

## Re: puc(4) man page update?

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/current/2008-07/msg00151.html>

---

- *From:* Marcel Moolenaar <[xcllnt@xxxxxxx](mailto:xcllnt@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 05 Jul 2008 08:44:56 -0700
- 

On Jul 4, 2008, at 6:08 PM, John Baldwin wrote:

The attachments get bound at runtime. This is actually an important feature.

It's an important feature of KOBJ, yes. The point of compiling drivers into the kernel is to get just what you need. Not a bunch of bus attachments you don't want. Modules have pretty much all bus attachments because they need to work with whatever kernel they're loaded in.

So, `sio(4)` is not following the rules in the strictest sense. That's why `sio(4)` is a bad example, why the problem is not adequately acknowledged and people keep running into the same old problems of things not working "as expected".

This is because `acpi` is a module. One way this could be fixed is to not put ISA devices enumerated by ACPI on `acpi0`, but instead of an ACPI-aware ISA bus driver for devices on ISA/LPC that ACPI enumerates.

Agreed. For this to work on ia64, we also have to clean up the ISA related code and some drivers. We have to remove the assumption of having (legacy) PC hardware from it. The legacy PC code must be moved under a different option. Think about `syscons`, `PnP`, `ISA DMA` and `option ROM`. Those options could be put under an option `LPC` or something.

For example: we could have an option `LPC` that is what option `ISA` is now, but excludes the `isa(4)` bus driver. The `ISA` option would change to mean the `isa(4)` bus driver only.

In a way `acpi(4)` is that new `isa(4)` bus driver, but we didn't

Re: puc(4) man page update?

change option ISA to exclude the current isa bus. In other words, we didn't add support for hints to acpi(4).

The amount of work is to eliminate the isa bus. That gives exactly what you suggest, modulo naming.

Also, none of that will fix any of the actual problems people have (i.e. COM1 being sio1 and COM2 being sio0 because the BIOS lists them backwards. This happens to work in the non-ACPI case with PNPBIOS due to far grosser hacks that cause PNPBIOS devices to not even be used if hints are present.)

That's still a different issue and unrelated.

—

Marcel Moolenaar  
xcllnt@xxxxxxx

---

freebsd-current@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list  
<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-current>  
To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-current-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"