

# Meeting Minutes: IEEE P802.3dp Cabling Restrictions for Single Pair Power over Ethernet Task Force

---

January 22, 2026  
Interim Meeting

Prepared by Jon Lewis

IEEE P802.3dp Task Force meeting convened at 10:15 AM CST, Thursday, January 22, 2024, by David Law, IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group Chair.

Attendance is listed in Appendix A

## **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Mr. Law explained that the Working Group chair appoints the Task Force Chair, and the Task Force would confirm the appointment. Mr. Law then reminded the group that he had announced his intention to appoint Chad Jones as Chair at the March 2024 802.3 Closing Plenary, and he then appointed Chad Jones IEEE P802.3dm Task Force Chair.

Mr. Law appointed Jon Lewis as recording secretary for this session.

Mr. Law reminded the group that the meeting was being conducted under teleconference rules, and that only 802.3 voters were eligible to vote on motions.

**Motion #1:** Confirm Chad Jones as the IEEE P802.3dp Task Force Chair.

**M:** Geoff Thompson **S:** Michal Brychta

**MOTION PASSES WITHOUT OBJECTION**

---

M. Law turned the meeting over to Task Force Chair Chad Jones. (8:19 AM)

**Presentation:** [8023dp\\_agenda\\_2601.pdf](#)

**Presenter:** Chad Jones, Chair.

Mr. Jones turned to presentation [8023dp\\_agenda\\_2601.pdf](#) and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

**Approval of Agenda:** The chair asked whether there were additions or corrections to the agenda, and there were none. He announced that the agenda was approved.

**Approval of (Study Group) Minutes:** The chair announced that the minutes from the final study group meeting from March 2025 had been posted (for a long while), and asked whether there were any additions or corrections to them. There were none. He announced that the study group minutes were approved as posted. (10:21 am)

The Chair then resumed the review of presentation [8023dp\\_agenda\\_2601.pdf](#) :

- Mr. Jones noted that there should be no recording or photography without permission.
- Mr. Jones asked if anyone was attending from the press including those who would run a public blog on this meeting – there were no indications from the group,

Mr. Jones then continued review of the presentation, reviewing decorum, information for the reflector, private area, and ground rules.

The Chair announced that as this meeting was an electronic Task Force meeting, under 802.3 rules, only working group voters may vote.

**Attendance**, the Chair advised the group that attendance would be taken from IMAT, and that WebEx attendance would be used to reconcile the attendance, but IMAT was the official record. He then reminded attendees that they should show their employer & affiliation. Attendance and affiliation from the Webex tool and IMAT are in Appendix A.

**IEEE SA Patent Policy**, Mr. Jones reviewed slides 1 through 4 of the IEEE SA Patent Policy (slides 14-17 of the agenda deck) for the Task Force from [8023dp\\_agenda\\_2601.pdf](#), and made the call for patents on the slide labeled “Ways to Inform IEEE” (10:25 am).

There was no response to the call for patents at 10:26 am.

### **Other IEEE Policies**

Mr. Jones read aloud the slides on the IEEE SA copyright, Participant behavior (ethics), IEEE individual participation, and fair and equitable consideration policies as shown in the agenda deck. (10:30AM). There were no questions.

### **LIAISONS**

The Chair moved to liaisons and noted that there were no liaisons for the Task Force at this time.

### **Project Documentation and Timeline**

Mr. Jones reviewed where the project documentation could be found. Timeline is discussed later in the meeting.

The Chair completed a review of the presentation.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

The Chair then moved to the presentations for the meeting.

**Title:** EPCR Consensus Building

**URL:** [https://www.ieee802.org/3/dp/public/2601/8023dp\\_cmjones\\_01.pdf](https://www.ieee802.org/3/dp/public/2601/8023dp_cmjones_01.pdf)

**Presenter:** Chad Jones, Cisco.

This is a summary of the items discussed during the presentation, as written by the Chair from notes he took during the meeting:

The presentation was compiled from various sources and presented as a method to encourage conversation on the topics. Nothing is binding and no topic was considered off limits.

Need to make a strong recommendation for 2A support, something like: Link segments are recommended to have a current carrying capacity of 2 A. Cabling systems that are rated below 2 A are considered engineered solutions.

There was a statement of general agreement with the approach on slide 4. It was noted that we may not want to say "cable heating" as it could be removed by IEEE legal. "Cable warming" was suggested as a softer alternative.

Suggested that we could use a warning box (as this rises to the level to warrant a warning box).

The text after warning box could follow the format of: If you do this (i.e. less than 2 A cable), then state the impact (i.e. degradation, reduced performance, IR, RL, etc.).

For Identification, we need something obvious to the uneducated. Network admins need to ensure they install PSEs that are compatible with the installed cabling, ensuring the uninitiated user cannot mess this up. Color coding the ports was not viewed as a solution. Many examples of colored ports we quoted and none of them had anything to do with port restrictions or reduced port performance. "The color ship has sailed..." and "Color-coding of connectors has been deemed not effective given the use of colors for other purposes."

It was suggested we state "The PSE shall not be able to exceed the cabling current capacity."

There was talk that this would result in an untestable PICS.

A need to capture text about administration (which is the suggested remedy by the IEC SC 25 WG 3 group) for our amendment. There could be no shalls in this section as again, untestable PICS. What was suggested for administration was that 802.3 could mandate labels on the PSE and PD. Section 60.6.2 was offered as a guideline, and it was suggested to search 802.3 for "shall be labelled".

Still to be decided: does 802.3 talk about mixing SPE cable with multipair cable (i.e. shared sheath).

Consensus discussions completed at 11:48am CST.

It was noted that the discussion above included a lot of "if I'm correct" when speaking to the requirements in the IEC cabling documents. The Chair stated that the group needed a summary presentation of what the requirements are and asked if the liaison to SC 25 WG 3 could assist the chair with crafting. The liaison stated that a lot of the information was likely already in the liaison reports. The chair will work to get this presentation ready for the next TF meeting.

Mr. Jones noted that he hadn't prepared a timeline but expected it would take one year to drive text to consensus to reach WG ballot and that he would present a proposed timeline at the next TF meeting.

### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

Mr. Jones noted that the next scheduled meeting is currently scheduled for the March plenary, however, due to the meeting load at the plenary he was leaning towards having off-cycle meetings and not meeting during the March plenary series. The proposed time would be to use the currently scheduled PDCC ad hoc meeting time for EPCR meetings as necessary. Meeting coordinates may be found on the IEEE 802.3 call and meeting calendar.

The Chair indicated that the agenda had been exhausted and asked the group if there was other business. Mr. Jones reminded the group to sign into IMAT.

Mr. Jones adjourned the meeting at 11:53 PM CST.

*Appendix A: Attendees at the IEEE P802.3dp Cabling Restrictions for Single Pair Power over Ethernet Task Force Meeting take from Webex and IMAT.*

Attendee	Affiliation
<b>Webex</b>	
Arkadiy Peker	Microchip
Bob Voss	Panduit
Chad Jones	Cisco
Geoff Thompson	GraCaSi-Ind
James Withey	Fluke
Michal Brychta	Analog Devices
Shaoan Dai	Infineon
<b>IMAT</b>	
Brychta, Michal	Analog Devices Inc.
Carlson, Steven	High-Speed Design Inc.
Jones, Chad	Cisco Systems, Inc.
Law, David	Hewlett Packard Enterprise
Lewis, Jon	Dell Technologies
Thompson, Geoffrey	GraCaSI S.A.
Voss, Robert	Panduit Corp.