

Maintainer's Diary: Devicetree and its stumbling blocks

Wolfram Sang



5.11.2012, ELCE 2012

About me & Devicetree

- Kernel hacker since 2008
- started working with PowerPC (which introduced devicetree to the kernel)
- now I am mainly working with ARM
- devicetree followed me :)

A simple snippet...

```
i2c@83fc4000 { /* I2C2 on i.MX51 */  
    compatible = "fsl,imx51-i2c", "fsl,imx1-i2c";  
    reg = <0x83fc4000 0x4000>;  
    interrupts = <63>;  
};
```

...and some addition

```
i2c@83fc4000 { /* I2C2 on i.MX51 */
    compatible = "fsl,imx51-i2c", "fsl,imx1-i2c";
    reg = <0x83fc4000 0x4000>;
    interrupts = <63>;
    debug-level = <3>;
};
```

The code for querying

```
struct device_node *node = pdev->dev.of_node;
u32 dbg_level;

...

ret = of_property_read_u32(node, "debug-level",
                           &dbg_level);
```

Why the fuzz?

What is the problem?

Platform data – the old way

- is completely embedded in the kernel binary
- exchanging kernel means exchanging platform data
- internal ABI
- out of tree → bad luck
- used to describe pretty much everything

Devicetree – the new way

- a lot of devicetrees are shipped with kernel sources
- *still external ABI!*
- newer kernels must support older devicetrees
- devicetrees are OS-independent hardware descriptions (usually boards)

Major difference

- changing platform data for all users in the kernel tree → OK
- changing devicetree for all users in the kernel tree → not sufficient!

Conclusion

- think twice before adding a new binding
- think of them more like syscalls rather than platform data
- work on generic bindings if you need a new one

Some existing I2C platform data

```
/* i2c Platform Device, Driver Data */  
struct mv64xxx_i2c_pdata {  
    u32    freq_m;  
    u32    freq_n;  
    u32    timeout;    /* In milliseconds */  
};
```

Proposed conversion

```
** Marvell MV64XXX I2C controller
+
+Required properties :
+
+ - reg          : Offset and length of the register set for the device
+ - compatible   : should be "marvell,mv64xxx-i2c"
+ - interrupts   : the interrupt number
+ - frequency-m  : m factor in baud rate calculation
+
+Recommended properties :
+
+ - frequency-n  : n factor in baud rate calculation
+ - timeout-ms   : How long to wait for a transaction to complete
+
```

Suggestions from that

- 1:1 mappings usually don't work out
- look for existing generic solutions

Accepted conversion

```
+* Marvell MV64XXX I2C controller
+
+Required properties :
+
+ - reg           : Offset and length of the register set for the device
+ - compatible    : Should be "marvell,mv64xxx-i2c"
+ - interrupts    : The interrupt number
+ - clock-frequency : Desired I2C bus clock frequency in Hz.
```

Accepted conversion II

```
static bool __devinit
mv64xxx_find_baud_factors(const int req_freq,
                          const int tclk,
                          int *best_n,
                          int *best_m)
{
    ...
}
```

I2C timeouts - proposed binding

`timeout-ms`: How long to wait for a transaction
to complete

Q: is that really a binding?

I2C timeouts - current bindings

```
fsl-i2c.txt:23: - fsl,timeout : I2C bus timeout  
                    in microseconds.  
gpio-i2c.txt:13: - i2c-gpio,timeout-ms: timeout  
                    to get data
```

Conclusion

- custom bindings are usually bad
- devicetree enforces generalization
- good, but who will do the work?

DMA - proposed binding

@@ -6,6 +6,7 @@ Required properties:

- interrupts: Should contain ERROR and DMA interrupts
- clock-frequency: Desired I2C bus clock frequency in Hz.

Only 100000Hz and 400000Hz modes are supported.

+ fsl,i2c-dma-channel: APBX DMA channel for the I2C

Examples:

```
@@ -16,4 +17,5 @@ i2c0: i2c@80058000 {  
    reg = <0x80058000 2000>;  
    interrupts = <111 68>;  
    clock-frequency = <100000>;  
+ fsl,i2c-dma-channel = <6>;  
};
```

DMA - generic solution

still not in linux-next :(

- RFC: February 2012
- V1: March 2012
- V2: March 2012
- V3: April 2012
- V4: September 2012
- V5: September 2012
- V6: September 2012

So?

- Not enough manpower?
- Not enough priority?
- Proper solution needs time?
- Developers want a solution now
- What should I do as a maintainer?

USB phy - proposed binding

@@ -8,6 +8,9 @@ Required properties:

- + require-transceiver: enable the flag in the driver
- + pullup-on-vbus: enable the flag in the driver
- + disable-streaming: enable the flag in the driver

@@ -58,18 +58,10 @@ static int ci13xxx_imx_vbus(struct ci13xxx *ci, int enable)

```
-static struct ci13xxx_platform_data ci13xxx_imx_platdata __devinitdata = {  
-    .name          = "ci13xxx_imx",  
-    .flags         = CI13XXX_REQUIRE_TRANSCEIVER |  
-                  CI13XXX_PULLUP_ON_VBUS |  
-                  CI13XXX_DISABLE_STREAMING,
```

Suggestions

- Don't do 1:1 mapping
- Use existing bindings
- Don't convert what you don't need
- Some information is implicit using "compatible" binding

Configuration?

@@ -5,6 +5,10 @@ Required properties:

- reg: Should contain registers location and length
- interrupts: Should contain ERROR and DMA interrupts
- clock-frequency: desired I2C bus clock frequency in Hz.

+

+Optional properties:

+- fsl,use-pio: Use PIO transfers instead of DMA

The End

Thank you for your attention!

Questions? Comments?

- right now
- anytime at this conference
- wsa@pengutronix.de