After Jules and I had our discussion last night I want to state my interpretation on our differences...

1. Jules is an entrepreneur, or in other words a risk taker, or in other words (to be harsh) a gambler. I am not.

2. Jules would develop software, with (a limited) amount of Sysgem money reserves, for sale without there being a "customer" under contract to buy it but with the assumption that it could be successful and earn Sysgem a significant reward. I would not.

3. Jules would develop software, with (a limited) amount of Sysgem money reserves, for sale by "distributors" who are signed up under contract to sell the software after it has been developed. I would not.

4. Both Jules and I would develop software, with (a limited) amount of Sysgem money reserves, for sale to "customers" who are signed up under contract to buy the software after it has been developed.

5. I have coined the phrase "speculative development of software" for points 2 and 3 above and the phrase "development of bespoke software" for point 4 above.

6. Ben outlined an interesting scenario for the development of "software with a web-based UI" as follows:
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In this scenario a version of SEM is developed with a Web UI to interact with the SEM Authorization Server for:

* Validation of SEM user login credentials
* Download of scripts (that may have been customised by standard SEM)
* Signing of messages for transmission to SEM Agents over SSL
* Other SEM services such as storage of Agent definitions, access to SEM databases, etc.

The Web based SEM component would emulate the working of standard SEM for a defined set of SEM modules / features. It would interact with SEM agents as does the standard SEM UI. There would be some features of standard SEM that would be deliberately left out of the Web UI version. For those features of SEM that are emulated, the look and feel would be similar to standard SEM.

I assume the SEM Authorization Service would need some modification to accommodate the new component.

If we were to generate enough interest in the above scenario by customer(s) who had enough desire for a Web UI and were willing to agree to a contract for the new component so that the cost of its development was met, then both Jules and I would be willing to develop this component.

A potential customer might be BIT with a version of SFiS being emulated by a Web based UI. But I think it is a ‘big ask’ for them to pay a sufficient amount to cover the cost of development – with the only advantage being a Web UI