

RE: Digi Neo 8: linux-2.6.12_r2 jsm driver

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2005-04/3551.html>

From: Kilau, Scott (Scott_Kilau_at_digi.com)

Date: 04/12/05

Date: Tue, 12 Apr 2005 15:01:32 -0500
To: "Jan-Benedict Glaw" <jbglaw@lug-owl.de>

> *There's a consensus that if there's *any* choice, new /proc files as
> well as new ioctls shall not be introduced. So if there's management needed*

Oh, keep in mind, the ioctls are not new.

They exist today, and are clearly defined in Documentation/ioctl-number.txt
> *'d' F0-FF linux/digi1.h*

But we have already been down this road in a previous thread,
and I gave up on that argument as well. =)

Scott Kilau

-----Original Message-----

From: Jan-Benedict Glaw [<mailto:jbglaw@lug-owl.de>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2005 1:49 PM

To: Kilau, Scott

Cc: Christoph Hellwig; Ihalainen Nickolay; admin@list.net.ru; linux-kernel@vger.kernel.org; Wen Xiong

Subject: Re: Digi Neo 8: linux-2.6.12_r2 jsm driver

On Tue, 2005-04-12 11:42:31 -0500, Kilau, Scott <Scott_Kilau@digi.com>
wrote in message <335DD0B75189FB428E5C32680089FB9F12215A@mtk-sms-mail01.digi.com>:

> *The JSM driver was forced to be stripped down when being submitted
> to the kernel sources, and many extended features removed as so to be
> included into the kernel, as the extended features added special ioctls
> and special /proc (/sys for 2.6) files.*

There's a consensus that if there's *any* choice, new /proc files as
well as new ioctls shall not be introduced. So if there's management
needed (disclaimer: I don't own such a card), then this interface needs
to be introduced as a generic interface, which might be used by any
further drivers. We've just had this situation for some RAID cards,
where the vendor wanted to introduce a (specific for his devices)
interface. Either do it correct (as of best current practice), or don't
do it at all.

> > *I didn't think that you would remove them. I read the posts and
> > wondered *why* they wanted the management pieces removed.
> > One reason to use the Digi products is for the sole fact that
> > they *can* be diagnosed.
> > I'm glad that Digi is still focused properly.
> > I agree that committing the drivers to the main kernel
> > is not the way to go if you are forced to remove dpa and ditty.*

Well, again, if this features can only used by your hardware (and there's proof that no other vendor will add these features *ever*), then an own interface is okay. But if there's a possibility that a different vendor *might* introduce these as well, then a generic interface needs to be build (with first of all only one user: your driver).

> *I will let the chips fall where they will, and clean up the mess that
> will soon be introduced into my driver world. =)*

That's a plan. Good to head :-)

MfG, JBG

```
--  
Jan-Benedict Glaw      jbglaw@lug-owl.de      . +49-172-7608481      _ O _  
"Eine Freie Meinung in einem Freien Kopf | Gegen Zensur | Gegen Krieg  _ _ O  
 fuer einen Freien Staat voll Freier Bürger" | im Internet! | im Irak!  O O O  
ret = do_actions((curr | FREE_SPEECH) & ~(NEW_COPYRIGHT_LAW | DRM | TCPA));  
-  
To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in  
the body of a message to majordomo@vger.kernel.org  
More majordomo info at http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html  
Please read the FAQ at http://www.tux.org/lkml/
```