someone ask that question if the App was never made available in the first place? In order to ask that question one has to test the market for that demand, otherwise it's a silly question. Market share is very misleading. When someone hears 5% market share they think *small*, forgetting the fact that 5% could amount to 40 million potential users... Not to mention the users who couldn't answer that question relating to demand because they were never given the option to decide between CATIA on OS X or CATIA on some other platform. One cannot know the level of demand unless it id actually put to the test. One way to spark an interest would be to recompile the code and at the very least get it to run on OS X.]]]

I am not forgetting the fact the 5% of the market could amount to 40 million potential users how many of the 40 million potential users would or could fork over the money for the licenses for using the functionality. It is not cheap. Have you ever asked why MicroSoft does not recode Flight Simulator for OS X? Same reason - Cost of coding for OS X. This I can say comes from the head of the FS program at MS. I think you may over simplify the recoding and recompiling efforts that a software developer goes through. It is not like Goodyear and the design of a tire. Can you take a graphic card designed for a PC and use it as is in a MAC? I think not. Don't get me wrong I think that if CATIA was changed to run under OS X (Unix) it would give other Unix boxes a run for the money. However you must know the comparison in performance of CATIA V5 for NT or Unix - The NT will win. Just look at the CATbench results. V5 Is developed on NT then ported to Unix. OS X Users still would have to show them selves willing to license and use V5. A company in the software business requires it for profitability. Find a industry that is willing to put the money be hide the effort and I would think that DS would have to consider the OS X because their customers are requesting it.

Even AutoCAD only offers their product for Intel based systems. Apple has to this point not shown from the user base to be CATIA needy. That may change but DS wont just code it hoping they will come. Would You? Would Goodyear develop a 33-inch tire without the truck manufacturing industry driving the need for such a thing?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72360)

Date: June 20, 2002 06:54 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA for Mac OS X ?

[[[It is not cheap.]]]

No kidding.

[[[Have you ever asked why MicroSoft does not recode Flight Simulator for OS X? Same reason - Cost of coding for OS X. This I can say comes from the head of the FS program at MS.]]]

And you actually believe that? From the company that literally pirates all of it's functionality, most of which it got from Apple?? The fact is that it would NOT be in M$'s best interest. I simply cannot believe that you are blind to the politics. Still, I can see that from a developers perspective going for the easy catch generates the most profit. Isn't it odd that they are choosing the most ubiquitous (and worst of the bunch) instead of the better option? I don't want to get into a platform war here. I use them both, but to claim the NT is the best solution is very disturbing.

[[[I think you may over simplify the recoding and recompiling efforts that a software developer goes through.]]]

That is incorrect. I've said nothing. Now we could bandy the technical issues back and forth, but it still remains that developers of science/medical/biological applications are doing just that which you say I'm oversimplifying. They are claiming the ease of the porting, not me. I suspect that these apps are as compute-intensive as any CAD package -- including CATIA. As are apps such as Maya. As far as

developers go... I talk to a few and the best part is that they are all cross-platform Windoze / Mac OSX. So I get a pretty decent balance. You'd be surprised at which platform they'd rather support.

[[[It is not like Goodyear and the design of a tire.]]]

And how much do you suppose it costs Goodyear to design, develop, market and sell a particular tire from start to finish? Now multiply that cost by the actual number of unique tires that they actually develop. In any case I don't see them discriminating saying "We will only offer this tire to owners of Toyota Carollas". I'm not sure I like the direction this thread is headed. On the other hand, if Apple were to fund the project I suspect that the opinions would change dramatically. Just a guess.. ;-)

[[[Can you take a graphic card designed for a PC and use it as is in a MAC? I think not.]]]

Um, that would be a good thing? Let me ask you this, will your cars wheels fit mine? Bad analogy. Bad example. It seems to be a DRIVER issue more than anything. Nvidia is developing solutions that are also available for the Mac. Again, in many instances it's been *suspected* that it's really only an issue of *drivers*. Macs don't require some special slot. They use the same industry standard slots as anyone else.

[[[Don't get me wrong I think that if CATIA was changed to run under OS X (Unix) it would give other Unix boxes a run for the money. However you must know the comparison in performance of CATIA V5 for NT or Unix - The NT will win.]]]

Well, that's not completely believable. Not that NT *wins* but rather the port is from x86 code. (my God when are people going to move forward!) Mac hardware is just as effective (don't get caught up in the advertised numbers) As a matter of fact, Apple hardware can offer UNIQUE advantages. This is where DS could really capitalize and make for a really intimate OS X version. After all, having something running that close to the metal will surely profit from platform specific optimizations (read: AltiVec).

[[[V5 Is developed on NT then ported to Unix.]]]

That's part of the problem. I don't know how DS *ports* it's products, but again, they are doing an injustice if their code and optimizations favor a particular platform. You said this yourself... People are spending BIG dollars. Why shouldn't they demand a platform specific version that is just as effective as say -- an NT version? Again, the bulk of the code is only written once and *maintained* afterwards.

[[[A company in the software business requires it for profitability. Find a industry that is willing to put the money be hide the effort and I would think that DS would have to consider the OS X because their customers are requesting it.]]]

Well, how do you *really* know for sure? Has anyone even contacted Apple. Apple keeps a large data base of applications that it's users are requesting. I'll ask again... Has anyone from DS even contacted Apple (or vise versa) or are just assuming that since they've heard *nothing* then no such demand exists? What about the possibility of a "light" or stripped down version for OS X?

Maybe a more important question would be to ask you if you've ever actually *used* a Mac and OS X...

You can learn about OS X at:

www.apple.com

Seriously, go have a look around

[[[Even AutoCAD only offers their product for Intel based systems.]]]

Hmmm. I talk to the person running the Architosh website from time to time. Perhaps you should check out the latest:

http://www.architosh.com/news/2002-06/2002c-0619-acadupdate.phtml

Be sure to pay attention to the 'Related Articles' area at the bottom.

[[[Would Goodyear develop a 33-inch tire without the truck manufacturing industry driving the need for such a thing?]]]

That argument would hold *if* Goodyear *only* supported 33-inch tires for trucks that required them and only on one particular variant of that truck -- call it the "Wintel Truck". In fact, Goodyear does none of the above. They support all markets where a tire is required. That is, they support Peterbuilts, Macks, et al Oddly enough GE does the same. Imagine if you couldn't use their lightbulbs in a Sylvania socket.. ;-)

I strongly suggest that you have a gander at what's actually going on in the computing arena with respect to the Mac. You can start here:

http://www.apple.com/scitech/research/

You might also check out the AppleSeed project that's been under way for some time already:

http://www.apple.com/scitech/stories/decyk/

And for developers:

* http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
* http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/acgresearch.html

As far as the potential of the Mac and OS X and it's performance you might be wise to check out distributed.net

Now, if you can test things that are independent of OS APIs and are using similar code (like image operations in Photoshop, computation in distributed.net or SETI@home), then you can really compare the performance across platforms.

Take a look at where the AMD, P3, P4 and Itanium stand. They are incredibly slow. These are machines with huge numbers-ratings as compared to the Mac. Yet the Mac wins out. The point is... There is no other SIMD architecture that could possibly yield such a dramatic effect on RC5, no matter how much effort is invested into programming for it. And that's on the seemingly slothful 133 MHz. bus?

See for yourself:

http://n0cgi.distributed.net/speed/query.cgi?cputype=all&arch=all&contest=all&multi=1

On the other hand, if developers spent half as much time coding and optimizing for the PPC as they do the x86 variants, then we'd probably see far better performance than we realize now. Remember, it completely up to the developers to make the Mac a viable platform. Apple has provided them with extremely fertile ground. They just have to look beyond market-share. That little number is way too misleading.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72362)

Date: June 20, 2002 08:15 PM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)

Subject: End of my contribution to this pointless thread.

I am sorry that I cannot help you understand the realities of life the business of software development.

Your right!
· Every one is against the MAC and it's users.
· MS Steals every thing from MAC and MAC is best at every thing!
I wont mention that if not for Xerox - Mac or MS/ IBM Compatibles would not have even a mouse much less a GUI. But your right and everyone else are wrong.
Better now?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72364)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 20, 2002 08:40 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Stop being ridiculous...

[[[I am sorry that I cannot help you understand the realities of life the business of software development.]]]

Oh I understand the reality just fine. I just disagree with you that things cannot be changed.

Your right!
· Every one is against the MAC and it's users.
· MS Steals every thing from MAC and MAC is best at every thing!]]]

The first part is clearly wrong, but we all know the dangers of a monoculture. Not to sound silly (even though you do), but have you *ever* studied history? Ever hear of the Potato famine? Same applies to computer systems friend. Second part:

[[[· MS Steals every thing from MAC and MAC is best at every thing!]]]

You work for Boewing?? Jeez.. I'll be sure to say a few extra prayers before I board a plane... Sheesh! Seriously, in all honesty, you are being silly.

[[[I wont mention that if not for Xerox - Mac or MS/ IBM Compatibles would not have even a mouse much less a GUI. But your right and everyone else are wrong.
Better now?]]]

Well, it's not about that really, but you really should brush up on your history a bit:

http://www.mackido.com/Interface/ui_history.html

Remember, you picked the platform-war rout. I wanted to talk viability of Mac OS X as a CAD solution. You are the one who is getting uptight and confrontational. You didn't even answer any of my simple questions regarding the actual use of a Mac and OS X. Again, I posted the thread to see if it would stir any curiosity. I've heard all the excuses before why something cannot be done or why something is "unlikely" to be achieved. The logic is simple... and the fact remains. Apple has provided the platform and now it's up to the *developers* to develop the demand. Not the other way around. Certainly anyone can see that without the apps or representation there will be no demand because at that point it isn't even an option yet. Again, I want posting to start a fight. I was posting to see if I could generate some curiosity and interest. It wasn't until you posted a few inaccuracies that I felt the need to set things straight. It's obvious you don't care for the Mac platform very much. And quite frankly it's those individuals that I try to avoid. I'm more interested in the open-

minded professionals.

Sorry for any aggravation

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72365)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 21, 2002 02:48 AM
Author: ian phillips (*ianp@gmx.net*)
Subject: Profit

I'm sure we'd ALL be happy to see CATIA running on OSX.
Dassault Systemes is certainly evaluating the cost and return on making OSX and Linux versions. And hopefully, one day we will start to see this happen.
But today they are having enough trouble supporting IRIX and the rest.
Incidentally, in Europe an Apple computer is VERY rare! They are expensive here, the schools use Windows and even some of the graphic designers are taking the cheaper NT path.
This will surely affect the decision.

Ian
PS. Boys, Nice thread! especially when it got to the insults! :-)

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72369)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 21, 2002 06:48 PM
Author: John Welch (*jwelch@mit.edu*)
Subject: CATIA on Mac OS X

[I am not forgetting the fact the 5% of the market could amount to 40 million potential users how many of the 40 million potential users would or could fork over the money for the licenses for using the functionality. It is not cheap.]

Neither is Maya, or Lightwave, or MatLab. But all of those either run, or are being ported to Mac OS X. The cost of the software is not an issue unless you are writing games. If it's a good tool, people pay for it. I don't think that Maya is going to grab 40 million users, but they'll get enough. MatLab is going to be an XFree86 application, ala IDL/Envi, so the port from the Unix versions of that application are pretty simple. If Catia is already running on Unix, you don't need to Aqua-fy it, just configure it to run under X Window on Mac OS X. No real interface coding at all, so you can spend your time doing hardware optimizations.

[Have you ever asked why MicroSoft does not recode Flight Simulator for OS X? Same reason - Cost of coding for OS X. This I can say comes from the head of the FS program at MS.]

Well, if MS used OpenGL instead of DirectX, that would be far simpler. There is one company with a port of Direct X to the Mac, and no one has really used it yet. If MS would get out of this mineminemine thought model, you'd have a lot more games going to many different platforms. but Direct X is really windows only. That is the code cost keeping FS windows only. And politics.

[Can you take a graphic card designed for a PC and use it as is in a MAC? I think not.]

Um, AGP and PCI are platform neutral standards. The only issue is endian issues in the ROMs, and the drivers. Obviously it's not a real problem for Nvidia or ATI, so I'll hazard that it's not terribly difficult.

[However you must know the comparison in performance of CATIA V5 for NT or Unix - The NT will win. Just look at the CATbench results. V5 Is developed on NT then ported to Unix.]

That's not surprising. i imagine the X86 code has a lot of X86 - specific optimizations that aren't redone for the Unix ports. This is the problem with porting software. To get a decent application, you still have to optimize a lot for it. NewTek is getting hit with this WRT lightwave.

[Even AutoCAD only offers their product for Intel based systems]

More acurately, Windows. Autodesk pulled the plug on *all* non-windows versions of Autocad years ago. So you can't run it under Linux X86.

If there is already a Unix codebase, then they have it running under X11. Therefore, getting it to run under Mac OS X is no harder than getting it to run under Linux, and oddly enough, Apple is now the #1 seller of Unix - based systems on the market. I find it odd that an OS that is obviously on the way out, Irix, is considered a more viable option than Mac OS X.

john c welch

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72391)

Date: June 25, 2002 05:06 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: I agree. Recompile CATIA to run under X-Window in OSX

The whole purpose of this discussion was to draw attention not only to Mac OS X, but to entertain the idea of having CATIA first ported over and running under X-Window. At the very least that shouldn't be much of a problem at all aside from the politics that might be involved. Other than that I bet *that* particular port can be done easily and straightforward in very little time. That would certainly test to see if there is any demand for a Mac version. If there is a significant impact, then DS could explore the possibility of Making CATIA a full-blown app on OS X that takes advantage of everything the OS X and hardware have to offer.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72436)

Date: July 07, 2002 03:23 PM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: Innovate or be obviated

> I am not forgetting the fact the 5% of the market could amount to 40 million
> potential users how many of the 40 million potential users would or could fork
> over the money for the licenses for using the functionality. It is not cheap.

Actually, it is pretty cheap. If you already have a UNIX based solution (that runs on X, KDE, etc.), then the cost is really to just bundle your software with the plug-ins (solutions) to get an install to work on

OSX. That's pretty cheap entry...

If you want to get a fully OSX version of the App, then you need to do the interface; but you're using the best UNIX UI tools on the planet.

Now compare that to volume. Apple is the #1 UNIX supplier in units. So having it on UNIX and not on OSX makes very little sense. It is cheaper to make it work on OSX than other UNIXXEN, and it is a larger installed base.

The question shouldn't be why, but when.

> Have you ever asked why MicroSoft does not recode Flight Simulator for OS X?
> Same reason - Cost of coding for OS X.

Because Flight Simulator is not a UNIX App? So you are mistaken in what that means.

We could just as readily ask then why does Microsoft do Office or Outlook for the Mac, etc... Because it is a very profitable segment for them. In fact, THOSE apps required complete rewrites and were much more major development efforts than what we are talking about here (since they used the Mac API's)...

What we're talking about is a more vertical solution that can have more interface quirks, and use a lot more of the standard API's, and you already have 98% ported, assuming it already runs on UNIX. You do have to QA and support it -- but you could probably throw one programmer at it for a few months (if he's good). Heck, if you asked Apple, they'll probably make consulting resources available to help with the port...

Knowing software development costs, this is probably a low 6 figure effort at worst ($100K) to get you into the market -- you're probably going to have to make a few year commitment, and add some marketing, etc., that will easily increase that dramatically.

The potential upside seems staggering.

> This I can say comes from the head of the FS program at MS.

That was a vertical Windows program, that was hacked and cheesed up from the get go. Yes, if you have a game that has been a pet project of the CEO, and has been hacked for 20 years, then porting it to another platform might be expensive; both in development costs, and PR. But that is not what we're talking about...

>I think you may over simplify the recoding and
> recompiling efforts that a software developer goes through.

I've been a software engineer (cross platform) for 23 years, and I've managed many projects. So I have a pretty good clue as to what it does and doesn't take...

I haven't seen the size of the project... But I'm assuming you are already running on UNIX. In that case, the cost of a cheesy port is infinitesimal compared to a Windows or normal port to another platform. And since you are a vertical app, there is far more tolerance of bad (see normal UNIX) interface. If you are generating revenues from that port, you can use those monies to increase your effort (staff) and put a better UI on things.

> Can you take a graphic card designed for a
> PC and use it as is in a MAC? I think not.

Actually, you can. Many were done exactly that way. Many choose to customize it more... And a bad design can't be used cross platform. And most often, you can use 99% of the design, and the redevelopment efforts are small...

> Don't get me wrong I think that if
> CATIA was changed to run under OS X (Unix) it would give other Unix boxes a
> run for the money.

I think that OSX is already the unit leader, but other UNIX people are learning that it is already the interface leader as well. And this is 12 months out of the gate. Jaguar looks to fix/improve many things... And in another 12-18 months, I think it will be the standard by which most UNIXXES are measured... OSX delivers today on what LINUX has been promising for 10 years...

> Find a industry that is willing to put the
> money be hide the effort and I would think that DS would have to consider the
> OS X because their customers are requesting it.

The problem is the other way... DS is missing an opportunity and losing potential customers because they CAN'T offer that option. (Or because there are better options). They are telling their customers to demand that they do their jobs (which is create good software)? That makes no sense...

Show me the customers that demanded a spreadsheet before Bricklin created Visicalc? Show me the customers that demanded a GUI before Apple delivered the MacOS? It doesn't work that way. And if you found both people asking for it, it would NEVER justify the expense. But when you offered the solution, you find that there are 1,000 that want it, and you just didn't know about it. And that the software created opportunities and brought you into new markets, etc.... Just like this would. But if you never take the risks, then you will never see the rewards.

> Even AutoCAD only offers their product for Intel based systems.

True. They created a Mac product, and mismanaged it, and then stopped selling it. And they lost many customers, and now there's a new market for other CAD solutions (Vellum, etc.) that AutoCAD will never get back; and many others that were burned and will never buy another AutoCAD product because of what the company did.

But just because one company does a stupid thing, doesn't mean we should all try to emulate it. Does it?

> Apple has to
> this point not shown from the user base to be CATIA needy. That may change but
> DS wont just code it hoping they will come. Would You?

That's the job of software companies; create solutions to gain new markets. If you stop innovating, then you are stagnant and just waiting to be obviated by someone with more a clue (more vision) than you have.

When you port to other platforms, and gain new customers, they give you insights into new features or ways of thinking that help your entire market. This is one of the reasons why Microsoft keeps their Mac products; it makes their Windows versions BETTER. In fact, if I wasn't for the Mac products, I don't think most of the Windows apps would have been nearly as big. (Heck, most were Mac first).

> Would Goodyear develop
> a 33-inch tire without the truck manufacturing industry driving the need for
> such a thing?

This is not hardware, this is software, there is a difference. But still Goodyear does exactly that -- they go to automakers and show them some prototype designs to guage interest, and the automakers showed interest. They do the same to customers. You either innovate, or you stagnate. Almost all the dead ex-large companies can trace their downfalls at least partly to that "it costs to much to risk innovation" attitude.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72632)

Date: February 07, 2003 09:03 AM
Author: David Chaney (*davidch@mac.com*)
Subject: Mac OS X Pro/E Port Survey @ Pro/E Digital Digest

I think we can all assume how Ed will vote, but any one else interested in Mac OS X port of Pro/E should vote "yes" on the Mac OS X Pro/E Port Survey @ Pro/E Digital Digest below. Note than I'm aware that this is Dassault site, but a port to Pro/E could spur a port to Catia and/or SolidWorks...

http://www.d-digest.com/proedigitaldigest/V3I6/

David Chaney
Mechanical Design Engineer

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76539)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 26, 2002 02:50 PM
Author: mikesch muecke (*mikesch@iastate.edu*)
Subject: sign me up

I just joined the discussion and would like to add my name to a list of those interested in CATIA running under OS X.

Although, the reason I joined the forum is to find out about useful tutorials to learn CATIA. We just purchased six licenses for Windows 2K and are trying to figure out what the best approaches to learning/teaching the software are. I teach at Iowa State University in the Architecture Department, and we see CATIA at this point as a supplemental offering in our CAD curriculum (formZ, Maya, AutoCAD, 3D Max, Electric Image).

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72464)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 26, 2002 04:03 PM
Author: Bill Gates (*bill@msn.com*)
Subject: Re: sign me up

Unfortunately you guys are barking up the wrong tree. I have been to a couple coe's in the last few years and Microsoft is playing a bigger and bigger part in the CATIA/Enovia enterprise. Come to think of it I went to a COE session and Steve Ballmer (Uncle Fester) was the keynote speaker. Just like IBM is in bed with Dassault/CATIA today, Microsoft is knocking on the door, the painting is on the wall. CATIA is the only "real" CAD player left and Microsoft has jumped on board. By offering CATIA on more then one OS is a double-edged sword. On one hand the competition keeps prices of hardware down but if you have ever had to maintain a multi platform environment you would know why I would vote against the idea. One more big thing will be when the third party players start inventing new functions they will now have to recompile for multi platform environments or they might just say they are only going to developed for one platform like they have in the past.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72468)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 26, 2002 10:30 PM
Author: Mick (*mricereto@earthlink.net*)

Subject: Catia/SolidWorks?

I linked up to this discussion through Architosh. I just received the CATIA demo in the mail at work. I didn't run the software yet (no time - natch!), but we poked around a little bit and it looks like CATIA is running the same engine as SolidWorks? WOW - if SolidWorks was available for OS-x that would be fantastic. We have SolidWorks at the office, along with Rhino3d, AutoCAD, VectorWorks and Mechanical Desktop. I prefer SolidWorks by a LONGSHOT. Am I correct in my assumption - same rendering/modeling engine?

M

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72474)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 26, 2002 11:49 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Sign EVERYONE up!

