

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [In your opinion, what is the best .net version to use for compatibility?](#)

DarkDelta - November 23, 2016, 6:14 am

So, we're quite some time ahead now since .net 2.0 was a sure shot.

Now looking at the [current windows versions in use](#) and the [list of .net versions](#) and it seems 3.5 is a smart idea to target when devices run anything below Windows 8, or the latest .net version for anything above and including Windows 8.

Anyone else able to chip in on this theory?

\$lick - November 23, 2016, 6:16 am

For compatibility, obviously 2.0

DarkDelta - November 23, 2016, 6:17 am

(Nov 23, 2016 07:16 AM){Nexus} Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) For compatibility, obviously 2.0

That won't run on newer devices, as that requires .Net 3.5, which is not included by default anymore

SIM-1847363 - November 23, 2016, 7:32 am

I like the overall improvement and features that they added to the .net 4 framework. Can't speak about .net 2.0 or any other due to the fact I rarely use the older frameworks.

Ninja - November 23, 2016, 7:48 am

I always use the latest.

You can always use 2.0 I think as with backwards compatibility it will work on any system.

DarkDelta - November 23, 2016, 7:50 am

(Nov 23, 2016 08:48 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I always use the latest.

You can always use 2.0 I think as with backwards compatibility it will work on any system.

2.0 is provided by the 3.5 package (CLR2), which isn't installed by default on windows 10... :(

Hapi - November 23, 2016, 8:48 am

(Nov 23, 2016 08:50 AM)DarkDelta Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 2.0 is provided by the 3.5 package (CLR2), which isn't installed by default on windows 10... :(

It really doesn't matter as .NET 4.* is backwards compatible with older version of .NET, I'm not sure if it goes all the way back to 1.1, but 2.0 will run on a system that has just 4.* installed as long as it has the following configuration file. No one can give you a 100% guarantee that your application will run on older/newer version you will have to test the application yourself.

If you are developing a new application and targeting .NET 2.0 you shouldn't have a problem, as if you are using an application made a long time ago then that's where you may face problems.

Code <configuration>

```
<startup>
  <supportedRuntime version="v2.0.50727" />
  <supportedRuntime version="v4.0" />
</startup>
```

</configuration>

Quote:The .NET Framework 4.5 and its point releases are backward-compatible with apps that were built with earlier versions of the .NET Framework. In other words, apps and components built with previous versions will work without modification on the .NET Framework 4.5. However, by default, apps run on the version of the common language runtime for which they were developed, so you may have to provide a configuration file to enable your app to run on the .NET Framework 4.5. For more information, see the Version compatibility for apps section earlier in this article.

#Kat - November 23, 2016, 9:10 am

I would've thought by now someone would have stopped this thread in its cold tracks by simply stating

Code Use Newer Visual Studio if like .. Just Target The Specific Framework ie. vf2.0 - vf4.62

DarkDelta - November 23, 2016, 9:14 am

(Nov 23, 2016 10:10 AM)#Kat Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I would've thought by now someone would have stopped this thread in its cold tracks by simply stating

Code Use Newer Visual Studio if like .. Just Target The Specific Framework ie. vf2.0 - vf4.62

It's not about VS, it's about the runtime, and current versions in use, and what can be considered as the minimum version now.

I'm thinking that 3.5 is the current minimum version that'll run everywhere.

GruntStyl - November 23, 2016, 11:50 am

I'd still say 2.0 is still the most compatible. I haven't had issues running a 2.0 framework application on windows 10. At the very least it will pop up a dialog saying it needs 2.0 installed. One click of a button and it installs it within a couple minutes. Most users shouldn't even have that come up as there is still a lot of applications that require 2.0 I'd assume?

Marwix - November 23, 2016, 2:14 pm

I would say that it depends on what kind of project you develop.

Sometimes framework 2.x could be a better option rather than using the latest framework for your applications.

DarkDelta - November 23, 2016, 3:02 pm

(Nov 23, 2016 03:14 PM)Marwix Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I would say that it depends on what kind of project you develop.

Sometimes framework 2.x could be a better option rather than using the latest framework for your applications.

2.x isn't delivered as a standalone .net version, 3.5 has 2.0 (it's both CLR2, basically 3.5 is 2.0 with extras)

I think 3.5 is the new minimum version to be honest!

Zilog80 - November 23, 2016, 3:34 pm

Maybe it helps:

<https://blogs.msdn.microsoft.com/astebner/2007/03/14/mailbag-what-version-of-the-net-framework-is-included-in-what-version-of-the-os/>

DarkDelta - November 23, 2016, 3:48 pm

(Nov 23, 2016 04:34 PM)Zilog80 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Maybe it helps:

<https://blogs.msdn.microsoft.com/astebner/2007/03/14/mailbag-what-version-of-the-net-framework-is-included-in-what-version-of-the-os/>

Basically as I thought, 3.5 if you target Win7 and below.

4.x.x if you want to target Win8 and above

Cecilia - November 23, 2016, 8:22 pm

(Nov 23, 2016 04:48 PM)DarkDelta Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Basically as I thought, 3.5 if you target Win7 and below.

4.x.x if you want to target Win8 and above

Meh, why would someone on windows 7 not have .net 4.0?

.net 4.0 is perfectly fine to develop in.

crack0n - November 23, 2016, 11:51 pm

Post Removed.

35chardogshit.

Menalix - November 24, 2016, 2:16 am

Depends on the application, if your application have some clear advantages of using a certain framework you should do that.

But as absolute minimum, I think 3.5 is fine nowadays, if we aren't talking malware.

I have 1200 customers atm, by stats, I can see there's simple no one of these who does not have 3.5.

DarkDelta - November 24, 2016, 5:54 am

(Nov 24, 2016 03:16 AM)Menalix Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Depends on the application, if your application have some clear advantages of using a certain framework you should do that.

But as absolute minimum, I think 3.5 is fine nowadays, if we aren't talking malware.

I have 1200 customers atm, by stats, I can see there's simple no one of these who does not have 3.5.

Even when creating malware, 3.5 would still be the minimum these days :P

3.5 includes 2.0 support, there is no separate 2.0 version anymore :)

Menalix - November 24, 2016, 6:28 am

(Nov 24, 2016 06:54 AM)DarkDelta Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Even when creating malware, 3.5 would still be the minimum these days :P

3.5 includes 2.0 support, there is no separate 2.0 version anymore :)

ye but indian folks and such, still runs xp some even 2000, with framework 2.0 only. I know 3.5 includes 2.0 support lol.

newmecha - November 24, 2016, 9:56 pm

4.0

It is supported across windows XP SP3 and up.