

Re: New FreeBSD package system (a.k.a. Daemon Package System (dps))

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/hackers/2007-05/msg00101.html>

- *From:* Mike Meyer <mwm-keyword-freebsdhackers2.e313df@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 11 May 2007 14:34:33 -0400
-

In <200705111011.52212.fcash@xxxxxxxxxx>, Freddie Cash <fcash@xxxxxxxxxx> typed:

On Friday 11 May 2007 07:35 am, Mike Meyer wrote:

I still think we ought to quit pretending that ports/packages aren't part of BSD, and default LOCALBASE to /usr. But if changing it is being tested, that's a big help.

Personally, this is the one thing I like *most* about BSD. There is a clear separation between what ships as part of the OS, and what apps I install on it later. There's a consistency to things, that you just can't find anywhere else.

/ and /usr are the OS.

/usr/local is what the ports tree installs.

Moving the OS into the package system has been on the "todo" list for a long time (assuming it's still there – there are people opposed to that). What happens to your distinction in that case? This is why I think the distinction is an illusion.

One could make the case for /usr to be the OS, /usr/pkg (or whatever) for port installs, and /usr/local for local source installs. So long as the OS is separate from the apps.

I think that would be an improvement. There's a real distinction between "things installed from ports/packages" and "things I built and installed myself". The former I expect to reinstall from FreeBSD media; the latter I can't. Since most packages in the latter install in /usr/local, using that for the former makes life a bit more painful if you want to keep them separate. The downside is that making the default something else makes things a bit harder for people doing ports, which we promptly throw away by providing a settable LOCALBASE.

Re: New FreeBSD package system (a.k.a. Daemon Package System (dps))

With the OS and apps separate, you can upgrade them asynchronously.
There's a nice feeling to running the latest version of appX on FreeBSD
5.3. Or an older version of appY on FreeBSD 6-STABLE.

How would setting LOCALBASE=/usr break this? Of course, equally valid
is the question "what will break if I set LOCALBASE=/usr"? Hmm. I
think I may found out....

Personally, what I like about FreeBSD is that it provides flexibility
for things like this. If I'd rather have ports out of /usr/local, it's
not really hard to do. Not as easy as doing things the default way,
but not any worse than anyone else who wants to build from
source. Other systems seem intent on making me do things their way, no
matter what I may think of it, and trying to change something like
this is a major change.

<mike

—

Mike Meyer <mwm@xxxxxxxx> <http://www.mired.org/consulting.html>
Independent Network/Unix/Perforce consultant, email for more information.

freebsd-hackers@xxxxxxxx mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-hackers>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-hackers-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxx"