

I'm not a bot



i am new to this, can someone tell me the difference between the two? compact logix/control logix The Selection Guide is a great start. ControlLogix and CompactLogix are the two main branches of the Rockwell Automation Logix 5000 programmable controller family. ControlLogix is the big system and process controller. It uses a Bulletin 1756 chassis, into which CPU and network and I/O modules are placed. The controller typically has only a USB or RS-232 port, and network modules are added to the system chassis. CompactLogix is the smaller machine-level controller. It uses a "snap-on" expansion I/O bus, rather than a chassis. There are several different models with different network options. Both controller families use the RSLogix 5000 editing software. There are several different editions of this software that support various languages and features, but the Relay Ladder Logic language is by far the most popular and widely used. There's an older Rockwell Automation product family called "MicroLogix". Don't be confused by the similar name; MicroLogix controllers are small members of the SLC-500 product line and don't use the same instruction set and editor as CompactLogix and ControlLogix. Skip to content in industrial automation, choosing the suitable Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) can significantly affect your operations' efficiency, scalability, and overall success. Among the myriad choices available, two PLCs often stand out: Rockwell Automation's Allen-Bradley CompactLogix and MicroLogix series. As such, the question often arises: What is the difference between CompactLogix and MicroLogix? At the heart of this query is understanding each system's unique capabilities, cost-effectiveness, programming environments, and the types of applications they are best suited for. Understanding the critical differences between CompactLogix vs. MicroLogix can guide decision-makers toward the solution that best meets their industrial automation needs. This article delves deep into the distinct features, advantages, and practical applications of Allen-Bradley MicroLogix and CompactLogix control systems. We aim to give you insights to make informed decisions about the ideal PLC for your specific automation requirements. So, let's explore CompactLogix vs. MicroLogix to uncover the unique attributes that each brings to the table in industrial automation. CompactLogix represents a line of PLCs manufactured by Rockwell Automation under the Allen-Bradley brand. Part of the Logix platform, which includes the more extensive ControlLogix series, CompactLogix controllers are renowned for their versatility and scalability, fitting a wide range of industrial automation applications, particularly those of small or medium size. These PLCs embody the idea of integrated architecture. They are designed to interact seamlessly with other devices in the system, creating a unified automation solution that significantly boosts efficiency and productivity. The underpinning design philosophy makes them a preferred choice for applications requiring sophisticated, high-performance controls without larger systems' physical bulk or cost. Programmability is another key strength of the CompactLogix series. They are programmed using a highly modern environment, like Studio 5000 Logix Designer software. This comprehensive engineering environment facilitates the configuration of your entire automation system, including PLCs, I/O, and network devices, enhancing your ability to create robust and flexible control systems. Moreover, CompactLogix controllers stand out due to their support for Ethernet/IP high-speed communication. This capability allows these controllers to integrate data across an organization, driving connectivity from the plant floor to the enterprise level. Some models also offer integrated safety functionality for protecting personnel, equipment, and overall productivity. Despite their advanced features and capabilities, these controllers are designed with compactness in mind. They deliver robust control capabilities within a smaller form factor, making them ideal for applications where space is limited but robust control is still required. In summary, CompactLogix controllers deliver the sophistication of larger control systems in a more compact, cost-effective package. CompactLogix PLCs from Allen-Bradley offer numerous advantages, making them a favored choice for many industrial automation applications. These benefits derive from their integrated design, versatility, and high-end performance characteristics. Here are the key advantages: Scalability: CompactLogix controllers are designed to scale, accommodating various applications from simple stand-alone systems to complex, high-performance applications. This flexibility allows you to tailor your control system to meet your needs. Integrated Architecture: Certain controllers, like the CompactLogix 5370, are part of Rockwell Automation's Integrated Architecture system. This unified approach to automation enhances productivity and efficiency and simplifies system design, commissioning, and operation. Powerful Programming Environment: These PLCs are programmed using software like Studio 5000 Logix Designer, providing a robust and flexible engineering environment for developing your control systems. High-Speed Communication: They support Ethernet/IP for high-speed communication with other devices and systems. This communication capability is essential in the modern era. Integrated Safety Functionality: Some models come with integrated safety functionality, which can help to protect people and property, reducing downtime and improving operational efficiency. Compact Size: While advanced in technology, CompactLogix controllers are designed with a compact form factor, making them suitable for space-dependent applications. These advantages make CompactLogix a highly effective solution for a wide variety of industrial automation applications, delivering