


Fair and “Balanced”...


**IEEE 802.3at
Vancouver 11/05**

**Clay Stanford
Linear Technology**


CURRENT MISMATCH IN 4-PAIR SYSTEM



4P system showing current mismatch problem.




- Loop Resistance is $<1\Omega$ in short cable installations
- System mismatch occurs from connector contacts, cable R, diode mismatch and PSE voltage differences
- Mismatch on the order of .25V or .25 Ω can throw one port into current limit and shutdown system



ACTIVE CURRENT BALANCING SOLVES PROBLEM


4P system with active current balancing.



- 4P system requires active balancing on both the top and bottom power supply rails.

Note: This example shows balancing performed in the PSE. Balancing can also be performed in the PD.



4-Pair Current Balancing Can Be Implemented in PSE



Balance in PSE

PSE balancing allows same PD schematic for .af, .at2P and .at4P Implementations



4-Pair Current Balancing Can Be Implemented in PD Front End



Balance in PD Front End ——— ↑ **Allows single signature/class front end**

4P PD ($\leq \sim 30W$) is compatible with 2P & 4P PSEs

4-Pair Current Balancing Can Be Implemented in PD Back End



PD Back End balancing is low loss but requires 2 DC/DC Converters!

↑
**Balance PD
Back End**

Current Balance vs. Current Limit



- In 4P system, possible to either balance currents so equal current flows in each pair

OR

- Limit current in first pair to I_{CUT} , then send additional current over second pair.

Either may be feasible and standard should allow both. We will refer to current balancing but it should be understood it could instead be current limiting.


Remember this has nothing to do with balancing current in the magnetics.

How Safe Do We Want To Be?



- PSE could implement Broken Wire Detect (BWD)
- PSE should monitor for severe imbalance regardless of current balancing location
 - ◆ If balancing is in PD, PSE can't see severe imbalance. Should mandate PSE monitor balance.
- Do we use worst-case cable/connector numbers? May mandate active balancing of magnetics, in which case pair-pair balancing can be implemented with the same hardware.

4P Balance in PSE or PD?



■ In PSE

- + Cheapest PD
 - ◆ Same schematic as .af
 - ◆ Same “cheap” PD cost model as .af
- + PSE can sense BWD, severe imbalance, etc. and take action
- Adds cost to PSE
 - ◆ Worst if Si cost \gg power supply cost
 - ◆ If Si cost \ll power supply cost, added cost doesn't matter much
 - ◆ Requires monitoring top and bottom rails of every port
- Adds heat in PSE
- + **Better if most ports require 4P**

■ In PD


- + Cheaper PSE ports
- + Only 4P PDs bear extra balancing cost
 - ◆ Must balance pair current or limit pair power
 - ◆ These PDs violate .af “cheap PD” cost model
- + PDs have the option of high-efficiency balancing in switcher-otherwise adds heat in PD
- + **Better if most ports can get by with 2P**

BWD=broken wire detect



In Summary

- If 2P is viable, balance 4P in PD
- If 4P is mandatory, balance in PSE
- In the end, it's all about the wire current capacity!!!



- Need agreement on cable current capacity before we decide where to put 4P balance circuit