

Re: A set of "standard" virtual devices?

## Re: A set of "standard" virtual devices?

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2007-04/msg01029.html>

---

- *From:* "H. Peter Anvin" <[hpa@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:hpa@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 03 Apr 2007 14:45:24 -0700
- 

Jeremy Fitzhardinge wrote:

So, what you're saying is:

1. assuming there's going to be a vast number of miscellaneous devices
2. it would be best if there were one per device rather than one per hypervisor per device
3. so we'd have one linux device driver

But this implies that the work is just pushed off into all the hypervisors to support this new device over the generic interface; there's no overall reduction of code or complexity, other than making "wc" on the kernel source smaller.

Sure there is, assuming you deal about heterogenous clients. I'm not sure Xen is (although that is, as far as I understand, being remedied), which might explain your different perspective.

Consider that this may not even be about Linux --- having these standard devices would enable, say, 'doze device drivers to be written and shared.

That said, something like USB is probably the best bet for this kind of low-performance device. I think. Not that I really know anything about USB.

USB is evil in the extreme for this kind of stuff. Although in theory you can have any HCI you want, in practice the ones that are implemented requires a very complex framework for full compatibility.

-hpa

-

To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in the body of a message to [majordomo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:majordomo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

Please read the FAQ at <http://www.tux.org/lkml/>

Re: A set of "standard" virtual devices?