



Contribution ID: 181

Type: not specified

DeviceTrees - MIPI SoundWire® Device Class for Audio (SDCA) and classic ACPI-DT problem

Saturday 13 December 2025 17:00 (20 minutes)

MIPI Specifications defines standard device properties that end up into ACPI tables. Whoever Device tree bindings evolve in a very different way.

Even-though all the three are defining hardware, there is no consideration of MIPI or ACPI while defining the bindings.

where do we draw a line?

Is there some consolidation that needs to happen?

How can drivers written for ACPI be re-useable for Device tree based platforms.

The MIPI SoundWire® Device Class for Audio (SDCA) specifications are built around ACPI, and the software support reflects that. At the same time, the kernel's `fwnode_*` API's provides a degree of unification between ACPI and Device Tree. Does this imply that Device Tree bindings should mirror ACPI descriptions to some extent?

This becomes more interesting as new MIPI SoundWire® Device Class for Audio (SDCA) specification is designed to offer "out-of-box audio enablement" without relying on SoC- or device-specific drivers. The goal is to support audio codecs through a generic driver rather than writing one for each device.

Fantastic!., Hold on.. What about ARM64 platforms and Device Tree Bindings?

Now the Question is :

- what extent should device tree bindings reflect the ACPI bindings from this Specifications?
- Should it make it fully compatible?
- Should we just ignore this and do THE device-tree way and invent a parallel bindings?
- Should we have an intermediate representation of this?
- Should Device Tree bindings comply to MIPI Standard Specifications?

Primary author: KANDAGATLA, Srin

Presenter: KANDAGATLA, Srin

Session Classification: Devicetree MC

Track Classification: Devicetree MC