Subject: RE: megaraid_mbox: garbage in file Posted by Seokmann.Ju on Fri, 05 May 2006 19:59:24 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Can you do one quick change in the driver?

Search for 'pci_set_dma_mask()' API calls in the driver and mask out one of them with DMA_64BIT_MASK as follow.
--
// if (pci_set_dma_mask(adapter->pdev, DMA_64BIT_MASK) != 0) {

// conlog(CL_ANN, (KERN_WARNING)

// megaraid: could not set DMA mask for 64-bit.\n"));

// goto out_free_sysfs_res;

// }

I found that the driver is NOT checking 64-bit DMA capability of the controllers accordingly and this could be a reason.

I'm waiting for feedback from F/W team for MegaRAID 150-4 controller if it supports 64-bit DMA.

I'll update here as I get.

Thank you,

```
> ----Original Message-----
> From: Vasily Averin [mailto:vvs@sw.ru]
> Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 2:17 PM
> To: James Bottomley
> Cc: linux-scsi@vger.kernel.org; Kolli, Neela; Mukker, Atul;
> Ju, Seokmann; Bagalkote, Sreenivas; devel@openvz.org; Linux
> Kernel Mailing List
> Subject: Re: megaraid_mbox: garbage in file
> James Bottomley wrote:
> > On Fri, 2006-05-05 at 09:37 +0400, Vasily Averin wrote:
>>>The issue is that the correctly finished scsi read command
> return me garbage
>>>(repeated 0 ...127 -- see hexdump in my first letter)
> instead correct file content.
>>> "attempt to access beyond end of device" messages occurs
> due the same garbage
>>>readed from the Indirect block. I found this garbage
> present in data buffers
>>>beginning at megaraid driver functions.
>>>I would note that if I read the same file by using dd with
> bs=1024 or bs=512 --
```

```
> >> I get correct file content.
>>>When I use kernel with 4Gb memory limit -- the same cat
> command return me
>>>correct file content too, without any garbage.
>>>Question is what it is the strange garbage? Have you seen
> it earlier?
>>>Is it possible that it is some driver-related issue or it
> is broken hardware?
>>>And why I can workaround this issue by using only 4Gb memory?
> > This is really odd ... if the controller can't reach *any*
> memory above
> > 32 bits, then, on an 8GB machine you'd expect corruption
> all over the
> > place since most user pages come from the top of highmem.
> > The first thing to try, since you have an opteron system,
> is to get rid
> > of highmem entirely and use a 64 bit kernel (just to make
> sure we're not
>> running into some annoying dma_addr_t conversion problem).
> Unfortunately it is customers node, and I'm not able to
> re-install 64-bit
> distribution to load 64-bit kernel. Of course I'll ask
> customer about this, but
> it will be done later.
> > Then. I
> > suppose if that doesn't work, try printing out the actual
> contents of
>> the sg list to see what the physical memory location of the page
> > containing the corrupt block is.
>
> I've already done such experiment:
> On 2.6.8-based virtuozzo kernel I've added following code to
> megaraid_mbox_display_scb function:
> virt = page_address(sg[i].page) + sg[i].offset;
   printk("mbox sg%d: page %p off %d addr %llx len %d "
       "virt %p first %08x page->flags %08x\n",
   i, sg[i].page, sg[i].offset, sg[i].dma_address, sg[i].length,
>
   virt, virt == NULL ? 0: *(int *)virt, sg[i].page->flags);
>
> and get the following results
> May 4 02:51:38 vpsn002 kernel:
> megaraid mailbox: status:0x0 cmd:0xa7 id:0x25 sec:0x1a
```

```
lba:0x33f624ac addr:0xffffffff ld:128 sg:4
> scsi cmnd: 0x28 0x00 0x33 0xf6 0x24 0xac 0x00 0x00 0x1a 0x00
> mbox request_buffer eafde340 use_sg 4
> mbox sg0: page 077a0474 off 0 addr 1fd575000 len 4096 virt ff15a000
> first 03020100 page->flags 40020101
> mbox sg1: page 077b5738 off 0 addr 1fdede000 len 4096 virt ff141000
> first 03020100 page->flags 40020101
> mbox sg2: page 077ad500 off 0 addr 1fdb40000 len 4096 virt ff056000
> first 03020100 page->flags 40020101
> mbox sg3: page 030d46e8 off 1024 addr 5e6a400 len 1024 virt 07e6a400
   first 03020100 page->flags 20001004
>
> "first 03020100" shows that data in the all sg buffers is
> already corrupted.
> Also I would note that page for last 1Kb buffer is not Highmem.
>
> If you want I can reproduce this experiment on 2.6.16 kernel too.
> > This could also be a firmware problem, I suppose, but I
> haven't seen any
> > similar reports.
>
> Thank you,
> Vasily Averin
> SWsoft Virtuozzo/OpenVZ Linux kernel team
```