

IEEE802.3at Task Force

Classification

Why we need it?

Denver CO, March 2006

Yair Darshan
PowerDsine



IEEE802.3af: Why Classification?

- Without Classification
 - PSE need to supply Max Power=15.4W
 - All ports need $N \times 15.4W = 370W$ for 24 ports or $740W$ for 48 ports!
- With 802.3af Classification:
 - Assuming 20% of the loads = 4W, 50% =7W and 30%15.4W
 - Average power per port is: $0.2 \times 4 + 0.5 \times 7 + 0.3 \times 15.4 = 8.9W$
 - Power Supply size=214W for 24 ports, 424W for 48 ports
 - 58% Power Supply size compared to w/o classification.
 - Note: Different power distribution gives different saving in PS size however in any case the impact is overwhelming
- Moreover, the actual unused power is higher due to the poor granularity and can be further improved as decided by 802.3 objectives
- In addition, unused power due to PD dynamics affects significantly the unused power however it was out of scope at the 802.3af from the reasons that will be elaborate later.

Why Layer 2 solutions were not used in 802.3af

- It was discussed in 802.3af and it was acknowledged that it is not good enough:
 - System may collapse at start up! Unless Power supply size is the max as per the case in previous slide.
 - Or sequentially controlling to turn on which is OK if granularity is sufficient with out having ready statistic history. Statistic history needs time to build up.
 - We need to know prior to startup what is the PD max power needs.
 - This is #1 reason why we need classification prior to startup.

Can Layer 2 classification be used in 802.3at?

- It can BUT the problem at startup is bigger now since there is much more power in 802.3at!
- Now we will have PDs that need 20, 25W, 30W and more at startup! Who knows what future is planning for us?
- There are two options:
 1. Having more classes before startup
 - Layer 2 communication optional: giving better utilization of PSE Power Supply due to PD peak/average support
 2. Mandate Layer 2 communication for PD operation at more than 12.95W levels
 - See next slide

Why Layer 2 recommended to be optional?

- It is not cost effective and/or technically feasible to support(*)
 - Midspans
 - Patch Panel Midspans
- This was also one of the reasons why 802.3af used classification(**) at the common mode path (power path) and not over the data path.
- (*) So far no layer 2 proposals has been made to support layer 2 in Midspan which is technically and economically feasible.
- (**) other methods with statistics still needs classification to be compliant

Should Classification be mandatory in 802.3at?

- Yes for the unique identification purpose which is orthogonal to the minimum number of classifications issue.
- Yes for min number of classes N1, to generate acceptable Power Supply utilization at startup for the max peak power
- Yes for minimum number of classes N2 to enhanced power supply utilization compared to 802.3af for solutions that don't want or need or can't used Layer 2 for the max peak power
- No for higher classification numbers, N3 that can be optionally done by layer 2 for the peak and average power
- What are those numbers N1, N2 and N3?
 - Obviously they are silicon + silicon tests + System tests cost dependent.
 - However it reduces Power Supply size and cost.
- See separate presentations that addresses the economical gain by using classification as function of the number of classes

Summary and Recommendations

- Classification function need to be sufficiently granular for supporting PDs during startup with Power Supply sized to lower then maximum required by all ports
 - 50% minimum reduction in power supply and system costs
- Enhanced classification should support both Midspans and Endpoint due too similar rational as in 802.3af
- Layer 2 should be optional and further improve Power Supply utilization by finer classification levels and supplying peak and average power data
 - May be part of the MIB ad-hoc group