S M Abdul Basit Imam. et.al, International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications
www.ijera.com
ISSN: 2248-9622, Vol. 15, Issue 5, May 2025, pp 55-58

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

The Hidden Hurdles of Industrial Automation: Field-Level Observations from Allen-Bradley to IDEC Systems

S M Abdul Basit Imam – Fareeha Imam
Department of Electrical Engineering – Department of Industrial Engineering
CMH MANUFACTURING COMPANY, USA – Schlumberger SLB, USA

Abstract
Industrial automation systems frequently encounter integration challenges due to incompatible communication protocols. This study presents a real-world case study of a 180-degree permanent mold casting machine (5XL project) developed for a major U.S. foundry, where integrating an IDEC PLC (FC6A-D16K1CEE) with Allen-Bradley (AB) drives and absolute encoders (842E-SIP2BA-B) led to unforeseen communication failures. The critical issue was a protocol mismatch—IDEC systems rely on Modbus TCP, while the AB encoder strictly uses the DF1 serial protocol, a fact we only discovered after extensive troubleshooting. Even though exhaustive research, no direct solution existed, forcing the team to replace the AB drive with an IDEC-compatible model and substitute the AB encoder with an inclinometer for angle measurement. This study explores the challenges, diagnostic process, and workarounds implemented, highlighting the need for better manufacturer documentation and standardized industrial communication protocols to prevent costly project delays.
Keywords: Industrial Automation, Protocol Mismatch, DF1, Modbus TCP, IDEC PLC, Allen-Bradley Encoder

---

Date of Submission: 01-05-2025 Date of acceptance: 09-05-2025

I. Introduction

In industrial automation, integrating systems from different manufacturers is often necessary but not without challenges. These difficulties typically stem from protocol mismatches, hardware incompatibilities, and a lack of supporting documentation. This study focuses on a real-world case study of a high-capacity casting machine—the 5XL—and the challenges faced in attempting to integrate Allen-Bradley encoders with IDEC PLC systems.

In today's rapidly evolving industrial landscape, automation has become a vital tool for increasing efficiency and maintaining competitiveness. However, integrating hardware and systems from different manufacturers remains a common challenge. These issues often stem from differences in communication protocols, hardware compatibility, and limited technical documentation.

This paper presents a real-world example from the 5XL project—an advanced iteration of the earlier 5H mold casting machine. This system featured a 180-degree tilt mechanism designed for high-capacity mold production. To meet the new safety and precision requirements, the team integrated an IDEC PLC and HMI with Allen-Bradley drives and absolute encoders. While these components are each highly respected in industry, combining them proved to be more complex than expected.

1.1 The Unforeseen Challenge

At the start of the project, we assumed that the Allen-Bradley encoder would easily communicate with the IDEC PLC, given their reputations and industrial-grade design. But soon after installation, the system failed to establish communication between the two devices. Calls to both manufacturers' technical support lines offered no solution. After two months of testing and independent research, we identified the core issue: the devices were speaking entirely different digital languages.

Specifically, IDEC's PLC communicates via Modbus TCP (an Ethernet-based protocol), while the Allen-Bradley encoder only supports the DF1 serial protocol. This critical mismatch wasn't mentioned clearly in any of the product documentation and only became apparent through firsthand troubleshooting.

This section of the study explains:

- Why wasn't the incompatibility immediately obvious.
- The detailed steps we took to diagnose the issue.
- The workaround we implemented (replacing the encoder with an inclinometer).

- Lessons learned for future automation projects.

II. Literature Review

Though many technical manuals and research papers discuss the integration of programmable logic controllers (PLCs) and encoders, there's limited documentation that focuses on cross-brand compatibility issues. Rockwell Automation's encoder documentation, for instance, outlines DF1 protocol usage but doesn't warn users about compatibility with other manufacturers. Similarly, IDEC's technical materials emphasize Modbus TCP but don't provide clear warnings about integration risks with non-IDEC devices.

Academic studies such as *"Design and Implementation of PLC-Based Automation Systems"* typically highlight the importance of protocol consistency in successful integrations. Yet, they often overlook the real-world problems that engineers face when combining components from multiple vendors. This case study helps address that gap by offering a practical look at what happens when protocol misalignment occurs in the field.