Well, Bill, It seems that Microsoft is under the microscope lately. I don't think it can afford to play the Godfather of the tech industry any longer. Microsoft's troubles haven't even begun yet. The case is in the remedy phase and stricter sanctions are highly likely. As is the possibility of a breakup. The proposed settlement (gift?) hasn't even been approved yet (as per the Tuney Act) Anyway, that's a whole other aminal... ;-) In any case, Microsoft had better stop leveraging it's monopoly in such a way. Not only that, but M$ is moving toward an increasingly CLOSED system. A simple box that they alone will control. Their goal is Palladium. Besides, who really *wants* Micro$oft's bugg-ridden products?

When is the tech sector going to wake up and realize that they have been duped into playing the part of that frog sitting in a pot of water on a stove? All seemed fine when it appeared that Billy-Boy gave them a nice big lake to swim in. He brought the heat up slowly and cooked them to death. Now they actually believe that they are dependent upon that entity. Micro$oft reminds me of a drug dealer. They tempt people with the goods, those people buy into the farce and [cause themselves] to become dependent and now they are at the mercy of M$. Not that M$ is the superior choice. Yet these people continue to throw GOBS of money in new versions and hardware that was supposed to solve all the problems of previous versions.

Anyone with a gram of intelligence could see that it's been that same exact marketing shpeil that M$ has been using since day one.. "Ooooooohhh, you guys better not look for alternatives.... Look at what we have lined up for you if you stick with us... Besides, you already have too much invested already; can you really afford to go somewhere else?" and so on. It's thinking like that that has allowed M$ to gain the foothold that it did. In other words, they've been promising everyone the world, keeping them in anticipation and actually delivering little. But wait, things will get better with the next version of our software; just wait and see!

The fact is that the these people and organizations can switch to an alternative if they really wanted to and developers would follow if there was actually an honest desire to migrate to an alternate platform. This mono culture that's emerging is quite unsettling. But that's enough of that. The topic and discussion is clearly aimed at people who are INTERESTED in seeing CATIA running on OS X in some form or another. Anyone NOT interested in seeing CATIA run under Mac OS X should quietly keep their opinions off and move along to other things.

I believe (as I'm sure many others do) that MOST people aren't interested in what can't be done, they are interested in what CAN be done. The one thing that can be done with minimal effort is to get CATIA recompiled so that it at least runs through the X-Window environment on OS X. However, it's likely that politics is holding CATIA on OS X back. Once that blockage is cleared, it's likely that many other scientists and engineers that rely on CATIA (and happen to prefer a Mac as their platform of choice) will come forward and request a more familiar, more Mac-like version. I say let Dassault test demand for an OS X version by recompiling it to run in the X-Window environment under OS X. Remember,

the bigger this list gets and the more posts that accumulate, the more attention the topic receives and in turn a higher level of consideration from DS.

Best

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72476)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 27, 2002 09:05 AM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: Macintosh Platform Justification & Business Case

All I am asking is there a company or better yet an industry that will make a formal business case and an enhancement request for the support of OS X? If there is great - I would like to see V5 Solutions (CATIA, ENOVIA, & DELMIA) common and accessible to as many companies as possible. With out someone (company or industry) doing the groundwork of justifying this change it will not get done. Shipbuilding Industry was able to slide the release schedule to the left for there functionalities with the proper case that was built. It is not the fact that the Macintosh is not able to provide the performance or other tools that engineering companies require. The wants of the End Users aside - is there a company that has gone to DS and requested V5 Solutions to run on Macintosh under OS X?

PTC Website - Answers to Questions from the Pro/DESKTOP Webcast and Demo - March 2002
http://www.ptc.com/company/mail/express200203/desktop_qa.htm
"What's involved in porting Pro/DESKTOP to the new Macintosh OS X-based machines? There is an enormous educational market out there, and these machines are EXTREMELY fast. We are aware of the Macintosh platform and its impressive capabilities. The decision to develop a MAC port requires commercial justification and we are interested in any input which contributes to the business case."

MAC World - August 1996 page: 38 - Science/engineering: Mac CAD Does Fine Without AutoCAD
http://www.macworld.com/1996/08/news/2330.html
"Second, unlike, say, word processing or graphics software, adopting CAD software is a major commitment - a company typically spends much more on training than on the software itself. AutoCAD was a relative latecomer to the Mac market, and only 15 to 20 percent of Mac-based firms using CAD were willing to face the downtime associated with a major changeover to AutoCAD."

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72498)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 27, 2002 10:54 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA on Mac OS X

[[[All I am asking is there a company or better yet an industry that will make a formal business case and an enhancement request for the support of OS X?]]]

Do you mean the company that develops the particular application or Apple supporting OS X for enterprise? It is completely obvious that former is the responsibility of the developer of the application. After all Adobe Alias|Wave front and many others already do this. If it is the later then that is available as well. Start by having a look at Apple's new Xserve offering found here:

http://www.apple.com/xserve/

Apple is already providing the necessary support for their hardware; not that it requires the support or the extremely high costs associated with Microsoft-based solutions. If you look at the specs of what Apple is offering enterprise you might be surprised. You can start by an in-depth review by John C. Welch. John provides a series of articles discussing Apple's enterprise offering from an IT perspective. Be sure to read each in the series

Part 1: http://www.workingmac.com/inetd/149.wm

Part 2: http://www.workingmac.com/inetd/154.wm

Part 3: http://www.workingmac.com/inetd/153.wm

Part 4: http://www.workingmac.com/inetd/155.wm

Part 5: http://www.workingmac.com/inetd/156.wm

[[[If there is great - I would like to see V5 Solutions (CATIA, ENOVIA, & DELMIA) common and accessible to as many companies as possible. With out someone (company or industry) doing the groundwork of justifying this change it will not get done]]]

I'm not sure what you mean by "justifying". Could it be that the need for LESS support staff is justification enough in this sluggish economy? Let's face it, there has been PLENTY of published reports stating that Macs simply cost less to support and maintain. This is where the Total-Cost-Of-Ownership comes in. Many people base their purchases on INITIAL price. They don't consider how much it's going to cost them in the long run. This is EXACTLY what M$ banked on when it duped everyone into relying so heavily on their products. Furthermore, it's that same industry that brought those costs upon themselves. If there was a more diverse playing field with more options and choices, Companies wouldn't come to rely on products for a single vendor or single solution. In this case Windows. Could it have to do with IT managers and support staff wanting to secure their jobs? I believe it is at least a moderate reason, and not so far-fetched. The sad part is that most of these support people really only know a single platform (again, Windows). Ask them to configure, support and maintain another platform and many will be stumped. Is this the kind of "expert" you want to higher to maintain your setup? If so, then be prepared to be married to that particular platform for a long, long time.

Being less diverse (and having less options) will end up costing a LOT more. So, I say support costs alone will be justification enough or at least go a long way toward a Mac-based solution.

[[[The wants of the End Users aside - is there a company that has gone to DS and requested V5 Solutions to run on Macintosh under OS X?]]]

That's a good question. Are you assuming that there isn't? I'd assume that there *must* have been. And that's what this list is supposed to (sort of) investigate. On the other hand, it gets back to one of my initial observations. If something wasn't offered as a solution to begin with, then why bother to seek that alternative? Here is a clear-ringing case where DS can simply port, through a recompile their CATIA environment to run under X-Window in OS X. If the infrastructure exists to support current UNIX versions then it will cover the initial OS X support as well.

[[[PTC Website - Answers to Questions from the Pro/DESKTOP Webcast and Demo - March 2002
http://www.ptc.com/company/mail/express200203/desktop_qa.htm
"What's involved in porting Pro/DESKTOP to the new Macintosh OS X-based machines? There is an enormous educational market out there, and these machines are EXTREMELY fast. We are aware of the Macintosh platform and its impressive capabilities. The decision to develop a MAC port requires commercial justification and we are interested in any input which contributes to the business case."]]]

Well, not to sound like I'm thumping my chest, but I still have the e-mails that I sent to PTC over a year ago bringing OS X to their attention. They didn't even know it existed let alone know what it was. They seemed even more surprised that it was a Berkeley UNIX. Anyway, a brief dialogue was opened with them through e-mail for a while and I got some pretty positive vibes from them. However, what I think PTC is trying to say is that for an honest, all-out, true-to-design Macintosh version to happen, it would cost a fair amount in R&D. However, I'm not certain they are aware that OS X is *really* UNIX-based, so getting one of their other UNIX versions of Pro/E to run would be a LOT simpler and cost effective at first. Similarly, the engineers that

rely on the Mac for specific tasks and also rely on Pro/E for Windows or UNIX for others can now unite the functionality under a single machine. Again the TCO comes to mind.

[[[a company typically spends much more on training than on the software itself.]]]

That's another problem. Simply *training* someone on a particular product does nothing but make them knowledgeable of that specific product. Reminds me of trained chimps. Why not focus more on the background, concepts and ideas rather than on a particular application? Why shouldn't these people (who are paid big bucks) be able to move seamlessly from one application to another similar or related application with ease? Why should it be a task or in many cases, impossible? So, the role of schools should be places of learning - not as vocational education factories for training on particular applications; We can train just about anyone like that. The end result are individuals who aren't diverse enough to make the shift if one was to occur. But getting back to the PTC. That is interesting. It's been a common rumor for quite some time that Apple was in the market for a high-end CAD solution. Given Apple's recent buying-spree of high-end graphics companies, some of which only offered Windows-based products (i.e., Spruce Technologies) It could be that Apple is eyeing a High-end CAD company as well. Spruce, Nothing Real, Raycer, Prismo, Silicon Grail et. al. all offered extremely high-priced solutions to their customers. Some in excess of $13,000 a pop. So it is conceivable that Apple could acquire a company like PTC and develop their own in-house solution. So much for the Windows version though. That'll definitely be history. Unix and Linux versions will likely continue.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72505)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 27, 2002 11:18 AM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: Re: CATIA on Mac OS X

[[Do you mean the company that develops the particular application or Apple supporting OS X for enterprise?]]
No I mean a using company like Ford, Boeing, Electric Boat, or another company that purchases the licenses for the use of the V5 Solutions.

May you could get the architectural firms to request this functionality!

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72506)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 27, 2002 11:46 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA on Mac OS X

Well, that would mean a departure from their current "Windows-is-the-only-solution" mentality. To do that they would have to test their IT staff and see if they are diverse enough to make the shift or at least a partial integration. Most of these IT people like their job. They WANT M$ solutions because for the most part it's all that they know. If these companies were willing to higher people like John Welch (just using him as an example of someone who is diverse and knowledgeable about MANY platforms) instead of high-school kids and other people who are simply only MCSE certified. These are the people who are milking the company and the higher up fall prey to them.

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72507)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 27, 2002 12:20 PM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: RE: CATIA on Mac OS X

So is there a company or industry that will make the case? Ed M. on the web you are a very outspoken person. You more than anyone should be able to build the support for a using industry to justify the addition of the Mac to the supported hardware for the V5 Solutions. What is your background in the CATIA products? For example I have 250 hours in V3, nearly 10,000 hours in V4, and 2,000 or so hours in V5- primarily in the design of electrical systems installations. Designing harnesses and harness support structure for aerospace applications. I am currently working within in a team that is developing common processes for my company and generating requirements for vendor software enhancements. I also co-Chair the Electro-Mechanical Engineering Development Planning Council at the CATIA Operators Exchange (COE) that I have attended since 1996 - Tell us about yourself. Have you Used CATIA? Do you participate in the design of a product for a company? Have you attended COE? If we can keep this forum and the thread about the support for the MAC civil the others here may be more supportive than you think. Let work together and share success in making V5 a great set of tools for product lifecycle management.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72508)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 27, 2002 01:43 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA for Mac OS X

[[[So is there a company or industry that will make the case?]]]

Make what case? CATIA for OS X? Too much time and red tape. I already suggested what the CATIA team could do. They can either choose to recompile an existing UNIX version to run on OS X or maybe they can offer a stripped-down version. In either case, It seem that it would be far easier to gauge demand once something is actually available. You still see the problem in terms of "demand". I agree, but no option currently exists

[[[Ed M. on the web you are a very outspoken person.]]]

Yes, I tend to be. Mostly regarding issues with Micro$oft. Not only that, but I see OS X as fertile ground for new development. Are you saying that we've pretty much reached a threshold where we don't really need another platform or solutions? I'm not sure I'm getting the gist of what you are getting at.

[[[You more than anyone should be able to build the support for a using industry to justify the addition of the Mac to the supported hardware for the V5 Solutions.]]]

Well, I think that is being a tad sarcastic, but that's OK. Before I brought the subject up for discussion, was there any previous mention of OS X on this forum? Uhh huh, that's what I thought.

[[[What is your background in the CATIA products?]]]

Absolutely none :-)

[[[For example I have 250 hours in V3, nearly 10,000 hours in V4, and 2,000 or so hours in V5- primarily in the design of electrical systems installations.]]]

That sounds very exciting actually. But what does that have to do with the proposal of bringing CATIA to Mac OS X? After all, this discussion is supposed to be for people who are interested in that end. It isn't to get railroaded on tangents and other off-topics irrelevant to this particular one.

[[[..... I also co-Chair the Electro-Mechanical Engineering Development Planning Council at the CATIA Operators Exchange (COE) that I have attended since 1996]]]

That's good. Perhaps you could introduce the possibility of CATIA on OS X to the development team. In any event, the main focus is to stir interest in OS X. Heaven knows DS was willing to bring their wares to the Windows platform. Surely this had to do with the fact that the Windows platform is the best suited for the task... After all, it has an extremely efficient interface and everything works as advertised.

[[[- Tell us about yourself.]]]

Nah, I'm not interesting enough; besides, what does that have to do with considering CATIA for OS X?

[[[Have you Used CATIA?]]]

I believe I already answered that.

[[[If we can keep this forum and the thread about the support for the MAC civil the others here may be more supportive than you think.]]]

Actually, I think it's been very civil, but for some strange reason you seem very skeptical of the idea. Might I ask what your experience is with the Mac or OS X? Have you had any working relationship with Apple Computer exploring the possibility of developing solutions? I'm not sure any of our personal information is relevant to the discussion at hand. Again, I'd like to see developers diversify and offer solutions for various platforms instead of just one. This will ensure that there is ample choice for EVERYONE regarding the tools they choose to use. That said, I will continue to advocate and support the proliferation of Mac OS X and Mac OS X-based applications.

[[[Let work together and share success in making V5 a great set of tools for product lifecycle management.]]]

Agreed, but we really should also be open-minded to the fact that other technologies actually do exist that could prove extremely beneficial to the further success of V5, and to realize that life isn't all about Microsoft and what they can try to do for everyone.

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72510)

Date: June 27, 2002 03:01 PM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: RE: CATIA for Mac OS X

[[That sounds very exciting actually. But what does that have to do with the proposal of bringing CATIA to Mac OS X? After all, this discussion is supposed to be for people who are interested in that end. It isn't to get railroaded on tangents and other off-topics irrelevant to this particular one.]]
I believe it has everything with it. Let us look at the history of just CATIA for a moment. When CATIA was first developed it ran from mainframe computers running MVS. This was true well into version 4. When several businesses made the justification of bring CATIA to Unix OS. DS started porting their code from mainframe to Unix. This was because of the high cost of mainframes. During the time they ported their code into V4 they worked with their customers to develop new functionalities for V4 like E3D the Products that enhance my job. Also during this time customers were working on porting their code written to take advantage of the provided API's from DS to customize CATIA for their processes. Right now the V5 Activities are very similar to what happened in V4 Porting and Enhancement. After this activity or late in this activity if a customer can justify this enhancement they might.

[[[What is your background in the CATIA products?
Absolutely none :-)]]]
Do you work for a company that uses CATIA or any of the V5 Solutions?

[[That's good. Perhaps you could introduce the possibility of CATIA on OS X to the development team. In any event, the main focus is to stir interest in OS X.]]
I would be happy to if my company had even one Mac in the product definition teams. Today we use a mix of Unix on varies Platforms and PC's using various OS's (Not Just Windows). We once had Mac's and no longer do. So a request from my company to DS for this functionality would not be justified unless we would commit to the Mac OS. We are not going to - unless you can show me the customers (IE the companies) that want it. I would be happy to talk with them to provide the need input to DS.

[[[- Tell us about yourself.
Nah, I'm not interesting enough; besides, what does that have to do with considering CATIA for OS X?]]]
On the contrary every one who can wish that NewTek, PTC, or CATIA would market to Mac is very interesting. As for what does that have to do with considering CATIA for OS X - Think that soon even high end PLM Solution will be common even in Small Companies that may only have one seat. They may be a vendor to a bigger company that uses their products or services. If you had the right back ground DS could use your justification to start that work. But it will take a current user (Company) to convince DS to make that investment. If all you are trying to do is have each company code their software for every computer on the market then let us ask for OS X to run on a PC, Amiga, or a Sega game console. 8-{)

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72512)

Date: July 07, 2002 11:48 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: CATIA Recompiled for X-window first

[[[I would be happy to if my company had even one Mac in the product definition teams. Today we use a mix of Unix on varies Platforms and PC's using various OS's (Not Just Windows).]]]

Now I'm a bit curious... Which platforms and operating systems do you use? I'll bet that for the most part you've probably adopted what amounts to mostly Wintel machines. Of course I'm just guessing, but examining the breakdown further might be interesting. Do you have any idea what the support costs of supporting those platforms is? Again, I'm just curious. On the other hand, it might be wiser to look at the specifics. Perhaps you could provide us with the breakdown of what it takes for you company to support the Windows platform. In that, I'd be interested in the yearly $$ amount. The breakdown should include all the support staff assigned to the platform, the cost of upgrades (hardware and software), security patches / testing. Since I'm sure that these machines are set up on a network of some sort the cost-per-client should also be taken into account. This would be the roundabout figure associated with supporting the Wintel machines. Obviously I've skimmed over the details, but it would certainly be interesting to get an idea of what the yearly support costs amount to.

[[[We once had Mac's and no longer do. So a request from my company to DS for this functionality would not be justified unless we would commit to the Mac OS.]]]

And you dropped your Macs in what year?

[[[We are not going to - unless you can show me the customers (IE the companies) that want it. I would be happy to talk with them to provide the need input to DS.]]]

In other words you want to see other companies committing to OS X before you consider it? I'm not sure I follow the reasoning. Could you be a little more specific? I would think that Boeing would evaluate such an option on their own; unless of course the IT staff is comprised of people that are completely unfamiliar with it. I guess it depends on who is calling the shots and which platform they are familiar with.

[[[If all you are trying to do is have each company code their software for every computer on the market then let us ask for OS X to run on a PC, Amiga, or a Sega game console]]]

I'm not sure where you are going with this comment and considering you decided to support the Windows platform it almost seem comical (and I mean that). After all *someone* had to convince (persuade?) Boeing (and DS) to support Windows. I'd be curious to know what that justification was and what it *really* amounts to. I'm sure many of the reasons provided for the port could also be made for OS X. However, we've been getting a bit off target. The main focus of this discussion was to stimulate interest in OS X and to see how many would be interested in having CATIA available for it. You brought up the cost of porting the app. I'm not sure I'm *totally* convinced it would amount to that much. Even if it did, I'm certain Apple would be willing (and delighted) to pick up a large chunk if DS (or Boeing) inquired. Similarly, you brought up the point of *demand* and as I stated earlier, You can't gauge demand unless *something* is available so you can weigh the options. There is in fact no option.

To remedy that and to reach a common ground would be to simply recompile CATIA to run in X-Window on OS X. What this would do it cut down the porting cost way down and at the same time this move

could be used as a barometer to gauge demand for a full-out OS X version. I say this because there are in fact UNIX versions of CATIA that are already being run. Getting it to run in X-window on OS X seems to be the perfect starting point and probably wouldn't incur any additional costs; support or otherwise. At this point it becomes a question of "why not?" rather than a question of "why?"

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72630)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 10, 2002 08:30 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Argument makes sense to me...

Well, it appears that David Every has provided an argument for apps (CATIA in this case) to migrate to OS X. Does anyone have any thoughts on this?

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72696)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 15, 2002 03:23 PM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: Re: Argument makes sense to me...

Well I have found a business case that has been documented in a format that I think you might be able to work with.
12 Jul 2002 - Autocad on Mac OS X Update Report - OS X version worth approx. $55 Million to AutoDesk
http://www.architosh.com/news/2002-07/2002a1-0711-axad-ox1.phtml
Once again this would need to be done by thoughts that would at a company level or group of uses to drive an opportunity to have CATIA on MAC OSX. Architosh has been working for two and a half year to get AutoDesk to market AutoCAD on MAC OSX.
Here is an example of the figures that would need to be worked up in order to get in front of DS will a serous proposal.
http://www.macevangelist.com/home/petitions/autocad/index.html
Similar work would need to be done to bring DS to the same point. I will note that AutoDesk made no firm commitments to this development that I could fined in the article.
Instead of saying Develop it and they will come develop a business proposal and convince the DS of the customer base.
Attend CATIA Training and see what CATIA is like. Go to the national conference and get involved in making the tools better.
These build value in you effort. These things are considered good for business.

Date: July 18, 2002 07:44 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Re: Re: Argument makes sense to me...

Mr. Suhr,

After discussing this topic with a colleague it would seem that you are missing the point with respect to what John Welch and Dave Every are attempting to convey.

First and foremost, *customers* shouldn't have to make these decisions for the company. This job lies squarely on the shoulders of the organization. You mention the AutoCAD petition articles that my friend Anthony has been running for over 2 years now. They are in fact pretty thorough; however, I suggest that you look at it from a different angle.

Instead of looking at it as a potential return-on-investment, look at it as loosing big $$ in a potential market. In the case of Autodesk we can look at it as $55 million dollar blunder that allowed them to loose an entirely NEW (and growing) market. In effect NOT porting to OS X or the Mac) cost them.

My colleague also pointed out that had Autodesk invested the necessary resources to port to OS X (maybe $5M max) their return on investment would have amounted to OVER 5x!! You'll be hard pressed to find another business that can provide over 5x return-on-investment. And 5 million is highballing the figure since most of the code is already written.

