

# Re: [linux-pm] Power Management framework proposal

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2007-07/msg09908.html>

---

- *From:* [david@xxxxxxx](mailto:david@xxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Mon, 23 Jul 2007 11:14:01 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mon, 23 Jul 2007, Igor Stoppa wrote:

On Sun, 2007-07-22 at 14:21 -0700, ext david@xxxxxxx wrote:

[snip]

this is another one. I'd be happy to get pointers to prior ones to learn from.

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/pipermail/linux-pm/2007-March/011204.html>

This is probably one of the latest. Previously there was some clash between powerop and oppoints that lead to people running away from too much confusion.

thanks, I'll read through that

Unfortunately, while it's true that there are significant similarities, there are also notable differences; as far as i know the USB subsystem is the one that gets closer to what we have in the embedded arena, since it can have complex cases of parent-child powering and wakeup.

this API is not trying to represent the parent-child hierarchy. as far as I know that's documented in sysfs (or is supposed to be). this is just an attempt to make it so that as you are going through the hierarchy you don't have to use vastly different API's to control the different functions.

Re: [linux-pm] Power Management framework proposal

You are going to end up with parent child relationships, or user-consumer.

Devices don't exist in the void, but are interconnected.

correct, but the interconnections are already documented via sysfs aren't they? if they are why should this new API need to worry about that?

I suspect that most (if not all) of the previous One Solutions have tried to completely handle all the details of their original case, and then