2.1 Industrial Communication Protocols

Modern industrial systems rely on various communication protocols to exchange data between components. Two of the most widely used protocols are:

- **DF1**: A proprietary serial protocol developed by Allen-Bradley (Rockwell Automation), typically used over RS-232 or RS-485 connections.
- **Modbus TCP**: An open standard Ethernet-based protocol, widely adopted for its flexibility and cross-brand compatibility.

Here's a simplified comparison:

Feature	**DF1 Protocol**	**Modbus TCP**
Communication	Serial (RS-232/485)	Ethernet (TCP/IP)
Speed	Up to 115.2 kbps	100 Mbps – 1 Gbps
Topology	Point-to-point/multi-drop	Networked
Error Handling	CRC/BCC	TCP checksum
Compatibility	Allen-Bradley only	Multi-vendor

Table 1 DF1 vs Modbus TCP Comparison

a. Prior Work on Protocol Integration

Previous studies highlight challenges in mixing protocols:

- ProSoft, Red Lion Gateways can bridge DF1-Modbus but introduce latency and cost.
- EtherNet/IP adoption is increasing, but legacy devices still rely on serial protocols.

b. Knowledge Gap in Manufacturer Documentation

- Neither Allen-Bradley nor IDEC explicitly stated the encoder's DF1 limitation in their datasheets.
- Technical support teams were unaware of cross-brand compatibility issues.

III. Methodology / Analysis

The goal of the 5XL project was to engineer a permanent mold casting machine with a 180-degree tilt for high-volume production. The system demanded accurate feedback on rotational positioning, initially intended to be handled by an Allen-Bradley absolute encoder. However, due to supply chain issues at the time, the team selected an IDEC PLC (FC6A-D16K1CEE) and HMI instead of an Allen-Bradley PLC.

Both IDEC and Allen-Bradley components are known for their reliability. However, the issue arose not from the individual quality of the parts but from their inability to communicate due to conflicting protocols. As we knew that both the products work well with MODBUS. IDEC's architecture is centered around Modbus TCP/IP, a widely accepted Ethernet-based protocol. In contrast, the Allen-Bradley encoder depended on DF1, a legacy serial protocol. The result: communication failures. The PLC returned null values despite correct wiring and configuration.

Technical support from both manufacturers, as well as online resources, offered no practical solutions. Our internal team ran extensive diagnostic tests to confirm that Modbus TCP and DF1 could not directly interface without specialized protocol converters.

a. Our Work Around

Eventually, we opted for a more pragmatic solution. We replaced the AB encoder with an industrial inclinometer that could simulate the necessary angle data via analog signals. While not as precise as the encoder, the inclinometer was accurate enough for our process and integrated seamlessly with the IDEC system. This allowed us to maintain project timelines and functional performance within acceptable limits.

b. Problem Summary

i. System Requirements:

- Precise angular feedback (originally intended via AB absolute encoder)
- Variable speed control (via AB drive)

ii. **Initial Assumptions:**The AB encoder could communicate with IDEC PLC using Modbus TCP or analog output.

iii. **Reality:**The encoder supported only DF1, which made direct communication impossible without a third-party converter.

c. Diagnostic Process

Step	Action Taken		Outcome
1	Verified wiring and power supply		No issues detected
2	Sent Modbus TCP requests from PLC		No response from encoder
3	Reviewed AB and IDEC documentation		No clarity on DF1 protocol limitation
4	Contacted technical support teams		No working solution provided
5	Conducted independent research		Confirmed protocol incompatibility

Table 2 Diagnostic Process

d. Solution Exploration

After identifying the root cause—a protocol mismatch between the Allen-Bradley encoder (DF1) and the IDEC PLC (Modbus TCP)—we explored several potential solutions. Each had trade-offs in terms of cost, complexity, and reliability.

i. Options Considered

Option	Advantages	Drawbacks
Use a protocol converter (e.g., ProSoft or Red Lion)	Bridges DF1 and Modbus TCP protocols	Added cost, complexity, and potential latency
Replace AB drive with IDEC drive	Ensures compatibility with IDEC PLC	Didn't resolve encoder protocol issue
Use an industrial inclinometer	Simple, cost-effective, compatible with IDEC	Lower resolution than absolute encoder

e. Final Decision:

We ultimately chose to:

- Replace the Allen-Bradley drive with an IDEC drive to maintain native Modbus TCP compatibility.
- Replace the AB encoder with a high-quality industrial inclinometer capable of analog output, allowing the IDEC PLC to receive rotational feedback directly.