To get directly to the point, my colleague (a very SMART man) says in short that "AutoCAD has blown it, and people are demonstrating how, and now what? That customers should show the same thing to CATIA or SolidWorks? (And porting costs should be less, since there is already UNIX versions, etc.)... "

Sorry Mr. Suhr, this makes perfect sense and is an accurate way to look at it. It reinforces my previous arguments and tends to raise questions of the role of politics within the company (DS) regarding such decisions. In short, DS is missing all the benefits that crossplatform development would award them.

Dave Every mentioned that crossplatform development offers you significantly better code and more robust features, but the Mac shouldn't be viewed as just "the other platform"

A significant point that is often overlooked is the fact that there is in fact a "crossplatform market". For instance, you

cold look at it as three (or more) separate markets... The Mac market, the PC market and the crossplatform market (the Mac+PC market). That is the Mac+PC markets are markets where organizations use BOTH Mac *and* PC. So, If you support one platform (either one), you are actually missing TWO markets. 1. the other platform AND 2. the cross platform market. This indicates that ANY revenue generated from sales of supporting another platform (in this case Mac OS X/Unix) will also draw revenue from the *combined* market as well. How can you (or rather DS) not see the potential benefits? I alluded to the *polotics* earlier. Either it's that or a simple oversight on the part of DS. There are other cost savings as well...

Historically, it's been *well* documented that it costs developers less to support the Mac than it does the PC. That means for every customer you convert to the Mac version you get a complete upgrade that you might not have sold (or at the very least a "competitive" upgrade, but the additional cost savings associated with supporting the Mac will provide additional revenue in the form of savings. Again, just another way to look at it. Most people and organizations only care to look at it from a single angle (narrow minded and shortsighted). Perhaps you could bring these things up in your meetings with DS. I'm sure they will consider these arguments. Pass along the whole topic discussion and see if anyone from the company is willing to provide feedback and clarification. Oh, and just so you know... Alias|Wavefront grew their Maya market 25% by deciding to support the Macintosh OS X platform. This should open some eyes over at DS, no?

Best

--
Ed M

PS Have you read the arguments put forth by John Welch and Dave Every?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72795)

Date: September 24, 2002 10:33 PM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: CATIA on XDarwin/XWindows

[[[Ed M. on the web you are a very outspoken person. You more than anyone should be able to build the support for a using industry to justify the addition of the Mac to the supported hardware for the V5 Solutions.]]]

Seems to me... this is what he is doing... He's getting people who work with the software on a daily basis to consider its use on the Mac OS.

Justification for its development (if not only as an XDarwin-optomized version) is simple.

Mac OS is the largest UNIX on the market. When you add in all the other UNIX and *NIX OSes that also run XDarwin-compatible (XWindows), then that market share is far greater. When you consider that most people that use the Mac OS (and a large majority of UNIX and *NIX users are already entrenched in relatively similar fields to the solutions that CATIA provides, the opportunity for growth in this sector is proportionally greater than what it is in Windows.

I would suspect that a code tweak for XDarwin to the already-existant UNIX code base could increase revenues for the product by as much as 15%.

I can't imagine any businessman snubbing his nose at an additional 15% increase in revenue for such a small investment.

If this increase in revenue seems solid enough, it would only seem logical to take the next step and develop a native version (using cocoa or carbon API) for the largest UNIX on the planet. (Mac OSX)

Kelly McNeill

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73940)

Date: July 23, 2002 04:45 AM
Author: Eddy
Subject: Take it easy

Hi Tim,

Take it easy, don't spend your time to argue. No one here take repsonse cause for me is just a Mac OS salesman try to sell something out.

I do not think I will buy CATIA because CATIA support MAC OS X.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72887)

Date: July 23, 2002 06:55 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Time to offer better options, more choice and become more divers

[[[Take it easy, don't spend your time to argue.]]]

No one is arguing. Tim asked me to *make a case* for CATIA or other DS products on the Mac. I've made several. He's yet to reply to either me, Dave Every or John C. Welch.

[[[No one here take repsonse cause for me is just a Mac OS salesman try to sell something out.]]]

Salesman? Hardly. I neither work for Apple nor an independent promotions company. I have no vested interest in Apple other than to see that the best technology is available for people who require nothing less than the best. If you get some time you should really research the company (Apple). I think you're a little behind the times.

Oh, and don't forget the fact that Alias|Wavefront's business grew 25% because of the port to Mac OS X!

Conversely, you could say that Autodesk blew a $55-million opportunity to grow and expand. What *new* markets are *they* getting into? Hmmmm.

[[[I do not think I will buy CATIA because CATIA support MAC OS X.]]]

Are you from the United States? I'm just curious. Anyway, that's HARDLY a case against the project. Just because *you* might not opt for it doesn't imply that others won't.

Sometimes people *really do* want the better technology and tools to do their jobs -- Often they want options *other than* Windows... I could go on, but I think a solid case has been built -- with solid reasoning. None of our points have been disputed. I'm still waiting for a reply to my *previous* post. As are John and Dave I'm sure.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=72890)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 31, 2002 10:41 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: PTC to bring Pro/E to OS X? It sure looks like it....

PTC to bring Pro/E to OS X? It sure looks like it....

See here: http://www.architosh.com/news/2002-07/2002b-0731-proE.phtml

Looks like PTC is interested. I'm glad PTC finally decided to look into OS X when I brought it to their attention back in 2000 (I have the e-mail exchange). And where is Dassault? Still waiting to follow in the footsteps of Autodesk? At least Autodesk is finally starting to realize that they made a mistake by not porting to the Mac. And the current petition shows that to be a $55,000,000 mistake. New markets means new $$.

Why hasn't DS responded and what happened to Mr. Suhr? It would be nice to reopen this discussion in light of the current news from PTC.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73043)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 08:49 AM
Author: Mike
Subject: Re: PTC to bring Pro/E to OS X? It sure looks like it....

Ed M. Do ya think PTC is taking its last stab at trying to stay alive? I think because PTC is doing it, DS shouldn't do it. Do you follow the CAD market at all or just OS X? Who do you think is making the right decision, DS's Market cap is almost 4X larger then PTC? PTC is only making money on Wind-chill; their Cad package hasn't made money in years.

Hey Ed, can you tell me a couple large companies (i.e. Boeing, Daimler Chrysler, Volvo, etc) that use PTC? So do you think major manufacturing company's pick their CAD system because of what platform they run on or the one which will save the company the most money? And do you think any Large DS customers would switch to PTC because they are ported to OS X? I guess DS is probably thinking, "why should we change

anything when we rule the CAD world. I bet DS doesn't even feel PTC is a major competitor any more. PTC's stock is down almost 70% this year. DS's stock is trading at 10X PTC's. WHO IS MAKING THE RIGHT DECISIONS?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73052)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 09:11 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: "Some companies only exist as an example to others on what not t

And I think that quote applies here...

[[[What platform they run on or the one which will save the company the most money?]]]

Windows/Microsoft save you money? LINUX and x86 save you money?

You have to be joking.

[[[And do you think any Large DS customers would switch to PTC because they are ported to OS X?]]]

You missed the point completely. I'm not suggesting that anyone switch applications at all. Where did I imply that?

[[[I guess DS is probably thinking, "why should we change anything when we rule the CAD world.]]]

Then you should go back and read what Dave Every wrote. OS X is coming and in a BIG way.

[[[I bet DS doesn't even feel PTC is a major competitor any more.]]]

Sigh I was using it as a reference to show that companies that were once blindly married to a specific platform for reasons that even they couldn't explain are now considering making the switch or "addition".

You say that PTC is dying, but at least they are making an effort to expand their market. DS has the same opportunity, How do you explain Alias|Wavefront and Maya business growing over 25%?

[[[DS's stock is trading at 10X PTC's. WHO IS MAKING THE RIGHT DECISIONS?]]]

That depends on who's pulling who's strings... My answer would be *Micro$oft*, but I really don't want to get into a debate on this one, so lets keep it pertinent to the topic in hand. BTW, did you read *any* of the other posts?

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73053)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 09:23 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: "Some companies only exist as an example to others on what not t

"Some companies only exist as an example to others on what not to do." - DKE

And I think that quote is starting to apply here...

So, is it wise for DS to increasingly *bind* themselves to a single, proprietary platform running MS-Windows (it seem to be the direction they are headed) or would it be wiser for them to diversify?

[[[What platform they run on or the one which will save the company the most money?]]]

Windows/Microsoft save you money? LINUX and x86 save you money? How much do you suppose they save these companies?

You have to be joking.

[[[And do you think any Large DS customers would switch to PTC because they are ported to OS X?]]]

You missed the point completely. I'm not suggesting that anyone switch applications at all. Where did I imply that?

[[[I guess DS is probably thinking, "why should we change anything when we rule the CAD world.]]]

Then you should go back and read what Dave Every wrote. OS X is coming and in a BIG way.

[[[I bet DS doesn't even feel PTC is a major competitor any more.]]]

Sigh I was using it as a reference to show that companies that were once blindly married to a specific platform for reason that even they couldn't explain are now considering making the switch. You say that PTC is dying, but at least they are making an effort to expand their market. DS has the same opportunity, How do you explain Alias|Wavefront and Maya business growing over 25%?

[[[DS's stock is trading at 10X PTC's. WHO IS MAKING THE RIGHT DECISIONS?]]]

That depends on who's pulling who's strings... I really don't want to get into a debate on this one, so lets keep it pertinent to the topic in hand. BTW, did you read *any* of the other posts?

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73055)

Date: August 01, 2002 09:52 AM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: Obviated

[[I guess DS is probably thinking, "why should we change anything when we rule the CAD world. I bet DS doesn't even feel PTC is a major competitor any more.]]

Every company that is not paranoid about their markets, and thus stops trying to innovate (and penetrate new markets) in order to maximize profits of the now, sells their future for the present. This short-term quarterly report thinking is what has allowed not only companies but whole industries to be eaten alive.

Some of these companies do survive. They go into innovation through acquisition mode; and can sometimes acquire fast enough to tread water or break even. (Or at least slow the innevetible descent into oblivion). Most go under, or become pathetic shadows of they once were, and shameful embarassments compared to their potential.

So, DS rules the CAD market now, but are laying the foundation for their own replacement. New

platforms coming up are ignored, by them, but not their competition. They are entrenched in their current market and profit taking, and so are missing out on many opportunities that their competition isn't. Let's not learn the lessons of Novell, Lotus, DEC, Wang, DataGeneral, Packard Bell, and so on. Let's mimic them, because many of them were profitable, in the short term, right before they focused on the now (too long) and let the competition pass them by, and they disappeared.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73058)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 10:37 AM
Author: Mike
Subject: Re: Obviated

[[Every company that is not paranoid about their markets, and thus stops trying to innovate (and penetrate new markets) in order to maximize profits of the
now, sells their future for the present. This short-term quarterly report thinking is what has allowed not only companies but whole industries to be eaten alive.]]

Well we are talking about the French, I have never met a French man that is paranoid, but I have met lots that are confident. If you think DS is thinking short-term then you might want to look back at the history of DS and you might read a little on what they are doing for the future of manufacturing.

Did you know that DS invests 30% into R&D and PMTC 10%? I would rather see DS invest money in R&D for the tools rather then developing the product for yet another platform.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73060)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 12:02 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Why even develop a Windows version for that matter?

[[[I would rather see DS invest money in R&D for the tools rather then developing the product for yet another platform.]]]

You'll have to explain the "yet another platform" comment. Don't you think the product is mature enough, robust enough to migrate to other platforms? Someone at DS must have thought migrating to other platforms was a worthwhile endeavor since it's now available for Windows. Still, why would DS begin to defacto-standardize on Windows when their roots clearly show they were immersed in UNIX?

Just out of curiosity, What year did DS start to support the Windows platform? And did you say the same thing when DS pumped R&D $$ into the Windows version? Did you stand up and say to DS that you'd rather see them invest their R&D into their tools rather than port to "yet another platform" (i.e., Windows)?

I don't understand your reasoning. Windows was a COMPLETE detachment from what DS was familiar with, yet they seemed to get the port done rather quickly, no? OS X can bring them back to that familiarity and their roots.

Similarly, I'm guessing that since OS X is a UNIX variant, it will take them a lot further and allow them greater flexibility since their knowledge and experience developing for UNIX *must* far surpass their knowledge and experience developing for Windows.

What were the 5 main reasons DS decided to develop a Windows version? Do you suppose *any* of those reasons could be used to justify a Mac OS X version?

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73065)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 01:51 PM
Author: Mike
Subject: Re: Why even develop a Windows version for that matter?

[[Just out of curiosity, What year did DS start to support the Windows platform?]]

around 98-99

[[I don't understand your reasoning. Windows was a COMPLETE detachment from what DS was familiar with, yet they seemed to get the port done rather quickly, no?]]

No!! They didn't get the port done quickly because it wasn't ported to windows. CATIA V4 runs on Unix and CATIA V5 runs on windows and they port it back to Unix.

[[What were the 5 main reasons DS decided to develop a Windows version? Do you suppose *any* of those reasons could be used to justify a Mac OS X version?]]

I would say that the number one reason was because the market demanded it. So your next question is "then we are requesting it to be ported to OS X". My answer is - obviously the people that spend the money and the people that advise those people what the best tools are don't see it the same way that you do.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73067)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 19, 2002 04:08 AM
Author: ian phillips (*ianp@gmx.net*)
Subject: Yes

>Windows was a COMPLETE detachment from what DS was familiar with.
Mike is right. This was deliberate detachment from the past.
A fresh start and a fresh look at where the market is going.

Anyone who is familiar with the CATIA product range knows that its has been built up over 20 years. With bits added to old legacy software.
20 Years ago they could not have predicted the cost of a PC compared to a SGI or Apple machine and their market segments.

Ian

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73319)

Date: August 28, 2002 10:08 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Dependency

[[[This was deliberate detachment from the past. A fresh start and a fresh look at where the market is going.]]]

So, the market is headed to Windows? And that is a "fresh" and "new" look? You must be kidding. Again, why would DS make the same mistake twice buy tying themselves to a single platform when others exist? You would think that during the first 20 years they would have learned the lesson of diversity.

[[[20 Years ago they could not have predicted the cost of a PC compared to a SGI or Apple machine and their market segments.]]]

Certainly they should have seen the need to diversify. Migrating to Windows is nothing new or exciting or fresh. Maybe for DS it is, but then that only shows just how far out of the loop they've been.

Let me ask everyone reading this thread; has anyone bothered to *use* a machine running Mac OS X for anything other than an urge to satisfy a passing curiosity? How about the new 10.2 version of the OS?

The point is if DS *really* wanted to break from the past, a fresh start at something new would be OS X. Not Windows. Windows is nothing fresh and nothing new. I'm not saying that they shouldn't have expanded to include the Windows platform, but at the same time they should have also been expanding to others as well.

How long do you suppose it will take them to break from the past *again* and recreate themselves again? Another 20+ years; or is Windows going to be the "be-all-end-all" of viable development platforms (this time)?

What's alarming is that so many developers and businesses tie themselves to, and rely so heavily upon a *single* entity (M$) that their own existence depends on the general health and prosperity of that single entity (M$). Why not diversify and remove that dependency from the equation?

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73538)

Date: August 01, 2002 04:15 PM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: But what have you done for me lately?!?!

[[Did you know that DS invests 30% into R&D and PMTC 10%?]]]

The percentage isn't as important as how wisely it is spent.

I tend to think that if they ignore the #2 OS, and the #1 UNIX OS, and the fastest growing OS (and UNIX OS), then they are not exactly being wise or planning for the future.

And you have to remember, ignoring that trend means more problems not only for Mac market, but also for all organizations that are mixed environments.

[[I would rather see DS invest money in R&D for the tools rather then developing the product for yet another platform.]]

The tools are the platform. If they don't support my platform, then they are not supporting me (as I would like). This means that they will either drive customers to competing products (and as you know it is 10 times harder to get someone back once they've learned something else), or they will be telling me that my concerns don't matter to them (generating bad will). Neither is good business.

"Yet another platform" that is bigger than all but Windows (and has a few million seats). It seems like they should choose their platforms to reflect market trends, don't you think?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73073)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 05:59 PM
Author: Mike
Subject: Re: But what have you done for me lately?!?!

You win, I can see why you work for mac, you are very good at making excuse and reasons why you arn't number 1.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73075)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 06:21 PM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: Amusement

[[You win, I can see why you work for mac, you are very good at making excuse and reasons why you arn't number 1.]]

Interesting, to make that many mistakes in one sentence:

1) I didn't "win" anything. The only potential here is for you (and others) to lose. (Lose an opportunity to learn something). And based on your reply, I'm guessing that you did that.

2) I don't work for "mac". In fact no one does. Many work for Apple. But I don't work for them either.

3) I hadn't made any excuses, especially on wether Apple (or myself), isn't #1. That wasn't even vaguely in any of my points.

My only points were that it is a good idea for companies to pay attention to their markets and customers. It seems like they are supporting UNIX, but

failing to support the #1 UNIX. That doesn't make much business sense to me.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73076)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 01, 2002 06:29 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Mistakes

[[[You win, I can see why you work for mac]]]

Who is mac? Do you even know what you are talking about?

There is no one on the forum topic that is employed by Apple Computer.

[[[you are very good at making excuse and reasons why you arn't number 1.]]]

You need to get a grip. It's not about winning. I suppose you eat all your meals at McDonnald's?

Anyway, It's about allowing DS to grow and expand into other markets where BOTH companies will benefit. IAs smart as you think you are you don't seem to get it.

The people that have posted here in favor of Mac OS X have provided a solid reasoning for a great app to be ported to a solid platform.

The entire reason for this post is to spark interest and curiosity in OS X. Instead of talking down about it and making excuses why something can't or shouldn't be ported to it, why don't you do yourself a favor and research it a little bit. You might be surprised. It's way ahead of XP in my opinion and I work with both platforms.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73077)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 07, 2002 04:45 PM
Author: bob
Subject: Re: Mistakes

So I was wondering why, if the CAD, Mac market is so good, why Autocad doesn't "STILL" play there? You would think that if it was such a big market that autodesk being the only major cad software that "did" run on Mac that they would continue playing. Why would they throw $55,000,000. away?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73177)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 07, 2002 07:34 PM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: RE: WHY?

> So I was wondering why, if the CAD, Mac market is so good, why Autocad doesn't
> "STILL" play there?... Why would they throw $55,000,000. away?

Incompetence is the most common answer.

Many companies get big in one market and can never expand out (and compete in others). AutoCAD dug their niche (PC's), and have milked it; but couldn't compete in the more artistic (Mac) parts of the market. (Rendering, design, etc). The Mac had a different market segment of users, that they never figured out how to cater to (incompetence).

Another problem is platform; if their entire expertise was in DOS hackers, they could stretch that (eventually) to Windows; but their expertise never included Macs. So they did it so poorly, they drove up their own costs, then blamed the tool (incompetence).

Politics is also an interesting game in many organizations. One manager in charge of one team (say Windows), and another in charge of Macs. Since the majority of the profits are coming from one side, that person can screw the other person over; not because it is good for the organization (or customers), but because of power. (incompetence).

And so on. There are many reasons that companies make bad decisions. I could name ten more... But historically, there are many companies that make millions (or more) in markets that other companies claimed were "unprofitable". It almost always boils down to a company that couldn't figure out how to exploit a market, and so in the spirit of sour grapes, made excuses for their failures, swiped the pieces from the board, and then blamed everyone/everything else for their problems. (You can learn a lot about business from 3-5 year olds).

I'm not even saying it is always wrong. If a company has a choice of doing it poorly, or not at all, often not at all is better. (It costs less, and then you don't look incompetent). But when you do it poorly, and then blame the market, it takes pretty naive people to buy into that. AutoDesk was incompetent -- their only saving grace was milking the market they already had. But that they've failed to expanding into new markets just reflects on them (not on those markets).

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73179)

Date: August 07, 2002 07:35 PM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: RE: WHY?

> So I was wondering why, if the CAD, Mac market is so good,

why Autocad doesn't
> "STILL" play there?... Why would they throw $55,000,000. away?

Incompetence is the most common answer.

Many companies get big in one market and can never expand out (and compete in others). AutoCAD dug their niche (PC's), and have milked it; but couldn't compete in the more artistic (Mac) parts of the market. (Rendering, design, etc). The Mac had a different market segment of users, that they never figured out how to cater to (incompetence).

Another problem is platform; if their entire expertise was in DOS hackers, they could stretch that (eventually) to Windows; but their expertise never included Macs. So they did it so poorly, they drove up their own costs, then blamed the tool (incompetence).

Politics is also an interesting game in many organizations. One manager in charge of one team (say Windows), and another in charge of Macs. Since the majority of the profits are coming from one side, that person can screw the other person over; not because it is good for the organization (or customers), but because of power. (incompetence).

And so on. There are many reasons that companies make bad decisions. I could name ten more... But historically, there are many companies that make millions (or more) in markets that other companies claimed were "unprofitable". It almost always boils down to a company that couldn't figure out how to exploit a market, and so in the spirit of sour grapes, made excuses for their failures, swiped the pieces from the board, and then blamed everyone/everything else for their problems. (You can learn a lot about business from 3-5 year olds).

I'm not even saying it is always wrong. If a company has a choice of doing it poorly, or not at all, often not at all is better. (It costs less, and then you don't look incompetent). But when you do it poorly, and then blame the market, it takes pretty naive people to buy into that. AutoDesk was incompetent -- their only saving grace was milking the market they already had. But that they've failed to expanding into new markets just reflects on them (not on those markets).

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73181)

Date: August 16, 2002 07:42 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Autodesk's revenues, profits fall in Q2

http://maccentral.macworld.com/news/0208/16.autodesk.php

Perhaps they might consider porting to the Mac to gain more revenue...

