



CMP 3 PI 1024 – We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of an ‘FR’ resolution of this PI.

CMP 3 PI 1025 – We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of an ‘FR’ resolution of this PI.

CMP 3 PI 1026 – We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of an ‘FR’ resolution of this PI.

CMP 3 PI 1028 – We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of an ‘FR’ resolution of this PI. – **TG2 took the position that this is an unenforceable requirement and is recommending resolve. recommend that 802 take no position and remove from the list.**

The preceding nine **eight** PIs are outputs from the NEC PoE TG. IEEE 802.3 continues to support the results from the NEC PoE TG.

CMP 3 PI 417, CMP 3 PI 697, CMP 3 PI 1922 – We understand CMP3 TG2 combined these three PIs with PI 1025 and recommended a disposition of FR. We request that IEEE-SA take a position of support for this FR.

CMP 3 PI 1864 – We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of an ‘FR’ resolution of this PI.

~~CMP 3 PI 4272 – We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of an ‘FR’ resolution of this PI.~~

~~CMP 3 PI 3659 – We understand CMP3 TG2 currently proposes: “per conductor” was added to prevent confusion in the required marking. We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of this resolution to this PI. Does IEEE really care? I would say no.~~

CMP 3 PI 3664 – We understand CMP3 TG2 currently proposes to resolve with the response: Indicating that the marking for the source of system indicates that the marking does not apply to down stream equipment. We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of this resolution to this PI.

~~[This section to be modified under editorial license once CMP3 TG acts on these PIs and the IEEE 802.3 SCC18 adhoc has reached consensus on a position. The positions below are the initial consensus positions of the IEEE 802.3 SCC18 adhoc as of Nov 9, 2017.]~~

CMP 3 PI 71 – We understand CMP3 TG2 currently proposes: **Communications Cables.** Conductors of one or more Class 2 or Class 3 circuits shall be permitted in the same cable with conductors of communications circuits provided the cable is a listed communications cable. The communications cable shall be installed in accordance with the requirements of Article 800. We request that IEEE-SA take a position in support of this resolution to this PI.

~~CMP 3 PI 414 – AIP purely editorial, no 802 position~~

CMP 3 PI 1012 – We understand CMP3 TG2 currently proposes to expand Table 725.144 to two significant figures for all entries in the table, with values derived from the Fact Finding Report. We request that IEEE-SA take a position of support for this FR.

CMP 3 PI 1920 – We understand CMP3 TG2 currently proposes to add the text “the cable conductors are 24 AWG or larger and” to the exception added by PI 1024 (the 0.3A exception). We request that IEEE-SA take a position of support for this FR.

CMP 3 PI 1921 – We understand that CMP3 TG2 currently proposes to change “the correction factors of 310.15(B)(2)” to “the correction factors of Table 310.15(B)(2)(a) or Equation 310.15(B)(2)”. We request that IEEE-SA take a position of support for this FR.

Further information on the IEEE 802.3 SCC18 adhoc recommendations can be found at:  
[http://www.ieee802.org/3/ad\\_hoc/SCC\\_18/public/2020%20PI%20PoE%20related%20recommendations\\_25Oct2017\\_adhoc%20output.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/ad_hoc/SCC_18/public/2020%20PI%20PoE%20related%20recommendations_25Oct2017_adhoc%20output.pdf) ~~update this to the latest file (112917 version, or if we update again on 121317)~~

[http://www.ieee802.org/3/ad\\_hoc/SCC\\_18/public/2020\\_PI\\_PoE\\_related\\_recommendations\\_112917.pdf](http://www.ieee802.org/3/ad_hoc/SCC_18/public/2020_PI_PoE_related_recommendations_112917.pdf)

We request that IEEE-SA take the position prescribed above when the PIs are dispatched at the 2020 NEC ® First Draft meetings.

Sincerely,

David Law

Chair, IEEE 802.3 Ethernet Working Group

DRAFT