

Reasoned document

Draft A&C Slip no. 2 to RDSO specification no. TI/SPC/RCC/SCADA/0130 (Rev.2)

SN	Clause No.	Description	Comments Received from	RDSO's remark
1.	4.2	<p>Purchaser shall arrange communication medium between RCC and RTU. For this purpose existing OFC network shall be used between RCC & way station nearest to RTU locations. OFC has been laid along the track and terminated generally in OFC huts at way stations. These OFC huts house STM equipment which are provided in short haul configuration enabling extension of E1 to way stations. Presently the connectivity from OFC hut to RTU locations is on copper cable. If the connectivity between the S&T hut and switching posts is provided with OFC then single mode fiber cable with SC interface enabling communication up to 15 km should be used. Purchaser shall provide redundant communication medium between RCC & station Hut along with STM-1 equipment connected in a ring. The purchaser shall provide all technical details of the communication media offered for SCADA.</p>	<p><u>Telecom Dte./RDSO</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the proposed specification redundant communication on OFC ring protection arrangement along with redundant STM at station has been mentioned. It will have huge financial repercussion/cost for those sections where OFC work is in progress or there is a branch line/spur link. Therefore redundant OFC ring communication for SCADA should be left to individual Railways to be decided between PCEE & PCSTE and should not be part of specification. It is also observed that redundancy of STM is generally not available at every station hut. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comments of Telecom Directorate is not pertains to corrections proposed in clause 4.2 of SCADA specification no. TI/SPC/RCC/SCADA/0130(Rev.2). Redundant communication through OFC ring arrangement was introduced in the SCADA specification no TI/SPC/RCC/SCADA/0130(Rev.2) after taking views of Telecom Directorate. The issues raised by Telecom Directorate i.e. <i>“huge financial repercussion / cost for communication on OFC ring protection arrangement alongwith redundant STM at station for those sections where OFC work is in progress or there is a branch line/ spur link and suggested that redundant OFC ring communication for SCADA should be left to individual railways to be decided between PCEE & PCSTE and should not be the part of specification”</i>. The above suggestion is not acceptable because the technical specification of SCADA is a guideline for manufacturing and supply of the equipment. The specific site related issues where the OFC ring communication is not available and difficult to provide OFC ring for SCADA communication, PCEE & PCSTE of user railways may decide jointly the need of OFC ring. Such kind of exception may not be the part of SCADA specification. Redundant STM is wrongly interpreting by Telecom Directorate in the sentence <i>“Purchaser shall provide redundant communication medium between RCC & station Hut along with STM-1 equipment connected in a ring”</i>. For better understanding, the above sentence appeared in clause 4.1 & 4.2 of SCADA specification may be corrected as <i>“Purchaser shall provide redundant communication medium between RCC & station Hut through STM-1 equipment connected in a ring”</i>.