;-)

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73305)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: September 15, 2002 10:41 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Still opportunities for Dassault

I think Dassault could benefit greatly from porting some of their wares to OS X. I've discussed this with a few other CAD professionals and they seem enthusiastic; especially if it means getting away from Windows, even in some small capacity.

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=73780)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 17, 2002 03:39 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: New IBM PPC 970 developed with Apple in mind?

I suppose if IBM decided to incorporate AltiVec/VMX onto this monster 64-bit processor it pretty much implies that it's geared toward use in Macs. After all why else would IBM utilize AltiVec? Certainly not for Linux. There's plenty of news, information and chatter floating around the web about this new processor that was announced at the recent Microprocessor Forum. It's worth checking out. Or simply head to IBM's site.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74397)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 17, 2002 05:16 PM
Author: Bill Gates (*Bill@macintosh.com*)
Subject: Re: New IBM PPC 970 developed with Apple in mind?

Phil, can you please remove this useless thread, please, please, please.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74402)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 18, 2002 09:18 PM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: Why is the thread useless?

The whole point it to show people that there are alternatives to Micro$oft Windows and that Windows IS NOT the future. It's as simple as that. If for no other reason other than security and stability alone. Sheesh!

What, 60 critical Windows-specific vulnerabilities in less than a year?!? Four in the last 2 weeks! Give us a break! Windows is a house-of-cards.

Listen bud, Mac OS X is here to stay. It's already *the* #1 (can you read that? N-U-M-B-E-R-ONE) UNIX on the planet right now. For Dassault to ignore that FACT would be ridiculous.

And now that Apple and Dassault's primary marketing company (IBM) are developing a workstation-class CPU together, I think it's only logical that Dassault follow through with optimizations geared toward this new IBM CPU (that is if IBM has anything to say about it).

By the way, this CPU will NOT run Windows. So get over it. IBM designed it that way. So, after Dassault is done optimizing for these new IBM workstations, It should be a snap to port the code over to Mac OS X, which will presumably be running on these new CPUs as well. That is to say.. If any Dassault products run on AIX/IBM-LINUX they have to be optimized for this new 64-bit CPU. IBM is aiming it toward their own workstation-class desktops with this CPU.

Once again, OS X is the best UNIX available, and for Dassault to ignore that fact would be completely insane. Eventually, the #1 UNIX will be running on this workstation-class hardware, but will SolidWorks or CATIA follow? I hope so because the code-base will soon take a turn for the worst if Dassault actually tries to port their wares to the up-and-coming 64-bit processors that will be offered by the competition. Will Dassault port to the Itanium processor family? If so keep in mind that the entire ISA has changed and a complete rewrite will be in order (again). Emulation you say? Well, you can forget that because it will be unusably slow. As for AMD workstations ... well, Dassault will have to maintain yet ANOTHER Windows/Linux code base for their products if they want it to run on *that* hardware because it will be different as well. And forget the fact that Microsoft hasn't planned on supporting the new 64-bit AMD CPUs officially yet (if ever.) So, that will make how many different Windows-centric code-bases for Dassault to maintain? Count 'em. Oh, and then there will be the support costs for each version...

On the other hand, Dassault can rewrite the Unix versions that they ALREADY have and forget about the hassle associated with Windows-64/32 on Intel-64/AMD-64 which will all need to be different (and won't run on these new CPUs). Or does Dassault plan on running on 32-bit Pentium 4 systems forever? I hate to break your heart, Bill, but OS X is *the* UNIX by which all others are judged. It's time for Dassault to take a look. Period.

This is all that this thread was intended to do. I gather that Phil is bright enough to see that too. And your last post wasn't very mature. silly in fact. Again, solid arguments in favor of OS X have been put forth and it seems that no one has been able to counter any of them as of yet.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74429)

Date: October 21, 2002 09:05 AM
Author: Timothy J. Suhr (*timothy.j.suhr@boeing.com*)
Subject: RE: Why is the thread useless? One Possilbe Answer!

Ed you asked why is this thread useless? One possible answer would be that you are to abrasive for most people; you simple rub them the wrong way. Ed, you have some very good points in your wanting CATIA on OS X – they are being lost by the hostility. As I have been told myself a time or two "You can catch more flies with honey than you can with vinegar." If you focus and lead you will see more effort and consideration given to you point of view. I have tried in the past on this thread to arm you with the proper tools to provide to show Dassault Systèmes (DS) that MAC OS X is a good platform for engineering work. DS has never just done it for the fun, or because someone said they should. They use Business Cases to write core engineering-

applications based on their customer requirements. If their customers can be lead into understanding that MAC OS X is good for business they will start making it a requirement.
· I know you do not use CATIA what CAD systems do you use now?
· What industry do you work in? (Aerospace, Automotive, ETC.)
· Does the company you work for use CATIA?
These questions could be used to show the customer base. Have you had any luck within your company to support the MAC OS X as a viable engineering design platform?

Show us you are not just a MAC zealot!

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74453)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 21, 2002 09:24 AM
Author: David K. Every (*dke@mac.com*)
Subject: RE: zealotry

> Ed, you
> have some very good points in your wanting CATIA on OS X ˆ they are being lost
> by the hostility.

While I understand your point, I'd like to ask, "whose hostility"? The anti-change or anti-Mac hostility, or the responses?

Sometimes we get more caustic when people ignore our points, or just argue to hear themselves type.

> As I have been told myself a time or two "You can catch
> more flies with honey than you can with vinegar."

Point taken...

> They use Business Cases to write core
> engineering-applications based on their customer requirements.

Except any of us experienced in business and engineering know that those cases are often highly biased by a few individuals inside the organizations, that will make decisions based on personal biases and agendas, and not on the objective facts. And often, they miss the forest through the trees; and sometimes grass roots bludgeons are required to beat them out of their stupor. More often than not, even that doesn't work. Dilbert is life.

>If their
> customers can be lead into understanding that MAC OS X is good for business
> they will start making it a requirement.

Agreed. Unless their bias or egos won't let them.

> · I know you do not use CATIA what CAD systems do you use now?
> · What industry do you work in? (Aerospace, Automotive, ETC.)
> · Does the company you work for use CATIA?

Those are irrelevant questions; the questions that should be asked are what CAD system would we like to use, or is there a market for CATIA on OSX?

> Show us you are not just a MAC zealot!

One's personal agendas do not change the truth (or untruth) of what they are saying; they

just show the motivations for saying it.

The company (and readers) should be questioning the logic of what is being said, completely separate from who is saying it, or why.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74455)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 21, 2002 11:41 PM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: Re: RE: Why is the thread useless? One Possilbe Answer!

"Ed you asked why is this thread useless? One possible answer would be that you are to abrasive for most people; you simple rub them the wrong way."

I've been reading these forums since Ed posed the initial question at hand and believe that he has composed himself very well... surely not in an abrasive manor although I can't say the same for some of the posts that were made in response to him. Frankly, I'm surprised that Ed has managed to keep such a cool head throughout these discussions.

"Ed, you have some very good points in your wanting CATIA on OS X – they are being lost by the hostility."

It seemed to me that any hint of aggression that I saw was well deserved considering the feedback he received.

"If you focus and lead you will see more effort and consideration given to you point of view."

From what I've read, Ed has exhibited this type of idealistic behavior, yet his efforts seem to have been received by stubborn minds.

"I have tried in the past on this thread to arm you with the proper tools to provide to show Dassault Systèmes (DS) that MAC OS X is a good platform for engineering work. DS has never just done it for the fun, or because someone said they should. They use Business Cases to write core engineering-applications based on their customer requirements. If their customers can be lead into understanding that MAC OS X is good for business they will start making it a requirement."

From what I've read, Ed has provided all the necessary arguments which suggest that such a move to OS X would be very profitable and thus worthwhile.

"Have you had any luck within your company to support the MAC OS X as a viable engineering design platform?"

I can't speak for Ed, by the company I work within was completely Windows-based, but after one Mac purchase, we've since decided that all future computer purchases will be strictly Macintosh.

"Show us you are not just a MAC zealot!"

Stop accusing people of zealotry when they are simply passionate about a superior

technology which hasn't yet received full recognition for its capabilities.

Speaking of zealotry, most people attribute the use of all-caps in "Mac" (MAC) to be anti-Apple/anti-Mac. Its similar to the way in which someone might call Microsoft Microsloth or some other disparaging term. Do I detect excess amounts of Zeal in your words?

Thou dost protest too much

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74463)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 09:59 AM
Author: ian phillips (*ianp@gmx.net*)
Subject: Not useless

Kelly

Sure there are stubborn minds out there. But Ed has been a bit heavy handed with his responses, even to people who are non Anti Mac. (see my early posts in this thread).

It's good that Ed is passionate about this topic, but most people here dont care about the OS. And most have no influence either. It is therefore understandably irritating when someone doesnt care about a subject you are passionate about.

Ed has to woo people over to his point of view. And good luck to him. Some of his posts are VERY long though!

Ian

PS. IF OSX ran on a cheap PC (Like Linux) it would help too!

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74480)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 10:37 AM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: Not useless

"Sure there are stubborn minds out there. But Ed has been a bit heavy handed with his responses, even to people who are non Anti Mac. (see my early posts in this thread)."

I saw no such instances of abrasivness... (although I did see some slightly more agressive behavor which seems justified IMHO after reading some of the replies that were offered to him that seemed a bit over the top.)

"It's good that Ed is passionate about this topic, but most people here dont care about the OS."

Perhaps it's because their OS never gave them anything to be passionate about.

"And most have no influence either."

I don't believe that... A person working for CATIA (no matter where he or she sits on the corporate totem poll) can have SOME influence over the direction of the software. Additionally, prospective purchasers have the software who are considering the use of OS X within their company may feel inclined to participate in the effort to bring the company's 3D software to OS X by simply calling the company and expressing their interest in the product... (if at least only under an XWindows/XDarwin install like Ed had suggested)

"It is therefore understandably irritating when someone doesnt care about a subject you are passionate about."

If you're not interested, why not simply leave the thread? If you are going out of your way to subject yourself to that which you consider to be irritating, than it's no fault of Ed's.

"Ed has to woo people over to his point of view. And good luck to him. Some of his posts are VERY long though!"

Ed seems to be proposing some very thought provoking arguments. If it takes a lot to express those arguments... then so be it.

Perhaps you shouldn't take such a defensive stance, and listen to what he has to say.

"PS. IF OSX ran on a cheap PC (Like Linux) it would help too!

And if a Mercedes used cheap yugo parts, it would help too! But then, it wouldn't be a Mercedes then would it.

(Linux runs on PowerPC too... and the experience is far superior to that of a cheap x86 PC if you ask me)

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74483)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 11:08 AM
Author: ian phillips (*ianp@gmx.net*)
Subject: Caution can pay off.

>Perhaps it's because their OS never had anything to be passionate about.
Maybe true. But my point is that many people here just dont care or understand about OSs.

>A person working for CATIA... SOME influence over the direction of the software.
Also Likely. But most people in this forum dont work for Catia. They genuinely dont have influence.

>If you're not interested, why not simply leave the thread?
1. I am interested.
2. Be careful about asking people to leave the thread. It goes down badly. (It may be taken as abrasive)
3. I have expressed positive interest in OSX (see my postings in June and today)

>Perhaps you might want to not take such a defensive stance.
What defensive stance? My posts are ALL positive to OSX, but explain to you why many people and companies (rightly or wrongly) just go with the flow.

Try not to dismiss my points. I am not against OSX. I would like to see you persuade more people to your cause. But dont be too downhearted if they dont understand.

Ian

PS I am passionate about CAD

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74484)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 11:44 AM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: Re: Caution can pay off.

"Maybe true. But my point is that many people here just dont care or understand about OSs."

Perhaps they should if it could help Dassault's bottom line.

>A person working for CATIA... SOME influence over the direction of the software.
Also Likely. But most people in this forum dont work for Catia. They genuinely dont have influence.

"2. Be careful about asking people to leave the thread. It goes down badly. (It may be taken as abrasive)"

I didn't mean it that way... I was saying that if its irrating then don't read it... if it does interest you... then do... simple as that. There's no reason to regard someone's long post as being overly obtrusive. The individual simply has a lot to say.

"3. I have expressed positive interest in OSX (see my postings in June and today)"

Wonderful. =)

"My posts are ALL positive to OSX, but explain to you why many people and companies (rightly or wrongly) just go with the flow."

Understood... but I'm just suggesting why a company shouldn't just go with the flow.

"Try not to dismiss my points."

Please don't misunderstand... I'm not dismissing your points... although sometimes I might have something to say about some of your or other people's comments.

"I am not against OSX. I would like to see you persuade more people to your cause. But dont be too downhearted if they dont understand."

I am (I would imagine Ed is too) all about helping people understand.

"PS I am passionate about CAD"

If a different platform made your CAD using experience significantly better, perhpas you might also be passionate about it as well. =)

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74491)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 23, 2002 06:33 AM
Author: ian phillips (*ianp@gmx.net*)
Subject: Tell us more..

Kelly

>If a different platform made your CAD using experience
> significantly better, perhpas you might also be passionate
> about it as well.

We need any advancement we can get our hands on. What sort of improvements should we expect if Catia were to run on OSX?

Ian

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74509)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 24, 2002 11:50 AM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: Re: Tell us more..

"What sort of improvements should we expect if Catia were to run on OSX?"

That's up to the folks at DS and if they choose to take advantage of the Macintosh's unique strengths as apposed to making a shoddy port of the Windows version.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74546)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 11:15 AM
Author: Mike Spellacy (*mikespellacy@freightliner.com*)
Subject: Re: Not useless

"It's good that Ed is passionate about this topic, but most people here dont care about the OS. And most have no influence either. It is therefore understandably irritating when someone doesnt care about a subject you are passionate about."

Ian I totaly agree with you on this point. I bet 95% or more of the users here have no idea what os they are running on and they don't care as long as it runs.

One question I haven't seen answered that keeps being asked is

What Cad system(s) does Ed use/know?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74485)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 11:30 AM
Author: Robert J. Fink (*Robert.J.Fink@Boeing.com*)
Subject: WHO CARES!!!!!!!

There's my vote!!!!!!!!!!

Actually I'm jealous I don't have the time to waste on this matter like ED!!! I'm to busy actually using the software!

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74489)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 24, 2002 11:31 AM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: Who cares?

"I'm to busy actually using the software!"

Who cares?

Apparently several people, as we'd like to use the software too...

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74544)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 19, 2002 08:16 AM
Author: Phil Harrison (*pph@lionheartsolutions.com*)
Subject: Re: Re: New IBM PPC 970 developed with Apple in mind?

Hmm, let's see:

(UNIX + LINUX) >> /dev/null

Oh, doesn't seem to work.... (on the contrary it really does work & work & work.....)

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74433)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 22, 2002 11:50 AM
Author: Ed M. (*EdsLab2@aol.com*)
Subject: People don't care about the OS??

The following quotes taken from:

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Apple's road less traveled" InfoWorld

"Apple's Mac OS 10.2, aka Jaguar, is regarded by analysts as its most competent operating system for businesses. The Xserve is attracting favorable reviews (see "No worms here"). And the company is touting a new commitment to open standards."

"Xserve is the best solution to us because it is Apple-supported and is cheap if you match it against other solutions from Dell or IBM," said Joeri van Dooren, Fleurop-Interflora coowner and technical director."

"Schiller said Apple's enterprise strategy is to listen closely to the companies that come knocking at its door. "It's not a question of 'should we?' It's more a question of how much resource we put in it now, and how much we get pulled by the market versus push it."

Side Note: So, Why aren't you guys knocking at Apple's door? Is Dassault completely content with a single-platform direction for it's users and apps? That doesn't sound too healthy to me. See David Every's explanation above.

URL:
http://www.infoworld.com/articles/pl/xml/02/10/21/021021plapple.xml
----

The following quotes taken from:
"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Mac marks the enterprise" InfoWorld

"IN MAY 2001, Apple began shipping OS X on new Macs. Six months later, at the O'Reilly Peer-to-Peer and Web Services conference, it was clear that a sea change was under way. The open-source geeks who flock to these events were flouting Microsoft not with PC notebooks running Linux, but with PowerBooks running OS X."

"But the OS X Mac isn't just another Unix box that you can manage with bash, Perl, or Python scripts. It's a consumer-friendly system that is successfully managed in places where IT budgets don't exist and kindergarten teachers double as network administrators. But Apple hasn't rested on its laurels. Despite its Unix roots, OS X makes end-user administration cleaner and simpler than the classic Mac OS ever did. And with Samba, WebDAV, LDAP, and a host of other standards-based integration technologies, it's ready to go to work side-by-side with Windows."

URL:
http://www.infoworld.com/articles/pl/xml/02/10/21/021021plmacent.xml
---

Listed below are the collection of the latest InfoWorld articles. Tons of recently written articles focussing on Apple exist throughout the web. They too emphasize that business would be foolish *not* to consider the Mac as a viable alternative to Windows.

What really annoys me is not so much the anti-Mac sentiment that's been displayed here, but rather the fact that the idea of an alternative to "Windows" is being met with incredible demur. It seems that people are completely content with what Microsoft is producing. The "common platform" argument is a dangerous one indeed. Diversity built on common and open standards is what's needed; not a locked-down, proprietary solution that Microsoft is aiming for.

The argument put forth is that people dont care what operating system the software is running on so long as it's running, well I do NOT buy into that.

If that was the main concern then Dassault would not have moved away from UNIX and embraced Microsoft Windows. After all, it's really no secret that Microsoft's wares are shoddy, is it? I don't believe the "don't care what OS" argument holds, since we know UNIX has higher "uptimes" than Windows. And that argument suggests that they don't care who manufactures their hammer or screwdriver just as long as the tool functions. I suppose that's why I prefer, Snap-On, Milwaukee, BOSCH, Xcelite, Eswign etc. The same holds true for nearly everything.

--
Ed M.

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Apple's road less traveled" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Apple gets Bluetooth bug" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Mac marks the enterprise" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Too big for its niches" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - More than musical?" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - No worms here" [Xserve] InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Apple on the move" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Enterprise Strategies: Presentation matters" InfoWorld 9:16 AM

"Special Report: Apple Unpeeled - Polishing the Apple for the enterprise" InfoWorld

Date: October 23, 2002 07:38 AM
Author: Jim Strawn (*jstrawn@cessna.textron.com*)
Subject: It's not really a Port

I've tried to stay out of this one for a while, but I just can't resist.

While what you say about *nix/Linix/Os-X may be true, the biggest problem with CATIA V5 running on these platforms is that it is not really a port to those platforms. It is merely an emulation. That is why running it on an IBM RS6000 Model 150 turns your big, expensive RISC workstation into something with the performance of an 80286. Additionally, you will lose a significant amount of functionality running V5 on any *nix platform over running it on a WinTel platform. On the WinTel platform, you have the ability to integrate your Graphics application with your other applications. You can drive your design from an Excel spreadsheet (or even a spreadsheet application). You can integrate your Graphics models and drawings with your support documentation. You can create pretty complex applications with simple tools such as VBScript, VBA, and VB. On the *nix platform, you can only integrate your design with flat ASCII files. You cannot integrate your Graphics models with your documentation application, you can only export images. You can only build applications with VBScript. If you need a more complex application, you must write it in C++, and then you need to purchase the (much more expensive) RADE product to access the API's.

In a perfect world, our applications would be completely independant from out platform or operating system. In a perfect world, Dassault would have chosen XML or OpenDoc (is it still around?) for application integration, rather than OLE. But then again, in a perfect world, Unix would never have been split up by the computer vendors, and they also would not have priced themselves out of business by making both the hardware and the software so expensive.

Another issue, how many companies are there that select their design graphics system solely based on the operating system/hardware platform? Total system cost has much more to do with it. But the primary driver is the functionality required. Sure, most small companies don't shell out the $$$ for unix or mainframe based graphics systems, but that usually has more to do with the payback they expect to recieve. A company large enough to require the full functionality and power that these systems provide will see a sufficient reduction in process and/or schedule that they can justify it.

Like it or not, CATIA V5 is built in and around the WinTel platform, and so deeply integrated that if you want to make full use of the product, you really need to be running it on that platform. Maybe someday they till truely port it to other platforms, but this is the reality today.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74513)

Date: October 23, 2002 05:54 PM
Author: Kelly McNeill (*contact@platypuscreations.com*)
Subject: Re: It's not really a Port

[[[*"The biggest problem with CATIA V5 running on these platforms is that it is not really a port to those platforms. It is merely an emulation. That is why running it on an IBM RS6000 Model 150 turns your big, expensive RISC workstation into something with the performance of an 80286."*]]]

Okay, then either DS is REALLY irresponsible with regard to the way it develops software (assuming that the company actually create an emulator before it made a port...), you are lying, or the company has an exclusive Hush-Hush, Wink Wink, Nudge Nudge deal with Microsoft to keep the software

optomized only for Windows. When Intel and AMDs 64 bit architectures become more widely used and DS is required to re-write its code for these processors anyways, it will be obvious which of these scanarious is the case.

[[[*"Additionally, you will lose a significant amount of functionality running V5 on any *nix platform over running it on a WinTel platform."*

You'll gain some and you'll loose some. Depending which *nix you choose. As a matter of fact, you'll gain some and loose (almost) none with OS X.

[[["On the WinTel platform, you have the ability to integrate your Graphics application with your other applications."]]]

And this differs from OS X how? Macintosh (including OS X) is all about graphics integration and workflow integration and has been from the very start. As a matter of fact, OS X's system-wide PDF technology makes it more integrated than Windows.

[[["You can drive your design from an Excel spreadsheet (or even a spreadsheet application).]]]

Same on OS X since OS X has some high-end DBs from Oracle and Sybase oh and OS X also has Office; (Excell included.)

[[["You can integrate your Graphics models and drawings with your support documentation."]]]

Are you suggesting that this couldn't also be done on OS X?

