Power Budget Analysis for Raspberry Pi 4B Host Nodes over PoE/PoE+

Date: 10 July 2025

1 Introduction

This report provides an updated power-budget calculation for four deployment scenarios involving headless Raspberry Pi 4B Host Nodes fitted with the official PoE or PoE+ HATs. Each node runs Raspberry Pi OS 64-bit Lite and hosts OctoPrint and MJPG-streamer services. Web-cams stream at 720 p, 10 fps. No on-board AI processing is planned.

2 Key Assumptions

Item Design-centre Value

Pi 4 B (heavy load, fan on) $\approx 7 \text{ W}$ at 5 V

Web-cam (720 p @ 10 fps) 2.5 W (0.5 A @ 5 V)

PoE+ HAT efficiency 85 %

PoE-af HAT efficiency 90 %

PoE delivery limits 25.5 W (802.3at), 12.95 W (802.3af)

3 Scenario Breakdown

Scenario 1 – 11 Nodes, 2 Cams per Node, PoE+

Parameter Value

Number of Host Nodes 11

Web-cams per Node 2

PoE Standard IEEE 802.3at (Type 2, PoE+)

PoE-HAT Efficiency (η) 85 %

Node Load (5 V rail) 12 W

Port Draw (incl. PoE losses) 14.1 W

Total Switch Budget $\approx 155 \text{ W}$

Recommended Switch ≥ 170 W, 16-port PoE+

Scenario 2 – 11 Nodes, 2 Cams per Node, PoE-af

Parameter Value

Number of Host Nodes 11

Web-cams per Node 2

PoE Standard IEEE 802.3af (Type 1, PoE)

PoE-HAT Efficiency (η) 90 %

Node Load (5 V rail) 12 W

Port Draw (incl. PoE losses) 13.3 W

Total Switch Budget $\approx 147 \text{ W}$

Recommended Switch ≥ 160 W, 16-port PoE-af

Scenario 3 – 22 Nodes, 1 Cam per Node, PoE+

Parameter Value

Number of Host Nodes 22

Web-cams per Node 1

PoE Standard IEEE 802.3at (Type 2, PoE+)

PoE-HAT Efficiency (η) 85 %

Node Load (5 V rail) 9.5 W

Port Draw (incl. PoE losses) 11.2 W

Total Switch Budget ≈ 246 W

Recommended Switch ≥ 300 W, 24-port PoE+

Scenario 4 – 22 Nodes, 1 Cam per Node, PoE-af

| Parameter | Value |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Number of Host Nodes | 22 |
| Web-cams per Node | 1 |
| PoE Standard | IEEE 802.3af (Type 1, PoE) |
| PoE-HAT Efficiency (η) | 90 % |
| Node Load (5 V rail) | 9.5 W |
| Port Draw (incl. PoE losses) | 10.6 W |
| Total Switch Budget | ≈ 232 W |
| Recommended Switch | ≥ 260 W, 24-port PoE-af |

4 Recommendations

- \bullet Budget roughly 15 W per two-camera node and 11 W per single-camera node at the switch, then add at least 15 % head-room to accommodate boot surges and future peripherals.
- For Scenario 1 an off-the-shelf 16-port PoE+ switch rated \geq 170 W is adequate; Scenarios 3 & 4 require a 24-port chassis with \geq 260–300 W.
- Although all ports remain under the IEEE limits, choose switches whose usable PSE budget meets or exceeds the figures in Section 3, not just their theoretical maximum.

| Scenario | Practical PSE choice |
|------------------------|--|
| 1 (11 dual-cam PoE+) | A 16-port PoE+ switch rated ≥ 170 W gives ~10 % headroom. |
| 2 (11 dual-cam PoE) | A 16-port PoE-af switch with a 160 W (or higher) budget works, but make sure advertised power is "usable", not "theoretical". |
| 3 (22 single-cam PoE+) | A 24-port PoE+ switch rated ≥ 300 W keeps load under 85 % and leaves room for one spare port. |
| 4 (22 single-cam PoE) | A 24-port PoE-af switch rated for ≥ 260 W (many enterprise af switches are 250 - 370 W) will suffice. |

5 Assumptions

| Item | Value used | Why this figure? |
|--|--|--|
| Raspberry Pi 4 Model B, PoE(H)AT fan running, both CPUs & GPUs moderately loaded (multiple USB, two Python services) | ≈7W@5V | Stress-test measurements report 7–7.6 W at the Pi's 5 V rail when all cores are busy and HDMI is off (Raspberry Pi Forums, Core Electronics) |
| UVC webcam streaming 720 p @ 10 fps | 2.5 W (0.5 A @ 5 V) | Vendor data sheets for HD webcams list 5 V × 0.5 A typical; that is 2.5 W (EMEET, Cable Society) |
| PoE HAT conversion efficiency | 85 % (PoE+) / 90 % (PoE-af) | As before; the newer PoE+ HAT runs a little less efficient than the original model |
| PoE power limits | 12.95 W to PD (af / Type 1), 25.5 W to PD (at / Type 2) | IEEE 802.3af / 802.3at tables (Wikipedia, Biamp Cornerstone) |

6 Load Model

Dual-camera node: 7 W + 2 × 2.5 W = 12 W @ 5 V

Single-camera node: $7 \text{ W} + 1 \times 2.5 \text{ W} = 9.5 \text{ W} @ 5 \text{ V}$

Power draw at switch port = node load ÷ efficiency

7 Scenarios Summarized

| Scenario | Nodes | Web-cams / node | PoE flavour | η (efficiency) | Node load (5 V) | Port draw (W) | Total switch budget |
|----------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 11 | 2 | PoE + (802.3at) | 0.85 | 12 W | 14.1 W | ≈ 155 W |
| 2 | 11 | 2 | PoE (802.3af) | 0.90 | 12 W | 13.3 W | ≈ 147 W |
| 3 | 22 | 1 | PoE + (802.3at) | 0.85 | 9.5 W | 11.2 W | ≈ 246 W |
| 4 | 22 | 1 | PoE (802.3af) | 0.90 | 9.5 W | 10.6 W | ≈ 232 W |

8 Key Considerations

- For Scenario 2 and 4, our 12W is operating at \sim 93% of the 12.95 W PoE delivery limit
- Long-term stability running near maximum sustained draw increases the likelihood of instability if workloads change or USB power draw fluctuates.
- For peace of mind and future flexibility, use PoE+ (802.3at) for these nodes. The 12 W load is easily handled by PoE+, and you gain operational margin with minimal extra cost per port.