robust control capabilities yet remaining compact and affordable. MicroLogix PLCs, produced by Rockwell Automation under the Allen-Bradley brand, are a go-to solution for more straightforward, cost-sensitive applications requiring high I/O counts. Known for their compact size and relative ease of use, they offer a cost-effective control solution without compromising on the robustness characteristic of Allen-Bradley products. Unlike more extensive and complex PLCs, MicroLogix controllers are designed with simplicity and economy. They provide a convenient solution for implementing control systems in scenarios where only essential control functions are needed. However, even within this framework of simplicity, they deliver a range of control capabilities. These controllers typically use the RSLogix 500 programming environment. This simplicity makes them relatively easy to program and a popular choice among smaller-scale operations that may need more extensive programming resources. MicroLogix controllers also offer flexibility in communication protocols. While some models support Ethernet/IP, others use RS-232 or RS-485 serial communication (or a combination), providing versatility based on the specific communication needs of your system. Overall, MicroLogix controllers are designed for straightforward, cost-effective control applications. This simplicity makes them relatively easy to program and a popular choice among smaller-scale operations that may need more extensive programming resources. The MicroLogix series, despite its simplicity, brings a set of distinct advantages to the table in the landscape of industrial automation. Here are the crucial strengths of these controllers that lend the series its unique appeal: Simplicity: Their easy-to-use RSLogix 500 programming environment brings simplicity to the forefront. This makes them accessible even to those without extensive programming experience, reducing the barrier to entry for smaller-scale operations. Cost-Effectiveness: Designed with budget-sensitive applications in mind, these controllers provide robust control capabilities without a hefty price tag. This economical nature is one of their greatest strengths, especially for businesses that need reliable automation solutions but have to work within budget constraints. Compact Form Factor: MicroLogix PLCs are small and compact even more so than CompactLogix controllers. Their size is a significant advantage in applications where space is limited, yet there's still a need for reliable control. Flexible I/O Count and Communication: These controllers come in various configurations, each offering multiple built-in I/O points. This flexibility allows you to select a model that fits your specific needs and can grow with you. Moreover, they offer versatility in communication protocols, with some models supporting Ethernet/IP and others utilizing RS-232 or RS-485 serial communication. Range of Control Capabilities: MicroLogix controllers offer impressive control capabilities despite their simplicity and small size. This makes them a surprisingly versatile choice for a range of applications. The MicroLogix series embodies the "small but mighty" ethos. Despite their simplicity and cost-effectiveness, these controllers can effectively manage various automation needs, making them valuable assets in different industrial scenarios. While CompactLogix and MicroLogix are both PLC product lines from Allen-Bradley, they serve different automation needs and environments. Here's a breakdown of the key differences: Application Complexity: CompactLogix is designed for complex applications requiring high-performance control, scalability, and integration with various devices across a unified platform. MicroLogix, on the other hand, is better suited for more straightforward, cost-sensitive applications that require essential control functions. Programming: CompactLogix controllers are programmed using a modern, comprehensive environment like Studio 5000 Logix Designer software. MicroLogix uses more straightforward programming like RSLogix 500 software. Communication Capabilities: CompactLogix controllers predominantly support Ethernet/IP for high-speed communication, integrating data from the plant floor to the enterprise level. MicroLogix controllers, in contrast, offer flexibility with models that support Ethernet/IP, RS-232, or RS-485 serial communication. Size and Cost: While CompactLogix controllers provide advanced capabilities within a compact form factor, they tend to be more expensive than MicroLogix controllers, which offer fewer features but are even more compact and economical. The decision between CompactLogix vs. MicroLogix hinges on your specific automation requirements, your available budget, and the complexity of your desired control system. If your applications demand complex control, high-speed communication, and seamless integration with other devices and systems, CompactLogix might be the superior choice. However, MicroLogix could be your ideal fit for straightforward, cost-sensitive applications requiring robust but basic control capabilities. Industrial Automation Co. has the experience and expertise to help you navigate these complex choices. Our automation professionals can guide you in selecting the PLC tailored to your operational needs. Trust Industrial Automation Co. is your reliable partner in finding the perfect automation solution. CompactLogix and MicroLogix bring unique strengths, addressing various automation needs. Understanding these differences is vital to selecting the suitable PLC for your operations. No matter what you need, Industrial Automation Co. is here to help. Whether it's a CompactLogix 5370, a MicroLogix 1400, or any other PLC, let us be your partner in the world of automation. Contact us today to find the solution to drive your productivity to new heights. Back to Industrial Automation Co. Blog choosing a selection results in a full page refresh press