[[["You can create pretty complex applications with simple tools such as VBScript, VBA, and VB."]]]

Apple's Applescript, Project Builder, Interface Builder and RealBasic are Apple's scripting and visual development enviornments and are highly regard as vastly superior to the software tools you mention. the rest of Apple's tools can be found here: http://www.apple.com/developer/

[[["On the *nix platform, you can only integrate your design with flat ASCII files. You cannot integrate your Graphics models with your documentation application, you can only export images. You can only build applications with VBScript. If you need a more complex application, you must write it in C++, and then you need to purchase the (much more expensive) RADE product to access the API's.]]]

Absolutely not true. I suggest you take another look at OSX, as none of what you say is correct. As a matter of fact, Apple's tools for OS X are vastly superior to Microsoft's.

[[["In a perfect world, our applications would be completely independant from out platform or operating system. In a perfect world, Dassault would have chosen XML or OpenDoc (is it still around?) for application integration, rather than OLE. But then again, in a perfect world, Unix would never have been split up by the computer vendors, and they also would not have priced themselves out of business by making both the hardware and the software so expensive."

Agreed. We don't live in a perfect, but that has nothing to do with DS not creating a native version of CATIA for Unix (preferably OS X since its the number one selling Unix) to increase its revenue. Ed, and some others have illustrated how this would be profitable for the company.

[[["Another issue, how many companies are there that select their design graphics system solely based on the operating system/hardware platform?"

The vast majority (approximately 80%) of graphics/design/advertising professionals choose to use the Macintosh due to its advanced capeabilities over competing solutions.

[[["Total system cost has much more to do with it. But the primary driver is the functionality required.]]]

Exactly. It is this reason why many graphics professionals aren't swayed by the slightly higher price tag that the Macintosh requires.

[[["Sure, most small companies don't shell out the $$$ for unix or mainframe based graphics systems, but that usually has more to do with the payback they expect to recieve."]]]

*The reason why *Nix systems aren't used more often has almost nothing to do with return on investment, as Unix has proven itself several times over to be more efficient more secure and less expensive than competing products from Microsoft. The reason has more to do with the hoard of MSCIEs who know know only Microsoft productsand absolutely nothing about *Nix.*

[[["Like it or not, CATIA V5 is built in and around the WinTel platform, and so deeply integrated that if you want to make full use of the product, you really need to be running it on that platform."]]]

If this is a the case, then a re-write/port is required for the Cocoa API.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74521)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 24, 2002 07:06 AM
Author: ian phillips (ianp@gmx.net)
Subject: What are the next steps?

VB and VBA are very widespread. The Apple equivalents are different. Dassault had to choose. Their decision was influenced by what was prevalent back then. OSX was not available then either.

So what will be needed to move CATIA closer to OSX?
Maybe many of the building blocks are already in place. I would not recommend CATIA supporting more proprietry programming languages or Apples tools. They should also move away from Microsoft tools towards Open, independant standards.

So when/if this happens, what is left to be done?

Ian

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74527)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 24, 2002 05:26 PM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: Re: It's not really a Port

While it is true that you can integrate applications on OSX, as well as other operating systems, including the AIX system that we are currently running CATIA V4 on, it is not true that you can integrate CATIA V5 running on those platforms. Dassault has chosen OLE and Active-X as their integration platform, and therefore, unless the other operating systems support these, you cannot integrate CATIA V5 with other applications on those platforms.

I also wish that Dassault had chosen a more open platform, both including the OS as well as the integration technology, but this is the way it is for now. Perhaps, when Version 6 or 7 is released, they will take heed of our requests.

But you need to remember that an application as sophisticated as CATIA has taken over 10 years to fully develop to the state that it is currently in. Most of these "open standards" were either in their infancy, or even non-existant at that point in time.

For all we know, Dassault is in the laboratory right now developing Version 6 or 7 around these open standards that we have today.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74557)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 26, 2002 04:17 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Ian, Jim and others...

I'm going to try and merge both Jim's comments and Ian's comments together and see if I can't address their comments systematically, since the additional info that they provided raises a lot of questions. First Jim's.

Jim wrote:

[[[I've tried to stay out of this one for a while, but I just can't resist.]]]

Actually, I'm glad you decided to join the discussion. Perhaps some good info and a better

insight can be attained.

*[[[While what you say about *nix/Linix/Os-X may be true, the biggest problem with CATIA V5 running on these platforms is that it is not really a port to those platforms. It is merely an emulation.]]]*

*That raises the first question and leads to others. First, Are your *nix customers aware that they are paying (the same or more $$) for a software package that's apparently "less capable" than the version specifically coded for Windows? Seriously speaking, I believe customers should have the right to know BEFORE they purchase a package or migrate to a new version/platform (by force or by choice) that Dassault chose to use Microsoft proprietary technologies that were going to CRIPPLE the other platforms with respect to functionality and performance etc. Again, I don't know what's usually disclosed. Perhaps someone here can fill us all in. That said, Dassault customers should take note because such a decision should serve as a warning to all other *NIX customers; telling them to flee to competing technologies that value them (the *nix base) more... Often customers prefer a high-end *nix solution. Still, I'm not sure how many *want* Windows.*

*Earlier, a comment was made that stated that no one really cared what OS the software ran on because it was the software that was important. However, if there is a noticeable and apparent disparity with the usability, features, performance, etc., the previous non-caring attitude might suddenly take a 180 degree turn. On the other hand, let's assume that the customers know full well all the details before the purchase and they are content with all the answers and happily follow. The next question that comes to mind is: What happened to all the previous *nix versions?*

*Since none of the versions before version 5 ran on Windows (someone please correct me if I'm wrong) and since the previous versions were written and developed (over years) for *nix, isn't logical to assume that if a port to OS X were to commence then the bulk of the code-base would already be in place (more or less)?*

*After all, the majority of the R&D went into the *nix versions first. The lessons that were learned and developed can now become the starting point for OS X. Other high-end Unix apps are making their way over; especially in the Biotech sectors. It might be worth looking at that market as well. Suddenly scientists and engineers are pleased that those apps are now available for OS X.*

[[[That is why running it on an IBM RS6000 Model 150 turns your big, expensive RISC workstation into something with the performance of an 80286.]]]

*And that made your customers happy?? Seeing a cheap, dated, mostly unreliable x86 32-bit box running Windows performing *better* than all those high-end machines they invested in? Does this make sense? How did IBM react to that? More importantly, is that what the USER *really* wanted or is it something that Microsoft *suggested*? Again, these questions are serious.*

*[[[Additionally, you will lose a significant amount of functionality running V5 on any *nix platform over running it on a WinTel platform.]]]*

*But why? For who's benefit were you doing this? And as stated above, IBM doesn't plan on taking their workstations in the direction of x86/Windows. In fact, they are taking them to PowerPC/Linux. This information leads me to believe that customers that shelled out big $$$ for hardware and software are suddenly left with only a single option. x86/Windows; even though the prior was not only adequate, but probably more desirable due to the more open nature of *nix over the proprietary Windows x86 platform.*

[[[On the WinTel platform, you have the ability to integrate your Graphics application with your other applications.]]]

*As Kelly mentioned earlier, That *IS* what the Mac is all about. All you need to do is look toward the print and publishing industry to see that for graphics and software integration, the*

Mac is superior. It's the ultimate integrated workflow solution for that market -- from design to product and the same concepts and approach can undoubtedly be brought to other areas as well. It seems that the PDF engine within OS X would provide a much more desirable stanbdards-base and also allow vastly better flexibility, no? After all PDF is pretty ubiquitous. Imagine all the nice catalogues and brochures that can be developed in no time right on the same platform. Again, I'm still a little concerned why companies decide to adopt proprietary standards and lock themselves (and their customers) into something that might be ubiquitous, but closed and a bit less capable as well.

[[[You can drive your design from an Excel spreadsheet (or even a spreadsheet application).]]]

*You could do the same on OS X. The Mac has the full MS: Office suite AND it's 100% compatible with the Windows versions. So, perhaps it couldn't be done *exactly* -- something similar could be developed. However, it would seem that your choice of "open standards" has now trapped you into the world of ActiveX and OLE (on Windows). Does anyone else other than Microsoft use these technologies? See my point? You're now limited and *NOT* portable. Again, customers should take note.*

[[[You can integrate your Graphics models and drawings with your support documentation.]]]

Sounds like you'd want to have that in PDF format. OS X allows you to output directly to PDF automatically.

[[[You can create pretty complex applications with simple tools such as VBScript, VBA, and VB.]]]

And so can hackers.... This raises the biggest red flag -- at least it should from a customers stand point. More on that later... VB and VBS are considered by many to be a crappy development environment. Not only that, it's isn't very portable.

Was is wise for Dassault to bet the farm on a proprietary piece of technology; especially on a company who's future is still unknown pending antitrust remedies?? Are your customers confident with this? Keep in mind that VB and VBS are not open standard by any stretch. On the other hand, neither is AppleScript, but that isn't the point. Dassault should have embraced open standards and portability rather than placing their eggs in one basket (that only holds certain types and sizes of eggs -- Microsoft eggs if you will). It's a wonder why Dassault hasn't opted to develop an open solution themselves.

*[[[On the *nix platform, you can only integrate your design with flat ASCII files.]]]*

It seemed to work pretty well for quite some time. However, I understand your argument. Still, OS X is a Unix, only it's vastly more flexible. Have you looked into any of the core technologies? I ask because it seems that almost everyone at Dassault was completely oblivious to this new type of Unix. How could it be dismissed or overlooked?

[[[You cannot integrate your Graphics models with your documentation application, you can only export images.]]]

This might be true in older, less sophisticated versions of Unix. OS X changes things dramatically and old rules need not apply. Simply put the Mac is by far the best platform to accomplish the tasks you wish to execute and complete. As stated earlier, just look at the photo, print and publishing industries.

I'm not trying to be coarse or arrogant, but it does appear that Dassault missed a golden opportunity in gaining new market share instead of simply exchanging it for upgrades of existing customers.

[[[You can only build applications with VBScript.]]]

As stated earlier, the script-kiddies figured that one out already and frequently use it to exploit

Windows apparently endless security holes -- over 60 critical security issues in the past year alone and the year isn't even over yet. XP was supposed to be the most secure OS, yet Microsoft can't seem to lock it down. Banks are running to other OSs because they don't want to deal with the liability. Has Dassault considered any of this? Has anyone on this forum considered any of this? Let me elaborate with a hypothetical scenario.

Consider for a moment that Microsoft has a BIG problem with security. Opting for a Windows solution people's information becomes less safe. Banks don't want anything to do with that. All the while the script-kiddies are really doing a job on Microsoft. I hate to sound overly critical, but the facts speak for themselves. The kicker is that the same information that these hackers gain oh-so easily off of Windows machines can be had by any of them if they choose to exploit any of the weaknesses of Windows. What if they decided to hack a company that was working on sensitive material for the government and involved national security? Are these companies aware that this new version of CATIA might be less secure and open for attack?? This should be of great concern to customers. Think of the corporate espionage that might follow; especially if hackers know these so-called sophisticated design solutions were written using an environment most familiar to the hacking communities!

A hacker could theoretically hack Boeing's design database and steal new, experimental models and sell them to the highest bidder or who knows what else? This isn't even taking into account that customers are lead to believe that their ultra-high-end app (The one they paid big $$$ for) was developed with a less sophisticated (and less secure) development environment running on an inherently less secure platform. What message does that relay to a customer? By opting to use/employ VB/VBScript Dassault chose a proprietary, platform-specific technology that opens them up to many more security risks internally as well as externally -- simply because hackers will now know that it's Windows-based and more than likely be even more willing to have a go at it.

Dassault should probably rethink their solution and make plans to address this. They can do this if they drop the proprietary technologies within Windows and instead concentrate on a more open and secure solution for their next pass; preferably on OS X (Unix) as well... This will ensure higher security, a greater degree of openness, increased functionality and more flexibility; especially if they'd like to have the code portable.

As engineers you should all know that there is no such thing as a free lunch. It's all about tradeoffs.

[[[If you need a more complex application, you must write it in C++, and then you need to purchase the (much more expensive) RADE product to access the API's.]]]

What the heck are customers paying for??? Shouldn't they expect quality and topnotch workmanship that was crafted using the finest tools?

[[[In a perfect world, our applications would be completely independent from out platform or operating system.]]]

Adobe does it... NewTek does it Alias|Wavefront does it... However, they do it within reason. All platform specific optimizations are handled accordingly in order to take advantage of the unique strengths of that platform otherwise the customer is getting cheated to a certain extent. Remember, software is designed to take advantage of hardware, not the other way around.

[[[In a perfect world, Dassault would have chosen XML or OpenDoc (is it still around?) for application integration, rather than OLE.]]]

It doesn't have to be perfect, but they could have at least decided to embrace standards instead of going with a proprietary platform. If I recall, it was this same exact argument that kept a lot of developers off of the Mac. Ironic isn't it?

*Again, just because McDonnald's sells the most food does not imply that they are the best nor does it imply that it's something most people *want*.*

Dassault's decisions seem to have been ill-considered. there is OpenGL, PDF and other open standards -- all supported by Mac OS X (and other platforms). Too bad Dassault didn't take the time to consider the OS Xs strengths and maybe even promote it's strengths with the application in mind (i.e., open standards, security, stability, integration, workflow...) The list goes on.

[[[But then again, in a perfect world, Unix would never have been split up by the computer vendors, and they also would not have priced themselves out of business by making both the hardware and the software so expensive.]]]

Yet people bought it. Along with CATIA and it apparently got the job done.

[[[Another issue, how many companies are there that select their design graphics system solely based on the operating system/hardware platform?]]]

Jeeez, I don't know... I would hope many.

Consider Windows. It's certainly the most widespread, not to mention the most insecure. Will Dassault start to charge extra for various levels of security within their apps? Jeez, Dassault might even be able to draw additional revenue for those apps. Apps IMHO that should be bulletproof from the beginning.

*Forgive me, but using VB/VBS to develop a package as sophisticated as CATIA just to embrace the Windows platform seems to imply that it was a "quick-and-dirty" port just to get it there. It's like buying a car from Ford and not knowing that they used Fisher-Price tools to assemble it. (again, I'm being serious) Should customers feel like they got their money's worth? What about the *nix customers?*

[[[Total system cost has much more to do with it.]]]

And we know MS like to charge those license fees. We mustn't forget about the support costs and other downtime that's likely to occur; as well as the additional tech support staff that will be required to address the issues. Then of course there is the added costs associated with the security issues. These costs are additive, so it appears that the tradeoffs might have been ill-considered. Again, customers should take note because I'm sure Dassault isn't advertising these "cons".

[[[But the primary driver is the functionality required.]]]

That's the tradeoff that tipped the scale? I can hardly believe it.

[[[Like it or not, CATIA V5 is built in and around the WinTel platform, and so deeply integrated that if you want to make full use of the product, you really need to be running it on that platform.]]]

That is a bummer in and of itself.

*What happens when x86 moves on? Windows 64-bit is designed for Itanium *only* at this point and now word from Microsoft is that they are uncertain that they will be supporting any of AMD's 64-bit CPUs.*

Since the Itanium ISA is completely different a COMPLETELY new version of CATIA will be needed anyway, otherwise the app will be run in emulation; which as you stated, performs poorly.

Is Dassault betting that Win-32/x86 is going to be around for some time to come? Perhaps. After all, the Itanium project doesn't seem to be fairing too well. But then there is IBM to consider.

As stated, IBM will be marketing a workstation based on PPC running LINUX. Surely

*Dassault is considering porting to it, no? Wouldn't IBM want such a package to run full-out on the new platform when it debuts? It seems that Dassault has one more shot to undo the short-term solution they've provided. Up-and-coming technologies are imminent. OS X is already here. It might be that Dassault will have to start hiring back those *nix developers and also hire some seasoned PowerPC developers too. (if IBM has anything to say about it) ;-)*

Ian wrote:

[[[VB and VBA are very widespread.]]]

And? I made my point about VB earlier. The development community looks at it as a quick-and-dirty way to get things ported to Windows. It says noting for functionality or quality of code. It's as if Dassault hired a bunch of outside help in the form of VB programmers. That doesn't sound too good IMHO.

[[[The Apple equivalents are different. Dassault's had to choose.]]]

That's just it, they didn't choose. They didn't even consider OS X. As a matter of fact, I'll wager that they didn't even hear of it until I brought it up on these forums. I'm also willing to bet that they didn't even realize that Apple or the Mac was even around anymore. If they had looked into OS X before they started they might have decided to go with a better approach.

[[[Their decision was influenced by what was prevalent back then. OSX was not available then either.]]]

Oh really? When did Dassault complete the port to Windows? When did they begin?

[[[So what will be needed to move CATIA closer to OSX?]]]

Well, I'd love for Dassault to ask Apple that question. And not only CATIA, but SolidWorks as well. I'm certain that IBM knows exactly who to contact over at Apple.

*I'm also willing to bet that if Steve Jobs ever got wind of the idea that Dassault/IBM *might* be interested in bringing CATIA or SolidWorks to OS X he would be extremely receptive. I bet you could get in touch with him if you *really* wanted.*

[[[Maybe many of the building blocks are already in place.]]]

Perhaps. You should really talk with Apple and see if their interested.

[[[I would not recommend CATIA supporting more proprietary programming languages or Apples tools.]]]

What's the difference at this point? You married the software to a platform that will likely need a complete overhaul in the near future anyway. And the direction of the Windows platform doesn't seem very clear at this point. Given Win-64, AMD and Itanium issues. IBM on the other hand has a new, fantastic PowerPC they will be bringing to the desktop in the form of a LINUX workstation. Rumor has it that Apple will be using the same CPU. ;-)

[[[They should to move away from Microsoft tools towards Open, independent standards.]]]

Exactly. OPEN standards. That's the mainstay of OS X.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74608)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: October 30, 2002 01:22 PM
Author: Robert M Petersen (robert.m.petersen@boeing.com)
Subject: Re: Ian, Jim and others...

Just a point of clarification... CATIA v5 was not developed with VBA or even VB or VBScript. As a person who has gone through the CAA development training, I can say this for a fact. The v5 architecture is based on C++. I believe that other Windows based applications are also written in C++. Through the architecture of the development environment there are interfaces that allow the developer to expose C++ objects to the scripting engine. In this case VBScript as well as VBA. BTW, you can use VBScript on Unix but you cannot use VBA. So, even though a person can develop custom applications in VBA, you do not get the full integration, extension and enhancement capabilities without using C++. As for having to pay extra for the CAA (Component Application Architecture) development environment, I don't think I am wrong in saying that most (not all) CAD software companies make you pay extra to gain access to their internals.

I'm not trying to downtalk or even oppose a Mac OSX port. I think software should be written to a standard that allows for easy integration on multiple platforms without sacrificing functionality.

Regards,
Bob P.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74670)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: November 12, 2002 10:44 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Don't you think OS X is worth looking into?

I'd say it would be a wise decision to at least have a look at Mac OS X. Relying on a single source to draw revenue seems absurd.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=74954)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: December 10, 2002 01:17 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: FEI

Just recently, I've forwarded this discussion to some individuals over at Apple. I'll post any replies as I get them. With luck, someone in the right department will take interest.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=75451)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: December 10, 2002 01:18 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: FEI

Just recently, I've forwarded this discussion to some individuals over at Apple. I'll post any replies as I get them. With luck, someone in the right department will take interest.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=75452)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: December 11, 2002 02:22 AM
Author: Jonathan Langton (jonathan.langton@stagetech.com)
Subject: Re: FEI

How many times do you plan to post you're replies? Come on COE!

I have been told V5 will be available for Singer sewing machines when London trains are running efficiently! Great!

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=75459)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 09, 2003 10:31 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: X-11 integrated right into OS X and more...

Well, it looks like Apple is making it vastly easier for LINUX and UNIX developers to port their apps over to OS X... From Apple's website: Thanks to their X11

And it's interesting to see that Apple is embracing official and open STANDARDS as well as open-source projects... Unlike Microsoft.

[[[Easy to port X11 applications
With the complete suite of the standard X11 display server software, client libraries and developer toolkits, X11 for Mac OS X makes it even simpler to port LINUX and Unix applications to the Mac.]]]

http://www.apple.com/macosx/x11/

BTW, Has anyone checked out Apple's new notebook offerings? There are now 3 sizes for their pro-line laptops... 12-inch, 15-inch and 17 inch

17 inches is really sweet for what amounts to a portable desktop and 12 inches is the ultimate in portability without any loss of ergonomics or functionality.

Some other key features:

- Built-in FireWire 800 (i.e., FireWire-2) and maintaining backward compatibility with FireWire 400.

- Built-in Bluetooth

- Built-in WiFi 802.11g running at 54Mbps that is backward compatible with all 802.11b devices

- Dual independent monitor support (this has always been there), but it's a feature that's not often found on other laptops.

- ambient light sensors.

- There are TONS of I/O ports on these gems You can connect just about anything you can think of.

So far these offerings are by far the most feature-rich in the industry at this point. They are worth checking out even if you are a die-hard Windows fan

http://www.apple.com/

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=75820)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 29, 2003 08:51 AM
Author: Brett Patching (binotto@mac.com)
Subject: X-11 and PowerPC 970

I'm a Vellum Cobalt user who's just popped in via Architosh's discussion of Catia.

I agree with Anthony Frausto-Robledo's comments on the Architosh forum about the weight of the PowerPC 970 chip on this discussion. If Apple is going to sway high-end users, they will have much more luck when they have hardware which can match Intel and AMD boxes for speed - and I'm sure Apple knows this. At present (even though prices have dropped with the newly released models) it's hard to justify the high price of the fastest PowerMac compared to its performance.

