

Discussion Board 4

Modern operating systems, such as Red Hat Linux, Apple macOS, Ubuntu Linux, and Microsoft Windows, frequently distribute patches, and some application and utility software developers also distribute patches for their products. However, the number of developers that distribute patches is relatively small when compared to those who do not. Many programs and apps never receive any patches or security updates. Should programs and applications be required to provide security updates for a specific period of time after the program is released? What should happen when a software company goes out of business and leaves your product without an option to be patched or updated? Should organizations charge for updates and patches?

When it comes to patches and updates to systems that are designed to fix vulnerabilities, I personally believe that companies have an obligation to patch their software for a set period of time after new software has been released. If I had to put a time period of how long after, I would say that the most reasonable time span for a company to continue to support an outdated software that they made is five years after it has been discontinued. For me this time period is justifiable, as it gives the customers enough time to update their software without pressuring them to update and/or change operating systems or any form of new software right away. I believe that this time frame is a reasonable set of time for a company to continue to update their system without it costing the company too much unnecessary expenses, as well as too much manpower from being exhausted, working on updating a product that a small amount of their customer base is currently using. The overall strategy with this is to spend the least amount of money on an outdated system, so that more time and resources can be spent on improving their most current

version of their software. If a company were to go out of business and leave the customer with no way of receiving updates for the software, I believe that the code for the software should be released to the public as open source, so that the community that still uses the software can continue updating the software on their own time. This will allow the consumer to still have access to the software, without leaving the consumers that depended on the software out to dry. Finally for outdated software, I would not call it a stretch to ask the consumers to pay for continued maintenance/update patches for end of life software. To me, if a company were to release new software, and everyone was using said software, and every new computer or laptop that could be bought at the store was operating with this new software, and some people were refusing to upgrade. I think it would be more than justifiable for companies to say, "hey we will still update the software, but you have to pay a monthly subscription in order for us to continue maintaining it.". Operation cost and manpower to update any software can be extensive at times, and when a company is not pouring a majority of their resources to ensure the continued operations of said software, because the majority of their users uses something newer, they're going to pour their money into the new software. This is why I believe that paying a monthly or yearly maintenance fee makes the most sense, as a majority of their funding they get from updating their operating system will come from the users that use said operating systems. While it may be hard to believe, but a lot of people out there would probably pay companies for continued support of older operating systems. This can be due to nostalgia, removed features that was included within older versions of operating systems, or simply they could have just liked the way that it looked and felt to do operations within the older version of the software.