the space key then arrow keys to make a selection Hello guys I would like to know, by your experience, what would be the best effective protocol to use according to easiest of use, speed, reliability and of course... the price... I will have to use few micrologix as local slave unit controlled by 1 compactlogix... thanks All CPU won't be far from each others Without knowing any details of your project I'd vote Ethernet based CompactLogix (L32E or L35E) and the Ethernet based MicroLogix (1100 or 1400).If I had it my way, they'd all be CompactLogix. I'd use the L32E/L35E as the master and replace the MicroLogix with the L2X CompactLogix series. Then use Produced/Consumed tags for comms. ok for ease of use but it will be costly... If i keep the slave micro and compact master... Connection config of a micro1400 offer df1 or ethernetRS232 DF1 would be a bit slow and obsolete? What would be involved to have a compact logix sending and reading information to few micro1400? VS using compact for all? Last edited: Apr 29, 2011 Hiif you concern about the speed go with Compact Logic.With ML you will have to use MSG which will take more time. Using produce and consume it like putting your PLCs on one bus.It cost more.You have to check the speed issue and get the best for you. You can connect and configure over DF1, but I don't think that you will be able to communicate between PLC's over DF1.Like ArikBY said, if you want to communicate between MicroLogix and CompactLogix over Ethernet, you would use message instructions. I have built numerous systems with CompactLogix communicating with ML 1100 and ML1400 over Ethernet. Works great to keep costs down. Performance is stellar: no measurable performance difference from remote I/O or multiple CompactLogix - you just don't have the nice tag architecture you would have with an all-CompactLogix design. Just use built-in explicit messaging commands of RSLogix 500 and RSLogix 5000 to perform the communication. I usually set it up so the slaves all send updates to the CompactLogix master whenever the slave sees a change, then the CL just works from its own local image. That way you don't have to "poll" the slaves for changes: its the slaves job to report changes when they happen. I write a timer around every ML change to ensure an oscillating input can't swamp the communication: immediately report changes but limit the maximum number of reported changes per second per signal (max 1 per second in my case), did you make the slave writing to master because having the master to read slaves was more complex or because it was the way you want it? Because on my side, i usually have the slave to remain passive with an exchange table and program the master to read and write to slaves... What about communicating back and forth between just micrologix ETH PLC? In a peer-to-peer messaging approach (as opposed to the multicasting used by CompactLogix under the hood for field I/O), you have two choices:1) The slaves each push (blow) new data to a block of memory in the master immediately as its available.2) The master pulls (sucks) data from each slave in an infinite regular loop: the master has a polling loop to constantly read each slave. I prefer #1 because it IMMEDIATELY sends new data to the master rather than waiting for the poll to get around to that slave and because it causes way less traffic on the (Ethernet) bus. If you are careful to make sure no slave can swamp the bus traffic (a timer to ensure data for each signal is transmitted no more often than every second), it makes for a very clean architecture. In #1 I set aside a block of registers in the master with a well defined and well documented purpose for each location: essentially a data structure for all the data that needs to be used between the master and slaves. Then each slave just writes to its own little chunk of master memory.Once the ML 1400 came out, it has enough memory for the master so there is no need for the CompactLogix in a cost-sensitive application. I have eight ML1400 slaves talking to one ML1400 master in one application (if I run out of memory I just define two units as "masters" and split their functions according to the application). That same application has 31 VFDs and six Red Lion HMIs using only ML1100 and ML1400. The VFDs communicate to the ML's using modbus and the ML's all communicate to each other using Ethernet. This is installed in many, many locations and is quite reliable as long as the ML's are installed directly to plates instead of DIN rails and the plates are attached to backplanes with rubber isolators: the ML's are sensitive to mechanical vibration on machinery that has vibration. First off let me say that you can communicate between ANY Allen Bradley PLCs via DF1. It is not just a configuration protocol. However if EtherNet/IP is an option (the PLCs yours going to use have it) then that is a good option. If MicroLogix is one of the PLCs then you must message but if they are all CompactLogix then you can use Produce/Consume which saves time but uses (a lot) of bandwidth. The reality is that every application has different best practices. With that, dont be fooled into thinking that DF1 wont get the job done. Its a great protocol and can work well. Do keep in mind that while using the slave messaging option does reduce the amount of time it takes for data to be updated it doesnt let you know if there is a problem with communications. If the Master is doing the polling and one of the nodes goes off line it will figure it out. Hi all,Im looking for feedback about the three PLC types: Micro, compact and Micro800 series. My company has been using primarily the CompactLogix series, but in some of the recent projects, management has been trying to cut cost and see if we can choose a less expensive platform to run the same process. Is there an easy way to figure out if these platforms would be compatible for our application?Any thoughts or advice based on your experience? Thank you.H. I