Hopefully the PowerPC 970 and 980 will get Apple out of the corner that Motorola has sqeezed them into in the last 2 years. Stagnating desktop sales might make the growing workstation market attractive to Apple now that they have seen high sales from the Xserve's launch into the server market. Perhaps that's one other reason why Apple has been out talking to some of the big players in the CAD industry.

I'm sure it will take time for the momentum to grow, but the advantages of UNIX on Apple hardware will surely strengthen the platform as a whole. But for our market it will also require hardware that is as feature-unique as Apple's PowerBooks are.

The thought of having Catia on the Mac is fascinating. Perhaps there is also a chance of Alias Studio moving over (perhaps through X-11) now that Maja has already proven itself on OS X.

/Brett

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76242)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 29, 2003 11:36 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Speed isn't the issue

*Hi Bret, Glad you joined the discussion. To a point you are correct in what you say about the *speed**

*of the Mac systems, but is that the *real* basis for your argument? Personally, I think it's just another *excuse* developers like to use when asked if there is going to be a Mac version of their product. Let's take a look at some of what you said and see if there isn't another side of the coin...*

[[[I agree with Anthony Frausto-Robledo's comments on the Architosh forum about the weight of the PowerPC 970 chip on this discussion. If Apple is going to sway high-end users, they will have much more luck when they have hardware which can match Intel and AMD boxes for speed - and I'm sure Apple knows this.]]]

*I'm not so sure that this is a valid argument or reason. MHz. myth aside, Apple boxes are FAST. Period. There have been CAD-based applications used on both the Mac and PC platform for many years. What I mean is that there was a time when AutoCAD, Pro/E, SolidWorks and may others were up and running on 450 MHz. Pentium 2 machines and these apps were considered *quite usable* on those machines. What I'm getting at is that for Intel, MHz. was a major marketing ploy.*

*I'm sure if you look at a chart or graph that plots the Intel chip rating in MHz. to the actual amount of work that it completes in a real-world situation you might be astonished at what you find given those results. But how can you test such a theory in a CAD application, after all, most of the time a user spends behind the screen is building and designing the model? If that is the case, then we've probably reached the threshold of performance or what's better known as the point of diminishing returns with respect to human perception of *speed*. Just to illustrate a point, can you tell the difference while crafting a Word document on a 500 MHz. Pentium 2 or a 2.5 GHz. Pentium 4? No. I know it isn't CAD, but the premise still holds. My cousin works a great deal with AutoCAD designing windows. He also uses SolidWorks. About 4 months ago he grabbed a dual 2 GHz. Xeon Compaq system to replace his HP Kayak that was running at 500 MHz. Bottom line? He's noticed no performance gain with the new system and is sorely disappointed. Perhaps for what he does, 500 Mhz. was fast enough. Is that a possibility? Could it be that the increase in speed got him very little in the way of noticed performance? Just to add another zinger... The Kayak probably runs circles around the new Compaq simply because the graphics card in the Kayak is twice the card that came in the new Xeon system. So, what does this tell us? It tells us that a lot of the work is offloaded to the cards anyway. Oh, and the cards the machines house are nothing special compared to the new cards, the same ones that are available for the Mac. With all that said, the question evolves into where is this *speed* required? If you can provide a list of areas where speed is *the* limiting factor in terms of actual productivity, and in that I mean actual "work done", It might be the basis of a good argument for raw speed; however, I think you'll be hard-pressed to provide a significant list. Still, there is one area that I see the argument holding some validity. Rendering output.*

*Using the rendering argument gets tricky. First, when most people send a model out to render, they aren't sitting around waiting for it to complete. Of course this all depends on the amount of Photo-realism that's desired or...whatever. The point is that many of these models when rendered for specific purposes such as marketing for magazines, television commercials, animations etc. are usually sent to a completely different software package! They won't be using AutoCAD, Pro/E, SolidWorks or (gasp!)even CATIA to render the final output simply because the software doesn't provide the sophistication, detail or resolution in that particular area that is needed for photo-realism (if that is what's required or desired). Now the *speed* argument starts to break down a bit more... Where is the need for more speed during the actual design process? Furthermore, what can a 400 MHz.Pentium do that a 400 MHz. PowerMac couldn't. Remember, aside from CATIA, all of the other CAD apps seemed to run just fine on those slow Pentiums ;-)*

*Just to blow the entire *speed* argument out of the water as it relates to CATIA on the Mac, have a look at the MINIMUM SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS that Dassault suggests:*

http://www.cadam.com/productinfo/system_requirements_v5.htm

*That's pretty funny... Windows 98 and a Pentium2 ??! I'm certain that a Mac with OS X is more than capable of running the software. So, where is this *speed* needed? Hell, you could run this stuff on an iMac! Which is my point... Speed of the system doesn't seem to get you much. Not only that, these minimum, IBM/Dassault certified requirements tell us that the Mac is and always has been more than capable of running these products. Period. So, what does that leave us? Rendering output?*

I'm betting that most of the output/final renders meant for marketing purposes or for

educational/instructional use, television, magazines etc are done with software like Lightwave, Maya, Renderman... etc. Software that's designed specifically for that task. CAD packages are not. What's odd is that the best of class rendering packages are already available for the Mac! Lightwave is considered to be the finest renderer on the market, second only to Pixar's PR-Renderman. It's output can't be touched. But let's say that you're going to be hardheaded about it and say "well, we're only going to use CATIA/Dassault products from start to finish, including the final renders and therefore we need to have that speed." OK, I'll give you that, but if I'm not mistaken, the render engine used in CATIA is Lightworks... Developed by LightWork design, and guess what? LightWorks is available for OS X...

http://www.lightworkdesign.com/news/latestnews/nepg.htm

*... and so goes the *speed* argument and the argument questioning the capabilities of Apple's current (and past?) hardware.*

*Speed isn't *really* the issue, now is it? ;-)*

[[[At present (even though prices have dropped with the newly released models) it's hard to justify the high price of the fastest PowerMac compared to its performance.]]]

read the above one more time; especially the URL to the minimum system requirements certified to run the product and consider it usable. Then look at the Mac and compare.

[[[But for our market it will also require hardware that is as feature-unique as Apple's PowerBooks are.]]]

This I don't understand... If you mean that Apple now provides PORTABLE UNIX WORKSTATIONS, then I agree with that.

--
Ed M

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76255)

Date: January 29, 2003 01:06 PM
Author: Brett Patching (binotto@mac.com)
Subject: Speed wasn't the issue

Hi Ed

I'm glad you started the discussion!

>I'm not so sure that this is a valid argument or reason. MHz. myth
>aside, Apple boxes are FAST. Period. There have been CAD-based
>applications used on both the Mac and PC platform for many
>years. What I mean is that there was a time when AutoCAD,

>Pro/E, SolidWorks and may others were up and running on 450
>MHz. Pentium 2 machines and these apps were considered

*>*quite usable* on those machines. What I'm getting at is that*

>for Intel, MHz. was a major marketing ploy.

I agree totally with you that MHz was and still is the big Intel marketing tool.

I'll always stand up and defend the Mac platform's qualities, like user experience and stability/up-time. I save time using a Mac and that's why I continue to invest in the platform. It IS a better place to work, and I truly believe that there can be a market for high-end CAD packages on the platform. solidThinking has arrived recently to battle with Vellum Cobalt in the mid-range category, and I can easily imagine Alias running in the Mac environment.

A year ago I would have agreed that speed isn't the issue. We all know that the G4 chip architecture is much more efficient than the long Intel pipeline. But things have slipped lately, and the fastest stationary Macs really aren't good value in relation to their performance, from a hardware point of view, when you look at the Wintel market. Unfortunately Wintel users thinking about switching get this thrown at them, and rarely get a chance to try Mac OS to understand how much time the interface alone can save you.

As long as power users can see things like the slow adoption of video cards & AGP 8x or the slow progress in chip speeds on the Mac platform, there will always be an excuse the Wintel user can throw up at the Mac. So there also needs to be advantages on the hardware side. Xserve provides great value with high performance. That's why it's making inroads in the server market. PowerBooks pack great functionality into an extremely small form factor (fantastic backlit keyboard!). The power user will still want speed (and will most likely sit at a stationary workstation with multiple screens) but the present PowerMac doesn't provide any clear hardware advantage here. That is why I believe the PowerPC 970/980 will play a role in increasing market share for the platform. It will conceivably draw scientific and 3D users over at a higher rate than present.

Cheers,
Brett

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76259)

Date: January 29, 2003 02:46 PM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: Speed wasn't the issue

I also agree with you that MHZ is not an indication of processing speed, unless you are comparing like archetectures. I do, however, take issue with Ed's arguement about speed. While you may not see the difference between a 400mhz Pentium and a 1GHZ Pentium on a 500kb MS Word Document, and you may not even notice the difference on a 1MB Drawing, when you enter the 3-D world, processing speed makes all of the difference in the world.

When you start building complex 3D solid models of aircraft or automotive parts, you will notice vast differences in processing speed. A typical design engineer working on aircraft parts in CATIA spends anywhere from 10-30% of his time with the CPU pegged at 100% while he is updating his drawing/part/assembly. This is true whether you are in V4 or V5, whether you are on Unix or Windows.

While the IBM Marketing claims that V5 will run on a 350mhz Pentium 2 w/ 128MB of RAM, don't believe them. CATIA V5 is a very scaleable system, that can cover simple drafting and modeling tasks thru full aircraft design's and digital mock-up. While you may be able to do simple drafting on a Pentium 2, I wouldn't attempt a Digital Mockup session of a portion of an aircraft with anything less than a 2GHZ Zeon, or a 350mhz Power2, both with at least 1 GB of RAM.

Years ago, when I was sharing a MicroVAX 2 with 2 other user's, I was happy to get a couple dozen parts on the screen. When I moved to the Mainframe, I could get up to 100 Part on the screen. In today's environment, my designer's are pulling up hundreds and

even a thousand parts on the screen on a regular basis. Give me a workstation (Intel, PowerPC, or whatever) with 10 times the power of today's machines, my users will pull up 10 times the information. And be more productive because of it.

As for the rendering argument, that too is full of holes. While CATIA isn't designed for the likes of Pixar and Lucas Films, it does have a photo-realistic product that is capable of creating truely photo-realistic marketing type images. Their latest offering is designed to be competitive with Alias/Wavefront.

And marketing is not the only department that gains value from rendered images. It wasn't that long ago that I didn't think that dynamic shading was of much value to the design engineer. Today, you couldn't pry it away from them. The additional information that the shaded image presents is invaluable. The Dynamic Rendering that CATIA V5 provides is just as valuable in many circumstances. Putting mirror quality reflections on your surfaces tells you more about the continuity of the surface you are designing than all of the other surface analysis tools combined. You get instant feedback regarding the quality of your surfaces.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76260)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 29, 2003 05:23 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: What would be the minimum Mac system?

Jim, it seems to me that your entire argument boils down to something like this... "there is never enough speed". I disagree...

[[[While the IBM Marketing claims that V5 will run on a 350mhz Pentium 2 w/ 128MB of RAM, don't believe them.]]]

When CATIA shipped for Windoze are you telling me that it wasn't a usable product because the Wintel crates at the time weren't 2GHz. Xeon processor based?

[[[While you may be able to do simple drafting on a Pentium 2, I wouldn't attempt a Digital Mockup session of a portion of an aircraft with anything less than a 2GHZ Zeon]]]

*But when CATIA V5 came out it was for Win98/2000 and those machines weren't as fast as the systems you state, yet CATIA was ported over -- to Windows (Yikes!) A an engineer, you must also be aware of the tradeoffs ... you say that you're team will be *that much more productive* given raw speed... I'll remain skeptical. What about the costs to power consumption and heat, not to mention the support costs associated with a Wintel environment. We've been through this before, you can't selectively exclude these costs. Anyway let's continue on with some of the things you mention...*

[[[Years ago, when I was sharing a MicroVAX 2 with 2 other user's, I was happy to get a couple dozen parts on the screen. When I moved to the Mainframe, I could get up to 100 Part on the screen. In today's environment, my designer's are pulling up hundreds and even a thousand parts on the screen on a regular basis.]]]

*OK, I see where you are coming from and where you are going, but to be quite honest, I doubt that any of you actually focus on 100 parts at any one time let alone *thousands* What I'm saying is that a human can only do so much at any given time. However, it begs the question of why you'd want or even *need* *thousands* of modeled parts up on the screen simultaneously. You'll have to explain that to me.*

[[[Give me a workstation (Intel, PowerPC, or whatever) with 10 times the power of today's machines, my users will pull up 10 times the information. And be more productive because of it.]]]

Yeah, right That's a bit overstated don't you think? As I said before we're only human and there is only so much we can do at any given time.

Hey, I hear IBM is taking orders for their ASCI White.... I'm sure one of those would keep you guys from EVER needing to upgrade. What's more you could add engineers in droves and the system would hardly break a sweat... The cost savings would be HUGE up front, but would be peanuts over the long haul if what you say is true... Think of all that work you'll be getting done. (just a bit of sarcasm to make my point so no disrespect intended).

[[[While CATIA isn't designed for the likes of Pixar and Lucas Films, it does have a photo-realistic product that is capable of creating truely photo-realistic marketing type images.]]]

Well, for the money, you could get a superior renderer in Lightwave from NewTek. I'm not sure I understand your argument. Besides, if you need higher detail, there is always PR-Renderman. So what gap is CATIA trying to cover? the high-end rendering environment? The midrange? For the money there are vastly better products more suited to the task. And consider the fact that you're not going to be doing any of this rendering on a single machine.. certainly not a Windows box... It will be done by render-farms that consist of machines solely designed for that purpose and used for nothing else but rendering -- probably running Linux. I'm not sure what you are stating... However, there's a few questions I'd like to ask you...

- Would a dual-1.42 GHz. Mac runnig OS X be enough to run CATIA? Simple question.

- If not, what do you think it would take as far as Mac hardware is concerned, to effectively run CATIA? And don't even tell me that you guys are running those sub $1000.00 2GHz. pentium boxes that are for sale at the local Radio Shack and Best Buy...

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76264)

Date: January 30, 2003 02:54 PM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: What would be the minimum Mac system?

[[When CATIA shipped for Windoze are you telling me that it wasn't a usable product because the Wintel crates at the time weren't 2GHz. Xeon processor based?]]

Welcome to my world. Actually, when DS released V5 R1, it was more of a "proof of concept" and "see how it's going to work" product. V5 really wasn't useable by most customers until they released V5 R7 or so. As for building aircraft, it really took until R9.

How much processor required really depends on what your design task is. If you are designing a new mouse or some kind of similar consumer product, and you only have 6-12 parts, then a 400mhz processor is probably sufficient.

If you are building aircraft with 10's of thousands of parts, then no, it wasn't really ready until we had both the R9 release, and at least 1ghz processors.

While not all designers need a thousand parts on the screen to design their little piece of the aircraft, many disciplines do require this. Just try routing flight control cables, hydraulic and pneumatic tubes, and electrical wire bundles thru the tailcone of an aircraft and you will better understand.

On aircraft and in automotive, many times single parts also will require a massive processor. Look at the design of a Landing Gear Trunnion, or of an automotive Cylinder Head. These parts are generally so complex that simply updating the solid can take anywhere from 15 minutes to 2+ hours on current hardware, and that's pure CPU.

As for the rendering, we do an awful lot of internal images to sell concepts to management, and we even generate these for marketing as well. We are currently using ALIAS, but we have been evaluating CATIA as well. One of the primary advantages of CATIA is that there is absolutely no data translation. If you have ever tried to translate data from one graphics system to another, you will soon realize that there is a tremendous amount of manpower involved in cleaning up the data after the translation.

You are correct, we are not buying $1000 machines at the local Best Buy. But our machines are not that much more. We are running on IBM Intellestation M Pro's, 2.2GHZ, 1GB Rambus Ram, SCSI Hard Drives, and 128MB FireGL2 Graphics cards.

But I am running pretty well on an IBM ThinkPad A31, 1GB Ram, 1.8GHZ Pentium 4, and a 16mb Radeo Mobile Graphics card. I'm not pulling up 1000's of parts, but it is working fine for the process development work that I am doing. IBM (and others) do have Lap tops that are Certified, and have mobile versions of the FireGL2 card.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76299)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 30, 2003 06:13 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: OK, but what about the Mac??

[[[You are correct, we are not buying $1000 machines at the local Best Buy. But our machines are not that much more. We are running on

IBM Intellestation M Pro's, 2.2GHZ, 1GB Rambus Ram, SCSI Hard Drives, and 128MB FireGL2 Graphics cards.]]]

I didn't think you were running those bargain-basement crates... Still, you didn't answer my question... How do you suppose a dual-1.42 GHz. Mac running OS X Jag would perform?

[[[But I am running pretty well on an IBM ThinkPad A31, 1GB Ram, 1.8GHZ Pentium 4, and a 16mb Radeo Mobile Graphics card. I'm not pulling up 1000's of parts, but it is working fine for the process development work that I am doing.]]]

*Hmmm... Are you saying that the current PowerBooks from Apple would fair quite good with CATIA too? Apple puts out some *sweet* portable Unix workstations ya know ;-)*

Have you looked at them yet?
--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76304)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: February 04, 2003 07:41 AM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: OK, but what about the Mac??

Since very little of CATIA is multi-threaded, a dual processor box is of not much additional value. There are some specific tasks that will make use of the second processor, but they are pretty specifically for Digital Mockup, not for day in and day out design work.

While it is nice to speculate how well CATIA might run on an Apple, the cold fact is that it doesn't. Perhaps DS will listen, and develop their next version on a more open platform.

But today, we have a limited set of choices. My main focus today is getting the existing software to work. And I don't mean functionally. The functionality is there today in V5. Our current focus is working on the business practices required to adapt to and make use of the new functionality in V5.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76393)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: February 04, 2003 06:46 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: OK, if not Mac, what about IBM 970/Linux? ;-)

[[[Perhaps DS will listen, and develop their next version on a more open platform.]]]

*You would think that they would have listened to you (i.e., their customers), no? I mean did you *request* that CATIA be made available for Windows or was that a "Dassault" decision?*

[[[But today, we have a limited set of choices. My main focus today is getting the existing software to work. And I don't mean functionally. The functionality is there today in V5. Our current focus is working on the business practices required to adapt to and make use of the new functionality in V5.]]]

*Hmmmm... not sure how I read this ... does this mean that it would only complicate things if another platform was supported? A touch of sarcasm perhaps ;-) I'm suspecting that you are referring to training... If that's the case then this is a *criticle* point since 90% of people stick with things that are weaned on. This course helps to promote the use of Windows-centric systems and totally ignores why such a monoculture mentality might be bad. In any event, it would be interesting to see what pans out in a couple of months. Apparently Apple is in talks with all the high-end CAD developers. I'm assuming that Dassault is one of them. And you seem to keep forgetting about those new IBM workstations that are just around the corner... PowerPC 970-based. 4-way configurations initially (as hinted by IBM). These systems were NOT DESIGNED TO RUN WINDOWS. They run LINUX. Wouldn't you think IBM would want CATIA on these boxes? I think they would... And as you know it's likely that if IBM requests it, it's gonna happen -- simply because it's IBM. A LINUX version also indirectly implies an OS X version (see my other posts). I've provided the pieces of the puzzle, I'm sure you can figure it out.*

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76419)

Date: February 05, 2003 07:50 AM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: OK, if not Mac, what about IBM 970/Linux? ;-)

*[[[I mean did you *request* that CATIA be made available for Windows or was that a "Dassault" decision?]]]*

Yes, the user community asked for this, back when DS decided to start developing V5. Unix was expensive and had little other software applications developed for it. Linux didn't exist at that time, and

the MAC was foundering, except in some niche markets (desktop publishing). The Open Software movement wasn't even a blip on the radar. The business side of most companies was pretty deeply entrenched in MS Office, and the engineering departments were tired of supplying their engineers with 2 computers to perform their work. PTC was eating their lunch, and they realized that a simple port to Windows wouldn't do it. They knew that they needed a completely new generation of CAD.

[[[does this mean that it would only complicate things if another platform was supported?]]] Absolutely. If it is just a port to a new platform, it's not worth our time - and if they do it as more of an emulation (like they are doing with Unix right now), then it is a complete waist of time. If it provided significantly improved functionality and performance, however, then it would be worth it. CATIA V4 is currently supported on AIX, HPUX, IRIX, Sun-OS. We stick with AIX and fight anyone who want's anything else, as it just complicates things immensely. Applications have to be developed, compiled, and tested on all platforms. Bugs have to be checked and verified on all platforms. Different environment settings and installation packages need to be maintained for all platforms. Etc, etc, etc. It's not worth it.

As for being stuck with the system you were weaned on, that's a bogus arguement. I started out on Interpreted Basic on a CDC Mainframe, moved to MS DOS 2.15, Windows 2 (yes 2), Windows 3.1, 98, NT, & XP. I have used HPUX and AIX. My first CAD system was on VAX/VMS (which still has functions superior to anything available today), moved to Mainframe CADAM/CATIA on MVS, moved to Workstation CATIA on AIX, and am now using V5 Catia on both AIX and Windows. All of the engineers here have been thru this same cycle (although most aren't old enough to remember VMS and DOS, let alone interpreted basic and Contol Data).

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76433)

Date: January 29, 2003 05:11 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: What makes for a usable desktop system?

[[[but the present PowerMac doesn't provide any clear hardware advantage here. That is

why I believe the PowerPC 970/980 will play a role in increasing market share for the platform. It will conceivably draw scientific and 3D users over at a higher rate than present.]]]

