

## Re: TEST PLEASE: if\_tun patch

**Source:** <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/current/2003-09/1677.html>

---

**From:** Brooks Davis ([brooks\\_at\\_one-eyed-alien.net](mailto:brooks_at_one-eyed-alien.net))

**Date:** 09/29/03

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 10:11:37 -0700  
To: Poul-Henning Kamp <[phk@phk.freebsd.dk](mailto:phk@phk.freebsd.dk)>

On Mon, Sep 29, 2003 at 07:29:08AM +0200, Poul-Henning Kamp wrote:

> *In message <20030929050442.GA20995@Odin.AC.HMC.Edu>, Brooks Davis writes:*

>

>

>>> | *Properly dismantle and remove the interface and destroy the dev\_t=20*

>>> | *at last close of the device.*

>>

>> *I'm not convinced this is the right direction to move in. The problem*

>> *is that users are beginning to expect that pseudo-interfaces be created*

>> *with network interface cloning, but tun, tap, and vmnet aren't.*

>

> *I'm totally "don't-care" on the semantics of any and all of these,*

> *my patch is just an attempt to evict makedev() from the tree. If you*

> *have a better idea how to do this, by all means go for it.*

I'd say that for tun devices, the new symantics are probably good. We can worry about supporting interface cloning on them later.

— Brooks

--

Any statement of the form "X is the one, true Y" is FALSE.

PGP fingerprint 655D 519C 26A7 82E7 2529 9BF0 5D8E 8BE9 F238 1AD4

---

- application/pgp-signature attachment: [stored](#)