This decision enabled us to preserve project deadlines without compromising core functionality, even though we accepted a slight reduction in measurement resolution.

IV. Results

Our field experience revealed the full extent of the challenges caused by mismatched communication protocols:

- The issue was **not** hardware failure—it was a **protocol-level incompatibility**.
- **Two months** of project time were lost in diagnostics, vendor discussions, and trial-and-error testing.
- In the end, replacing the encoder and drive resulted in **a fully functional system** that met the operational needs of the foundry.

This experience underscored the importance of validating protocol compatibility **early in the design phase**, especially when mixing components from different vendors.

V. Conclusion

This project offered a valuable real-world lesson in the hidden challenges of multi-vendor system integration in industrial automation. While both Allen-Bradley and IDEC produce reliable, widely used components, the lack of cross-compatibility in communication protocols—specifically DF1 and Modbus TCP—became a significant obstacle.

What initially seemed like a routine integration turned into a two-month setback due to unclear documentation and incompatible systems. The experience reinforced several key takeaways:

- **Never assume protocol compatibility**, even between major industrial brands.
- **Conduct thorough protocol validation** before hardware procurement.
- **Push for clearer manufacturer documentation**, especially regarding cross-brand use cases.
- **Be ready to pivot** and implement practical workarounds when vendor solutions fall short.

Ultimately, this case demonstrated the critical role that field-level problem-solving plays in automation engineering. Textbook knowledge is essential, but adaptability and critical thinking are what move projects forward in the face of unexpected hurdles.

VI. Future Work:

Based on this experience, several areas for improvement and exploration have emerged:

- **Protocol Bridging Solutions**: We plan to evaluate third-party DF1-to-Modbus TCP gateways (e.g., ProSoft or Red Lion) for cost-effectiveness, latency, and reliability in future projects.

- **Advocacy for Open Standards**: Promoting broader adoption of Ethernet-based, vendor-neutral protocols like EtherNet/IP and Modbus TCP/IP can reduce integration complexity and long-term maintenance costs.
- **Knowledge Sharing**: More field-level documentation and knowledge sharing among engineers could help prevent others from facing similar delays or pitfalls.

These steps will help build more resilient automation systems that are not just functional but also easier to scale and maintain.

DF1 vs. Modbus TCP Comparison

Feature	DF1 (Allen-Bradley) vs Modbus TCP (IDEC)
Protocol Type	Proprietary Serial Protocol vs Open Ethernet-based Protocol
Communication Medium	RS-232, RS-485 vs Ethernet
Speed	Slower vs Faster
Vendor Support	Allen-Bradley Only vs Widely Supported
Integration Complexity	High (with non-AB systems) vs Low (standardized)
Usage Scope	Legacy Systems, AB Devices vs Broad Industrial Use

References

[1]. Rockwell Automation, “842E Ether Net / IP Absolute Encoder User Manual”, Publication 842E – UM001C – EN – P, Sep. 2016.
[2]. Rockwell Automation, “842E Ether Net / IP Absolute Encoders, Publication 842E – PP001A – EN – P, Sep. 2016.
[3]. IDEC Corporation, “FC6A Micro Smart Series User Manual.”
[4]. J. Smith, “Design and Implementation of PLC – Based Automation Systems, “International Journal of Industrial Automation, Vol. 10, no.2, pp. 45 – 52, 2018.
[5]. Rockwell Automation, “DF1 Protocol and Command Set Reference Manual”, 2019.
[6]. IDEC Corporation, “FC6A Series PLC Technical Guide”, 2021.
[7]. Modbus Organization, “Modbus TCP / IP Specification”, 2020.

Final Notes

This study is based entirely on our firsthand experience with the 5XL project. The observations, setbacks, and solutions described reflect real challenges encountered during development and integration.

We want to clarify that this article is not intended as a critique of either Allen-Bradley or IDEC. Both brands offer high-quality, reliable products and enjoy strong reputations in the automation industry. Our goal is simply to share our findings so that others can learn from the issues we encounter.

We declare no conflicts of interest and received no external financial support for this work. It is written with the intention of contributing useful insights to the engineering and automation communities, especially for professionals working with mixed-vendor systems.

We do not claim authority over product decisions—our goal is simply to contribute to shared learning through what we experienced and resolved firsthand.