See, this is where I don't agree with you here... I was hoping you read my earlier post and understood what I was getting at.... In short a 4 GHz Pentium will probably get you nothing in the way of a completely usable desktop from a perception stand point. And there comes a time when no matter how many MHz. you throw at it, the enduser will not be able to discern performance UNLESS ... it comes down to really high-end 3D rendering. If you're going to be working with it during a design and modeling session then a person sitting behind a 500 or so MHz. PC isn't going to tell the difference if he was suddenly placed behind a 2 GHz. PC. I've taken the blind taste-test myself... There is no noticed difference... Remove the term Mac and G4 from your argument and replace it with "Pentium 500 MHZ" or something of that ilk... Suddenly you would think that all those low end PCs would be FLYING off the shelves and companies would be upgrading more often because the price is right... the sad truth is that it isn't happening... The PS sector is a slump and not even those cheepie PCs are selling. And let's be honest here.... the types of workstations that people buy to run this stuff isn't the "under $1500.00" PC machines ... companies spend a lot more than that. At work my cousin apparently ordered 10 new Dell monster desktops (this was about a year ago I think) the added "must have" option seemed to be this $700.00+ graphics card that amounted to nothing more than a waste of money since no one can figure out when all this supposed performance was going to arrive... They were sorely disappointed... Again, these companies aren't buying the cheap PCs.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76263)

Date: January 29, 2003 06:26 PM
Author: Brett Patching (binotto@mac.com)
Subject: Designers on Macs

Ed

>> If you're going to be working with it during a design and modeling session then a person sitting behind a 500 or so MHz. PC isn't going to tell the difference if he was suddenly placed behind a 2 GHz. PC. I've taken the blind taste-test myself... There is no noticed difference. <<

I have to side with Jim here - I can max my CPU out during a lot of intensive tasks in Cobalt and spend time waiting as the nice little wheel turns around.....

For more mundane tasks, of course speed is now at a level where you can't notice any difference between machines.

>> Remove the term Mac and G4 from your argument and replace it with "Pentium 500 MHZ" or something of that ilk... Suddenly you would think that all those low end PCs would be FLYING off the shelves and companies would be upgrading more often because the price is right... the sad truth is that it isn't happening... The PS sector is a slump and not even those cheepie PCs are selling. <<

Perhaps I didn't clarify things in my first post. I am only talking about this in relation to the possibilities in the higher-end workstation market, which is growing

at present. I think the desktop market will continue to shrink, and I guess Apple is betting that it will - that's why they are investing so much in the laptops this year.

Anyway, this sort of sidetracks the original reason I popped over. I know several design studios who are looking at packages like I-DEAS and Alias here in Denmark, and these studios are running Macs now. They don't want to move onto Wintel, but the high-end programs aren't there on OS X. I think Dassault underestimates the size of the market. I have absolutely no idea how much it would take to compile CATIA to run in X-11, so it's impossible for me to judge how feasible this would be. I just know that there is a market in my corner of the world.

Cheers,
Brett

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76265)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 29, 2003 08:31 PM
Author: Mick (mricereto@earthlink.net)
Subject: Design on Mac vs. Speed with bonus goodies

Hey guys, I'm dropping back in here. Alot has changed with OSX-Jaguar since I first dropped in. Alias has come over to OSX which is just wonderful. A colleague of mine, a very well respected industrial designer in plumbing products has stated Alias to be "one of the greatest pleasures of life", which I might agree with. This is just great for us Mac users who want the best surface modeling program money can buy.

Perhaps I should explain why I am commenting in the first place: the new 17" Powerbook is just exquisite. I have a 550mhz Ti-book and it is feeling a bit slow anymore. I have a desktop in the office which makes it feel slow at least. So Ed, yeah - speed is really, really important when you are on a plane or in a hotel room trying to cram in some fillets on your latest model and the battery indicator is in the 00:59 and less range. And I agree with Brett - alot of the time I am sitting there and waiting for rebuilds and assembly file openings. Hey - I render during the design phase!!! I don't have a team of designers behind me rendering all of my stuff. If I am unsure of something or just want to look at my shape, I render it. And I work in Gouraud/HLS most of the time. And, I travel ALOT. I am a high-level designer in a plumbing company and I spend time on the road talking to customers and working/visiting trade shows and so on. So, a 17" 6lb. laptop is really exciting to me.

Another reason why I am here - I love the Catia/Solidworks system. I do alot of assemblies (unlike my colleague who loves Alias to death, I don't do as much surface modeling). It's not more than a few dozen models in the assembly, but it can get slow nonetheless. I just got into the software package in the past 12 months, but since my corp. "approved" the system people have been frothing at the mouth. We are heavy Pro/E. Alot of file conversions happening in design for sure, not as much in the engineering area as they just stick with Pro/E and the Dell $3500 "approved" workstation. But the other designers won't touch Pro/E and have no patience with the Wildfire noise and just wanna get to work.

But I travel. And I want that laptop. So please Dassault, bring us Catia on Jaguar!

Here is my other insight, which is very, very interesting:

One of my best friends is a senior networking engineer at one of the biggest dot.coms. He is a computer scientist/geek of the highest Gen X order (which means there are plenty of kids who can program stuff faster than him, but then again they don't sleep - yet). He poo-pooed the mac for as long as I can remember. I don't know, System 6? He laughed at me throughout college (we're now in our early 30's). Last week, over a cocktail at a nice NYC sushi bar, he said, "you know, the Mac is gaining alot of attention in the programming crowd. Geeks are moving to it in droves. Dudes with Titaniums are freaking about it's UNIX capability and are hiding away in closets with a fervor that I have not seen in awhile. Can you do WiFi on that thing?"

Yes John, I can. It's called Airport. I wander around my loft or about town and I am online. oh, sweetness.

*OK, enough for now. In summary, I *do* need speed. I love that Apple is concentrating on laptops. And I want my software!*

M

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76266)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 30, 2003 04:54 AM
Author: Brett Patching (binotto@mac.com)
Subject: Alias Studio on Mac?

Hi Mick

>>Hey guys, I'm dropping back in here. Alot has changed with OSX-Jaguar since I first dropped in. Alias has come over to OSX which is just wonderful.<<

I can't find an announcement about Alias Studio on OS X anywhere on the Alias|Wavefront site. All the news is about Maya 4.5. Tell us more!

/Brett

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76274)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 30, 2003 06:40 AM
Author: Mick (mricereto@earthlink.net)
Subject: Maya on OSX

It's quite a habit throwing the name Alias around - but what I really should have said was Maya, by Alias.

M

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76282)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: January 21, 2003 10:04 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: More Mac OS X discussion on the LINUX thread.

I just wanted everyone to know that there is another discussion brewing on OS X under the LINUX thread. Hopefully more people will get involved.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76036)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: February 10, 2003 10:31 AM
Author: David Chaney (davidch@mac.com)
Subject: Mac OS X and MCAD

Professional MCAD Users (need your support):

Most of you guys know (probaly through Ed), that Apple created a new OS last year combining an opensource UNIX core (based on FreeBSD) and an extremely intuitive, powerful, graphical interface called Aqua (based on PDF and OpenGL). In short, its a system that is much easier to use than MS Windows while also a being as reliable, secure, and virus-free as a high-end UNIX System.... something that had never been done before. At the time it was introduced (was beginning to learn Linux & NT), I was so impressed I sold my SGI O2 and an older NoteBook to purchase a Titanium PowerBook G4 which I primarily use today. I've been using it hardcore (Internet, Video, MS Office, S/W Development) for 1 1/2 yrs now and have been unable to crash the OS (outside of pulling the plug) or had any virus issues. Outside of some minor tinkering with RedHat Linux (still a little complex for the average user), I don't use anything else anymore.

Due to OS X's unique capabilites and "free" high-end developer tools, it is quickly gaining widespread interest by numerous software developers (many of which never considered Apple before) especially where high-end graphics and multimedia are required. Alias Wavefront (Maya), Microsoft (Explorer, Word, Excel, PowerPoint), id (Quake Series), FileMaker (FileMaker),Macromedia (Dreamweaver, Flash, Director), Intuit (Quicken, QuickBooks), OpenOffice, Oracle, Sybase, Netscape, etc. and all the standard UNIX apps(apache, perl, php) & shell "commands" (ls,cp, mv, grep, cron, etc.). In addition, many new appliations are being developed "only" for Mac OS X (like the award winning Final Cut Pro (video), Watson (web services), and the acclaimed iTools Suite (iTunes, iMovie, iPhoto, iDVD, iCal). Many more common business/home apps (especially games) are currently being ported also.

The only category currently lacking is high-end MCAD, but over the last few months Apple has been working closely with all the big players including: PTC (Pro/E, Intralink, etc), Dassault (Catia, SolidWorks), Unigraphics (UG, SDRC), and Autodesk (Autocad, Inventor). They even added a native X/11 Window manager in January to help developers and allow users to X/Display from UNIX workstations at native OpenGL speeds in the Aqua enviroment. PTC seems the most interested so far

Anyway, if you get a chance I would really appreciate a "yes" vote on Mac OS X port of Pro/E at the Pro/E Digital Digest (ie Pro/E Magazine Site). Even if you don't use OS X,, the competition will only push your platform (Windows, Linux, or older UNIXs) to improve. This is how the interest started with Linux a few years ago and now it's available for Pro/E Wildfire.

http://www.d-digest.com/proedigitaldigest/V3I6/

If you want to check out what Mac OS X is about:

http://www.apple.com/macosx/

Industry Reviews:

Infoworld: Technology of the Year
http://infoworld.com/article/03/01/24/2002TOYmac_1.html

eWeek: OS X in the Enterprise
http://www.eweek.com/article2/0,3959,838233,00.asp

ZDNet: Apple's Linux, Unix pitch - X/11
http://zdnet.com.com/2100-1104-981495.html

Let me know if you have any questions,

David Chaney

Mechanical Design Engineer
(Also worked many years as an MCAD Administrator)

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76575)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: February 25, 2003 09:32 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Intel: No rush to 64-bit Desktops (you guys seem to be in a bind

Well, it looks like Dassault has hitched it's wagon to a couple of "dead horses" so to speak -- the dead horses in this case seem to be Intel and Microsoft.

This URL explains why: http://zdnet.com.com/2100-1103-985432.html

*I've hinted at this before. I've brought it up on various other message boards and now Intel goes and makes it official. The fact is that the Windows world (with respect to it's users) is in a bit of a bind, and Windows doesn't seem to be as *portable* as Microsoft had boasted. It would appear that you guys were sold on a rather dubious idea. In any event current users of Windows desktop configurations will be stuck at 32-bit for quite some time -- until the end of the decade or even longer. That means 32-bit Pentium4's for the foreseeable future for anyone running CATIA on Windows. Let's look at the debacle a little closer -- after which someone on this board (Dave Every, John C. Welch?) can jump in and correct any mistakes in reasoning that I might have made.*

Apparently 4 separate teams at Intel were given the task of coming up with a 64-bit desktop solution. After running a LOT of simulations they all decided that such a move would not be feasible. Here's the basics why:

*There is no 64-bit desktop version of Windows -- it's already become too big and unwieldy in it's current state (so let's add a few more ;-). Furthermore, the only 64-bit version of Windows is Windows Server 2003 and it only runs on the Itanium line and is only meant for servers. 32-bit apps running through emulation on the Itanium platform are EXTREMELY SLOW and anymore hacks to get it to run faster will likely increase the price and complexity of a processor that is already too expensive. Itanium systems start at over $10,000. Not only that, but IA-64 is a completely different architecture from what's already out there. In effect, it *orphans* a whole TON of applications already out and running on Windows 32-bit boxes. And here's where it would get even more squirrelly for Windows users..*

*AMD *is* planning on offering a 64-bit desktop processor, but it's 64-bit server line has already been ignored by*

*Microsoft. For the desktop x86-64 would be yet another completely different architecture from Intel's IA-64. Will Microsoft begin to support and develop *another* version of Windows for the AMD x86-64 platform? It isn't clear that they will. In short, might leave AMD's platform to the LINUX camp. Sure Dassault could in theory port to LINUX, but then it would beg the question: if LINUX, then why not OS X? Then there is always Apple's X11. The point is... Offering yet another version of Windows for a completely different platform will just ADD to the confusion that a lot of endusers already face. Compatibility issues across those platforms will likely skyrocket as well. But this is only the start of the horrid situation. If it will be a task for Microsoft *and* Intel to deliver a 64-bit desktop version of their wares (at a reasonable price to endusers) then where does that leave developers? A: In an even worse situation...*

Developers will be asked to support, maintain and ensure compatibility of their drivers and apps across 3 different versions of Windows. That's 3 versions for the same platform in total! Win32, WinIA-64 and WinX86-64. The apps haven't even been dreamed up yet, and remember, emulation is out of the question because it yields poor performance for the $$;-) I doubt Dassault will offer 3 versions of their applications for the same Windows platform. So, where does that leave CATIA users? Stuck at 32-bit for quite some time now that you've effectively limited your options by supporting a seemingly stagnant platform. Intel has stated it, and Microsoft has stated it. There will be no 64-bit desktop version of Windows or an Intel chip for quite some time. AMD seems to be left with a processor but no apps and a LINUX port is possible, but that will likely go against the reasoning many pro-Windows users have supported in this thread when arguing why a port to OS X seems out of the question. Their arguments can be applied to a LINUX port as well. Then there is IBM...

*IBM is offering the PowerPC 970. A 64-bit chip aimed directly at desktop workstations in multi-proc configs that will run older 32-bit code natively and arguably even faster at the same clock-speed given the overall processor improvements with respect to pipelines and the bus - a chip that Apple is likely to adopt for their desktop workstations. Remember, Apple is ALREADY running a UNIX-based OS with THOUSANDS of commercial applications available. Still, you would imagine that IBM would want an application like CATIA running on their hardware and as I stated earlier, it's likely that if IBM *suggested* that Dassault do so, then you can bet it would be in Dassault's best interest to deliver what moma wants ;-) Then it gets back to the same question... If LINUX on IBM 970 then why not OS X on IBM 970? The point is that a good lot of you should have been sharp enough to foresee this sad situation. But it's not over yet. It gets even more horrid.*

Suppose AMDs desktop CPU takes off and Microsoft endorses it with an X86-64 version of desktop Windows and developers all line up with their applications all debugged and ready to go.. Where does that leave Intel, the company hell-bent on making Itanium succeed? It forces Intel to come up with ANOTHER HACK that keeps the company solidly bound to the x86 specter for quite some time. Now that's what I call ironic. In effect, Itanium would fail miserably and thus Intel's attempt to get away from that antiquated architecture known as X86. If Microsoft decides to chance support for multiple versions of thier already bloated OS for different platforms while attempting to secure, bug-fix and ensure compatibility across said versions, then developers and consumers will be rewarded with even MORE of that confusion.

All this said, it looks like CATIA will be running exclusively on proprietary Windows 32-bit for quite some time. You would think Dassault would acknowledge the situation and start gearing up for IBM and Apple desktop workstations designed specifically to run 32-bit or 64-it applications. The bottom line is that Intel and Microsoft seem to have been caught with their pants down and not knowing what to do they simply stick to Win32 on Pentium for desktops, effectively missing the 64-bit boat. It seems to be a nice way to reward all their loyal customers who were initially sold on the ideas that those companies were promoting. Isn't it time the industry moved on? Someone tell me why Windows on Intel was a good choice for Dassault/CATIA again?

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76936)

Date: February 25, 2003 10:19 AM
Author: Julian Laxton (julian_laxton@cinmach.com)
Subject: Re: Intel: No rush to 64-bit Desktops (you guys seem to be in a

You are underestimating Intel and Microsoft. I have no great love of either of these companies, and I would very much like to see more competition, but history has shown that they both are incredible competitors (that sometimes resort to illegal tactics). My prediction is that within 3 years there will be a fully 64 bit implementation of windows out there.

Intel is saying that there is no market for 64-bit desktop computers primarily because a) they don't have a 64-bit x86 chip ready to ship, and b) they are starting the FUD campaign against AMD. Rumor has it that there is in existance an Intel chip (Yamhill) that is a 64 bit implementation of x86. Intel is hesitant to release this chip, most likely so that their "cheaper" chips don't cut the margins of their new Itanium line.

Secondly, it is also rumored that Microsoft has a 64 bit version of windows already running on AMD's x86-64 hardware. Windows NT was originally written on MIPS chips, so I imagine it is quite a bit more portable than you think.

Thirdly, nobody except computer science professors and people that own RISC chips really care what instruction set a chip uses. Everyone bashes x86 as if it has been the same since 1979. It isn't: MMX, SSE, SSE2, etc. have all been added on. The segmented architecture of the 8086 and 286 sucked, I will grant you that, but the 80386 and up all have 32 bit modes with flat address spaces. The instruction set may not be as "elegant" as the Alpha, MIPS, or PPC, but so what? The x86 code size is smaller than just about every RISC architecture, and RISC chips have had to resort to an instruction decode step in their pipelines now because their instruction sets are no longer "reduced" (for example: Altivec has been tacked on to the PPC). x86-64's 64 bit mode is a clean 64 bit implementation with a flat memory model. It doesn't get much better than that. You can argue about which instruction set is more "elegant," but at the end of the day the person sitting in front of the terminal just does not care.

If AMD has any success with x86-64, Intel will release a competing 64 bit x86 product within a year. This does present a problem for people who need more than 2GB of application memory right now, I will admit. Then again, most of the CAD packages that are available right now, even on UNIX, are compiled as 32 bit apps, so the 64 bit question is moot until Dassault et al release 64 bit apps.

Finally, Windows may have not been the best choice for Dassault, but the question you need to answer is "Why is OSX better?"

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76939)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: February 25, 2003 11:17 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: No 64-bit Wintel destop until end of decade

[[[Intel is saying that there is no market for 64-bit desktop computers primarily because a) they don't have a 64-bit x86 chip ready to ship]]]

Yep, that's exactly right.. It isn't ready when others will be ready FAR (years?) sooner.

[[[Rumor has it that there is in existence an Intel chip (Yamhill) that is a 64 bit implementation of x86]]]

Which is still a little different from AMD's X86-64 implementation; enough so that in can probably be considered a different platform.

[[[Intel is hesitant to release this chip, most likely so that their "cheaper" chips don't cut the margins of their new Itanium line.]]]

Yep, now you see the bind they were in... Oh, and you forgot to mention the MHz. thy've been preaching for so long will likely come around to bite them ;-)

[[[Secondly, it is also rumored that Microsoft has a 64 bit version of windows already running on AMD's x86-64 hardware.]]]

*SERVER hardware. This is different from a Windows *desktop* Microsoft has no plans for a 64-bit version of the Windows desktop primarily because there is no 64-bit Intel chip ready to ship. What will they test it on? lol Be serious.*

[[[If AMD has any success with x86-64, Intel will release a competing 64 bit x86 product within a year.]]]

For SERVERS.

Anyway, to clear up a few points...

It's my understanding that Windows running on those non-Intel systems, especially Alpha, ran dog-slow (on an Alpha!?) Furthermore, applications had to be recompiled to run on it. How many will be recompiled this time? How long will it take for developers to release robust apps? Oh probably not many since it's a completely NEW platform that will need to run older apps through emulation, which is really out of the question.

*So, will developers be asked *yet again* (and so soon) to throw significant $$ into application development for these new and separate platforms running the SAME OS? Can you answer that? It's also my understanding that anyone who was interested in shelling out for Alpha systems were running OSF/1 - Tru64 UNIX or OpenVMS. It would appear that the Itanium is running into the same debacle that the Alpha did with respect to Windows. So you keep right on believing that Intel and Microsoft will provide you with the rosiest of futures and 64-bit desktops within 3 years with all the current apps to go along with it... You've been buying it up to this point. And you still missed the point completely.*

By MS only developing Server 2003 for IA-64 tells us that developers and endusers alike will now have to worry about 3 to 4 completely different platforms running the same OS: x86-64 and IA-64 and x86-32. AMD's 64-bit isn't exactly what an Intel x86-64 implementation would be so that also has to be factored into the equation as perhaps a half-platform. You act like Windows ran like a champ on those other platforms when in fact it was a dog and thus, not nearly as portable as Microsoft marketed, which was my point.

*Just more confusion, chaos and compatibility issues for developers and endusers to consider. I mean what about all those nice brandy-new desktops that were sold to all you guys this year? Those legacy systems aren't going to go away any time soon. Are people going to ask to upgrade *again* ? Will OEM suddenly drop support for those systems? It might have considerable blow-back.. people might indeed update -- to a platform that's much more forward looking.*

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76943)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: February 25, 2003 12:01 PM
Author: Julian Laxton (julian_laxton@cinmach.com)
Subject: Re: No 64-bit Wintel destop until end of decade

I love talking to the macintosh faithful. It reminds me of when I was a fan of OS/2.

Anyway, to answer your points...

1. There is still no 64 bit macintosh. Will there be one with a 64 bit operating system before a

64 bit x86 implementation with a 64 bit operating system? Nobody knows. I'd say the odds are even right now.

2. I have no idea if Intel's 64 bit x86 implementation is the same as AMD's. In it's current state, likely not. Will they release a x86-64 implementation if AMD's chips take off? I don't know. AMD didn't patent the instruction set (as far as I can remember), so Intel could clone it. Even if AMD has patented it, I'm sure they would be willing to cross-license it with Intel in exchange for SSE3 and upcoming Intel extensions.

3. Intel is having to back off the Mhz marketing already - their new "Centrino" or whatever the mobile chip is called runs at low Mhz but apps run about the same speed as a P4 with a much higher clock. It's all marketing - what else can you say? Just about every chip company has resorted to other performance measures besides clock speed, and intel will have to now as well. At the end of the day, if the chip is fast, people will buy it.

4. AMD provided a x86-64 simulator to microsoft and the linux community long before there was any x86-64 silicon. Intel will do (or has already done) the same thing. Microsoft can test to their heart's content on the simulator.

5. NT on Alpha and MIPS was actually quite fast, but it had to be running natively compiled applications. NT/Alpha could run x86 binaries; the problem was that running x86 binaries via the FX32! emulation package was not as fast. Unfortunately, changing CPU architectures is not easy (as I am sure the Mac faithful well know). Recompiling to get native binaries is a fact of life that will not go away.

NT was developed to be portable primarily because Microsoft and Intel were not the best of friends at that time in their corporate histories. This was a move by Microsoft to put some pressure on Intel. At the time, the other RISC architectures had a sizeable performance advantage over Intel. This performance lead has mostly evaporated, but Intel chips remain cheaper than their RISC counterparts. This is why NT only runs on Intel these days: there's no cost or performance benefit to running it on any other platform. I am not a big fan of Intel, but they can turn out huge numbers of chips for low cost, something the RISC vendors (and AMD) can only dream about.

6. I really don't understand the difference you are trying to define between making people port apps from a 32 to a 64 bit version of windows, and a 32 and 64 bit OSX. If you want 64 bit functionality, the OS is going to need at best a recompile, and at worst a re-write. Is OSX 64 bit clean code? Then the apps must be recompiled, and you face the same difficulties. There is certainly uncertainty in the Intel/AMD side of the world as to which 64 bit implementation will win, but in the end I expect only one to survive.

Let me close this note by making one final point. Microsoft and Intel have been presenting "confusion, chaos, and compatability issues", as you said, for the last decade and a half. Yet, together they hold over 90 percent of the market. I can only conclude that they must be doing something right. What it is, I don't know, but I don't see that Apple is presenting anything new in the way of an alternative. I may very well be wrong, but I still don't see what is going to compel the marketplace to move to OSX.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=76944)

Date: March 17, 2003 05:04 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Apple updates X11 public beta

Just thought that some of the Unix people on this board would be interested in this little bit of news:

Article:
Apple updates X11 public beta

http://maccentral.macworld.com/news/0303/17.x11.php

Further information:

http://www.apple.com/macosx/x11/

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=77351)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: April 15, 2003 11:31 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Apple releases Mac OS X 10.2.5

And it continues to progress...

http://maccentral.macworld.com/news/2003/04/10/macosx/

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=77903)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: April 16, 2003 04:56 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: LightWorks update adds AltiVec optimization

Correct me if I'm wrong, but isn't LightWorks the renderer used in the CATIA software?

LightWorks update adds AltiVec optimization

By Peter Cohen pcohen@maccentral.com
April 16, 2003 11:00 am

http://maccentral.macworld.com/news/2003/04/16/lightworks/

LightWork Design has released a new update to the Mac version of the 3D rendering engine in its LightWorks 7.0 software. The update adds AltiVec optimization -- changes designed to improve performance using the Velocity Engine registers in G4 chips -- that results in a 1.5x faster rendering speed than before.

LightWork Design said that the AltiVec optimization provides performance boosts in scenes containing soft shadows, ray tracing and procedural shaders.

The AltiVec optimization - built on the new software architecture introduced in LightWorks 7.0 - gives user a performance increase of up to 1.5 times for typical scenes containing soft shadows, ray tracing and procedural shaders.

The new update is available now as a drop-in replacement for the standard version of LightWorks.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=77922)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: May 15, 2003 08:23 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing!

http://maccentral.macworld.com/news/2003/05/15/autocad/

Autodesk gauging interest in AutoCAD for Mac OS X
By Dennis Sellers
May 15, 2003 7:25 am

Eric Stover, the AutoCAD product manager at Autodesk, wants to hear from people interested in having the company develop AutoCAD for Mac OS X. Interested? Drop him an e-mail.

AutoCAD, currently available for the Windows platform, is an interactive drawing system designed for drafting and design. Apple is mentioning Stover's request on their Hot News site, presumably to help drum up support for a Mac OS X version of the software.

The 2004 series of AutoCAD includes different versions. There are titles for engineering, mapping, land planning, surveying, spatial data analysis and more.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=78548)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: May 15, 2003 09:09 AM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing!

Comparing AutoCAD to CATIA is like comparing a Ford Focus to a Freightliner Truck. Both of them will help you haul your goods, but one of them will haul a lot more.

While it may be nice to wish and dream that Dassault would provide a Linux Based (or OS X, or generic UNIX, or any other OS out there) CAD/CAM/CAE System, that will not happen until some time in the future, and most of us here are dealing with the present. CATIA V5 on Windows is the most functional and powerful Fully Integrated CAD/CAM/CAE System in existance today.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=78549)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: May 15, 2003 10:06 AM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Re: Re: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing!

[[[Comparing AutoCAD to CATIA is like comparing a Ford Focus to a Freightliner Truck. Both of them will help you haul your goods, but one of them will haul a lot more.]]]

Viewed from another angle, it tells me that there a lot more things to worry about when things go wrong. I just think it's a poor analogy, but I get the gist. And I still think it's a flawed argument that we've already covered.

[[[While it may be nice to wish and dream that Dassault would provide a Linux Based (or OS X, or generic UNIX, or any other OS out there) CAD/CAM/CAE System, that will not happen until some time in the future, and most of us here are dealing with the present.]]]

*As the competition passes you by smiling and waving because you decided it was a "safe bet" to rest on your laurels. What about the future? Long term? Growth? Diversity? How about just being *forward looking*?*

[[[CATIA V5 on Windows is the most functional and powerful Fully Integrated CAD/CAM/CAE System in existance today.]]]

And you must be aware of how quickly that could change, but still, having it on Windows doesn't say much. Why not diversify? Why place all your eggs in a single basket? Why sell your soul to an opportunistic company like Microsoft? I'm betting you'll come around sooner than you might think.

*Still you have failed to address IBM's plans for the 970. IBM has already stated it's intentions. They will be releasing high-end desktop workstations and low to midrange servers based on LINUX-on-PowerPC-970. Do you mean to sit there and have me believe that if IBM wanted CATIA to be running on their new platform offering you would sit there and preach to them how great 32bit CATIA is on Pentium-based Windows systems?!? No, I think not. I'm willing to bet that IBM holds a LOT more clout than that and if IBM wanted CATIA running on LINUX-PPC970 it'd be offered and there would probably be very little argument. And suddenly CATIA on Windows wouldn't look that great. Let me ask you this... Do you think that offering CATIA *only* for Windows was a smart/safe move?*

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=78551)

Date: May 15, 2003 11:40 AM
Author: Jim Strawn (jstrawn@cessna.textron.com)
Subject: Re: Re: Re: Autodesk: Interest In AutoCAD for MacOS X Increasing

When it takes 3 to 5 years to implement a new Graphics System, I'm not concerned with the Johnny-Come-Lately systems. If a truly innovative and competitive system comes along, it will still be there the next time we start looking. In an industry that takes 3-5 years or more to develop a new product, we do not change CAD systems lightly. The amount of training alone is a significant enough investment that management will not even consider more frequent changes.

Nor am I concerned with my competitors beating me to the punch. They have the same budgetary, training, and legacy issues that we do. And we are not "resting on our laurels". We are in the the process of switching from CATIA V4 to V5. This implementation started last year, and will probably last another 2 to 3 years before we are fully migrated. If DS were to re-write CATIA and make it fully Linux, OS-X, or Unix operable, and if it were as significantly different as V5 is from V4, we would either have to start over, or wait a few years (and waiting would be good anyway, as the first few releases of any CAD system are pretty unusable).

Having run CATIA for many years, and many releases, on both Unix Workstations (AIX) and Windows, I can tell you that the vast majority of issues are with the application, not the OS. Most of these end up being functions that do not work the way they were supposed to. The only OS dependant issues that seem to come up are memory leaks, and those are not always OS dependant - sometimes the identical errors show up on all platforms.

Since our CAD system is integrated with a VPDM system for data storage and management, and that database resides on a Unix Server, data security is less of an issue than most Windows Only installations. Even our File-Based processes reside on Unix Servers. We do not rely on Windows for our security.

As for the 32 bit arguement, CATIA is still a 32 bit application, and until they re-write it and make it a 64 bit application, it really doesn't matter whether my OS is 32 or 64 bits (yes, I know that there is supposed to be some improvement even with 32 bit apps, but I do not believe that it is significant). I suspect that, when CATIA does become 64 bit, it will only be certain functions within CATIA (at first anyway), and those types of applications are already running on Unix Workstations and Servers.

As for IBM's new iron, I'm sure that, if IBM wants CATIA to run on these, they will provide AIX (probably AIX 5), and V5 will run on these workstations. But, just like V5 on AIX today, it will be running as an emulation, with a fair amount of missing functionality.

PS we are currently running our V5 users on a mix of AIX and Windows 2000, with some IRIX thrown in.

Jim Strawn
Cessna Aircraft Co.
316-517-5851

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=78555)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 11, 2003 02:51 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: World Wide Developers Conference (WWDC 2003)

All eyes will be on the upcoming World Wide Developers Conference this June. Apple will likely provide developers with a sneak-peek at new hardware -- probably machines based on the new 64bit IBM PowerPC 970 CPU and of course a look at Panther, the next version of MacOS X. Presumably Panther will be a 64bit operating system allowing Macs running Panther to address more than 4 Gig of memory. All this, not to mention all the other system enhancements the new hardware will undoubtedly bring.

http://developer.apple.com/wwdc/

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79160)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 12, 2003 12:38 AM
Author: B O Lox (BL@hotmail.com)
Subject: OS-X

```
For a while now I have been reading your posts.
Until you joined the forum, I hadn't really thought about an alternative OS for CATIA.
Can you honestley tell me OS-X is a better solution.
Knowing how few people are writing code for OS-X
Will you really influence people in the right places using this tool.
I wish you luck with your quest.
Thanks for perservering Ed.
```

Bobby Lox

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79172)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 26, 2003 03:08 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: 64-bit G5 (IBM 970), 64-bit OS X (Panther), gobs of additional d

The G5 has landed folks. Will CATIA be a player on the #1 64bit UNIX workstation? The tools available should make it a breeze to bring over. The technology used in Apple's new systems is AMAZING, but the big excitement for scientists and engineers alike is the fact that Apple is offering all this power and versatility in systems starting at under $2000.00 ! Where else can you get a 64-bit UNIX workstation for those prices with the technology that Apple has packed in them?

www.apple.com

Be sure to research the whitepapers as well as the developer areas too. There is lots to be excited about.

I expect comments from at least *some* of you.

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79467)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 26, 2003 05:07 PM
Author: Julian Laxton (julian_laxton@cinmach.com)
Subject: Re: 64-bit G5 (IBM 970), 64-bit OS X (Panther), gobs of addition

The new G5's look very nice, definitely a marked improvement over the G4's. I'm happy that Apple finally has a CPU on which OSX can really shine.

>Will CATIA be a player on the #1 64bit UNIX workstation?

Let Apple ship a few, then we'll discuss this question.

>Where else can you get a 64-bit UNIX workstation for those
>prices with the technology that Apple has packed in them?

How about an Opteron running Linux?

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79468)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: June 30, 2003 11:32 AM
Author: ian phillips (ianp@gmx.net)
Subject: Power? Who needs it?

Just a minute Ed

Earlier in this forum you wrote:
*Where is the need for more speed during the actual design process? where is this *speed* required?*

You also wrote:
Perhaps for what he does, 500 Mhz. was fast enough. Is that a possibility? Could it be that the increase in speed got him very little in the way of noticed performance?

And Also:
CAD apps seemed to run just fine on those slow Pentiums ;-)

And:
*So, where is this *speed* needed? Hell, you could run this stuff on an iMac!*

And more:
Speed of the system doesn't seem to get you much.

And more:
*Speed isn't *really* the issue, now is it? ;-)*

And more:
Jim, it seems to me that your entire argument boils down to something like this... "there is never enough speed". I disagree...

Ed I'm glad you're now aware of the bane of a CAD designers life. Slow computers.
But that was just for fun. And I'm delighted that there is a nice fast G5 with a 64 bit OS on it. It certainly would be great to see Catia on an Apple and going at top speed. I'm sure "it still wont be fast enough" for some of us, but we'd be grateful for any speed improvement.

Ian

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79503)

Date: July 01, 2003 03:33 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: RenderMan Coming to OS X

Well, it looks like Pixar is impressed with Apple's new G5 systems. So much so that they are already in what looks to be alpha release of the software.. Demos anyway. The point is that Dassault should be paying strict and close attention to this. Where else can you get this type of power and versatility for the price Apple is asking for a full-blown 64bit workstation? I told you guys that these things would happen. Everything is starting to fall into place. Will Dassault be left behind, forever enslaved to suckle the teat of momma Micro$oft?

I think it's a perfect time for Dassault to diversify. Major developers have been coming over since the advent of OS X. Apple has moved quickly and decisively in a very short period of time. It's time all of you gave Apple a really close and serious look.

Architosh: News > Mac3D: Pixar benchmarks early RenderMan for Mac OS X on G5, Interested in Feedback

http://www.architosh.com/news/2003-06/2003c1-0625-renderman.phtml

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79555)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 01, 2003 03:40 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: RenderMan Coming to OS X!

Well, it looks like Pixar is impressed with Apple's new G5 systems. So much so that they are already in what looks to be alpha release of the software.. Demos anyway. The point is that Dassault should be paying strict and close attention to this. Where else can you get this type of power and versatility for the price Apple is asking for a full-blown 64bit workstation? I told you guys that these things would happen. Everything is starting to fall into place. Will Dassault be left behind, forever enslaved to suckle the teat of momma Micro$oft?

I think it's a perfect time for Dassault to diversify. Major developers have been coming over since the advent of OS X. Apple has moved quickly and decisively in a very short period of time. It's time all of you gave Apple a really close and serious look.

Architosh: News: Pixar benchmarks early RenderMan for Mac OS X on G5, Interested in Feedback

http://www.architosh.com/news/2003-06/2003c1-0625-renderman.phtml

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79556)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 02, 2003 09:06 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Kerris of Apple Still Insists That Major CAD Developers Are Inte

[[["When you have a small market share like Apple does, in order to increase your share, you don't want to go up against the mountain, you want to find paths along it that allow you to open up new opportunities. And anything that is graphically rich is an opportunity for the Mac," said Kerris.

"We're seeing it in a couple of different tracks," he continued. "One of the biggest is CAD and design. Designers of everything from consumer goods and products to automobiles and airplanes have started moving their ideas to front-end on the Macintosh and looking to [migrate] their entire workflow to Mac. That's a [US]$60 billion market and a huge opportunity for Apple. We have all the technology they use today. And if you look at us in particular markets, we're in a much more favorable position. In video editing, we're 50 percent. We're also strong in visual creation and animation. We're in a David-and-Goliath scenario, but we're fighting hard."]]]

Taken from here: http://sdtimes.com/news/081/special1.htm#80CONT

Thanks to Del Miller for the heads up.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79592)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 02, 2003 09:07 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Kerris of Apple Still Insists That Major CAD Developers Are Inte

[[["When you have a small market share like Apple does, in order to increase your share, you don't want to go up against the mountain, you want to find paths along it that allow you to open up new opportunities. And anything that is graphically rich is an opportunity for the Mac," said Kerris.

"We're seeing it in a couple of different tracks," he continued. "One of the biggest is CAD and design. Designers of everything from consumer goods and products to automobiles and airplanes have started moving their ideas to front-end on the Macintosh and looking to [migrate] their entire workflow to Mac. That's a [US]$60 billion market and a huge opportunity for Apple. We have all the technology they use today. And if you look at us in particular markets, we're in a much more favorable position. In video editing, we're 50 percent. We're also strong in visual creation and animation. We're in a David-and-Goliath scenario, but we're fighting hard."]]]

Taken from here: http://sdtimes.com/news/081/special1.htm#80CONT

Thanks to Del Miller for the heads up.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79593)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 14, 2003 06:16 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Qt comes to Mac OS X

From the article:

"Qt/Mac is the Mac port of Qt, a single-source, multiplatform C++ GUI toolkit that allows applications to run natively on Windows, Linux/Unix, and Mac OS X, all from the same code base. With Qt/Mac anybody who has ever written a Qt application for Linux/Unix or Windows -- that includes over 150,000 developers -- has now written a native Mac OS X application too! Using the same source used in Qt you can now compile your app for native Mac OS X. "

http://www.architosh.com/news/2003-07/2003c-0710-150-000.phtml

http://www.trolltech.com/products/qt/mac.html

By the way, rumor has it that there were developers from Dassault, PTC and Autodesk at this past World Wide Developers Conference (WWDC). If true, I wonder what they were doing there?
--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79953)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 14, 2003 06:16 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Qt comes to Mac OS X

From the article:

"Qt/Mac is the Mac port of Qt, a single-source, multiplatform C++ GUI toolkit that allows applications to run natively on Windows, Linux/Unix, and Mac OS X, all from the same code base. With Qt/Mac anybody who has ever written a Qt application for Linux/Unix or Windows -- that includes over 150,000 developers -- has now

written a native Mac OS X application too! Using the same source used in Qt you can now compile your app for native Mac OS X. "

http://www.architosh.com/news/2003-07/2003c-0710-150-000.phtml

http://www.trolltech.com/products/qt/mac.html

By the way, rumor has it that there were developers from Dassault, PTC and Autodesk at this past World Wide Developers Conference (WWDC). If true, I wonder what they were doing there?
--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=79954)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: July 16, 2003 05:47 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: PTC launches Pro/Concept 2.0 for Mac OS X

PTC launches Pro/Concept 2.0 for Mac OS X
July 16, 2003 - 17:21 EDT

PTC today announced that its conceptual and industrial design solution, Pro/Concept, which is being unveiled at the MacWorld CreativePro Expo this week in New York City, is expected to be available for Mac OS X in the Fall of 2003. Pro/Concept 2.0 is PTC's conceptual design solution that allows designers to capture, explore and develop product designs and create realistic digital product models quickly and inexpensively. It is the first solution to combine sketching and modeling in a single, easy-to-learn and use environment, according to the press release.

First PTC Product Design Solution for the Mac Debuts at MacWorld 2003

NEEDHAM, Mass., July 16 /PRNewswire-FirstCall/-- PTC (Nasdaq: PMTC), the product development company (TM), today announced that its conceptual and industrial design solution, Pro/CONCEPT, is expected to be available for Mac OS X in Fall 2003. Pro/CONCEPT 2.0 is being unveiled at the MacWorld CreativePro Conference and Expo at the Javits Center in New York City from July 14-18.

Pro/CONCEPT 2.0 is PTC's ground breaking conceptual design solution that allows designers to capture, explore and develop product designs and create realistic digital product models quickly and inexpensively. It is the first solution to combine sketching and modeling in a single, easy-to-learn and use environment. Pro/CONCEPT contains tools for free-form sketching, image retouching, curve and facet modeling, painting directly onto three dimensional (3D) models, and real-time and photo-realistic rendering.

"Pro/CONCEPT 2.0 is PTC's first product for the Mac and we are excited to offer this innovative conceptual design solution on a premier 'designers' platform," said Brian Shepherd, senior vice president of product management for PTC. "Design professionals can now quickly and easily capture and distill ideas, make assessments and seamlessly move the best ideas to detailed design and production with Pro/ENGINEER Wildfire or other platforms."

"We are extremely happy that PTC is bringing Pro/CONCEPT 2.0 as its first product to the platform and see it as an important solution that will extend the Mac to even more design professionals," said Ron Okamoto, Apple's vice president of Worldwide Developer Relations. "Pro/CONCEPT 2.0 takes advantage of Mac OS X's OpenGL support to provide real-time interactive 2D and 3D graphics to power the creation of innovative new designs faster and easier than ever before."

PTC worked closely with industrial and conceptual designers to define a complete conceptual tool that not only captures new ideas but also allows for the freedom to easily explore and expand them into real working designs

as quickly and seamlessly as possible. With Pro/CONCEPT, users can: -- Sketch, model and paint product concepts, including creating sketches using a full palette of tools, creating and editing 3D facet models, and creating curve layouts. -- Provide photo-realistic images, using capabilities such as retouching images and photographs, real time rendering, photo rendering and advanced photo rendering. -- Transfer models to and from MCAD and collaboration systems.

Pro/CONCEPT can transfer file types in Pro/ENGINEER and a variety of formats (STL, VRML, ProductView, OBJ, TIFF or JPEG). 3D print and stereo lithography provide the ability to produce rapid prototypes.

Pro/CONCEPT 2.0 is expected to start shipping in October 2003 in one low- cost package that includes self-paced tutorials. Pro/CONCEPT 1.0 is available immediately, and starts at $1495 (USD). Pro/CONCEPT is available directly from the online PTC Store at https://www.ptc.com/estore/.

For more information on Pro/CONCEPT, please go to http://www.ptc.com/go/proconcept. For more information on the MacWorld CreativePro Conference and Expo, please go to http://www.macworldexpo.com/.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=80040)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 11, 2003 03:13 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Renderman

So, what do you guys think about Renderman coming over to OS X? OH, and rumor has it that PTC wants to migrate their entire workflow over to OS X. Some companies obviously see value in migrating their wares. It's called diversity.

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=80581)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: August 11, 2003 03:14 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: Renderman

So, what do you guys think about Renderman coming over to OS X? OH, and rumor has it that PTC wants to migrate their entire workflow over to OS X. Some companies obviously see value in migrating their wares. It's called diversity.

--
Ed

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=80582)

Top Previous Next Print Reply

Date: September 02, 2003 07:17 PM
Author: Ed M. (EdsLab2@aol.com)
Subject: More G5 news: Virginia Tech Building G5 Supercomputing Cluster

Well, its been confirmed that Apple and Virginia Tech are building a G5 Supercomputing cluster that will place in the top 5 in the world.

http://news.com.com/2100-1008_3-5070403.html?tag=cd_mh

Also worth mentioning is that IBM released XLC for MacOS X. XLC is a world class C compiler highly tuned for Power4 and G5. It's based on IBM's powerful VisualAge compiler.

http://www-3.ibm.com/software/awdtools/ccompilers/

FORTRAN too!

http://www-3.ibm.com/software/awdtools/fortran/

Shouldn't Dassault start to take Apple seriously? It think it's time.

--
Ed M.

(http://neo3.sba.com/forums/Index.cfm?CFApp=57&Message_ID=80929)