Like the micrologix has been on the market for two decades and some of its models are already discontinued, if not, do work with rslogix500, it may take you more time to develop the logic, although there is a tool to go from RSLogix500 to 5000.the micro 800 is currently the plc of low rockwell cost, programs the CCW software and the compact is the rockwell mid-range you work with rslogix5000,I have worked with the 3 PLCs, if you want to reduce cost I would recommend the micro800, it depends on the amount of IO you have, you can choose the 820 or 850. If it is a standard solution you will have to do it again on the micro800, until now I dont know one tool from RSLogix5000 to CCW. I believe it depends on the system, the design as well as the external hardware. The Micro800 series PLCs have several variations. However, I've almost never seen them in large manufacturing plants; only in small shops. The companies I've worked for would typically prefer the ControlLogix line. However, they'd come at a steep price which isnt always easy to justify in a smaller/simpler system.My advice for my current clients is to consider the low-end CompactLogix (L16ER) first. If that isnt enough capability, you have the new 5609 series CompactLogix PLCs. Allen Bradley MicroLogix, CompactLogix, and ControlLogix are three different product lines offered by Allen Bradley, a prominent industrial automation company. Here are the key differences between them: 1. MicroLogix: MicroLogix controllers are the smallest and simplest of the three product lines. They are typically utilized in small-scale applications with limited I/O requirements. MicroLogix controllers offer basic functionality and have a fixed number of I/O points. They are suitable for stand-alone machines or small processes. 2. CompactLogix: CompactLogix controllers provide more advanced capabilities compared to MicroLogix. They offer a higher number of I/O points and more processing power. CompactLogix controllers are commonly used in medium-sized applications and can handle more complex automation tasks. They can support various communication protocols and can be expanded by adding additional modules. 3. ControlLogix: ControlLogix controllers are the most powerful and feature-rich product line offered by Allen Bradley. They are designed for large-scale applications that require high-performance control, extensive I/O capabilities, and complex networking capabilities. ControlLogix controllers can handle large amounts of I/O points and support multiple communication protocols. They are suitable for demanding automation systems requiring advanced control algorithms, motion control, and data acquisition. In summary, the main differences between MicroLogix, CompactLogix, and ControlLogix lie in their size, performance, I/O capacity, and suitability for different applications. MicroLogix is the simplest and smallest, CompactLogix is a mid-range option, and ControlLogix offers the most advanced capabilities for high-performance automation systems. Feel free to contact, any of your requirements are warmly welcomed. Bot / Cell: +86 175 5077 6091 Sales Director / Email: Reddit and its partners use cookies and similar technologies to enhance your navigation, improve site usage, and assist in our marketing efforts. By accepting all cookies, you agree to our use of cookies to deliver enhanced services across our site. Improve the quality of Reddit, personalize Reddit content and advertising, and measure the effectiveness of advertising. By rejecting non-essential cookies, Reddit may still use certain cookies to ensure the proper functionality of our platform. For more information, please see our Cookie Notice and our Privacy Policy. Log In or Create an AccountOpens new dialog The page will refresh upon submission. Any pending input will be lost. I'm curious, why are these two programs from same company so different?Is same like with Siemens S7 and S7 MicroWin (originally from Texas Instruments, bought by Siemens and re-branded)? It's just marketing history. The "Logix" name got its start with the MicroLogix 1000 in 1995, which had an operating system derived from the SLC-5/02 controller. A-B chose to use a similar name with the ControlLogix, and then later with the CompactLogix. There were also the now-discontinued SoftLogix, DriveLogix, and FlexLogix controllers. All of these controllers are designed and built by Rockwell Automation; they were not an acquired company design or a third party label, though A-B has done that with some other control devices in the past.Maybe they wish they'd had a better brand name so that there wasn't confusion between the SLC-based MicroLogix and the ControlLogix-based CompactLogix. But that's how marketing goes, sometimes. I think that Petr Broza dont ask why the same name is used for different PLCs, but why the PLCs are so different. I also thought the same many times, why there isnt the same programming architecture from smallest to biggest PLC in Rockwells portfolio of PLCs.I can understand that when ControlLogix was introduced in 1997, it was a so powerful architecture that it was not possible to squeeze into a micrologix style CPU. But today 18 years later - I think there is no excuse, and Rockwell would have a much better all-encompassing architecture if they had a micrologix PLC programmed with the same tool as the bigger CompactLogix and ControlLogix, and you could exchange code freely between them.I think that Rockwell sees CompactLogix and ControlLogix as high-end PLCs that calls for a high-end price, and that works for them since they are so dominant in north America. The Micro800 and MicroLogix are supposed to compete with lower cost competitors, while not cannibalising sales of CompactLogix in particular. Thus it is a deliberate decision from Rockwell to make the MicroLogix not compatible with CompactLogix and ControlLogix. I'm not sure whether it's "right" or not - but here's the way I heard it explained years ago ... the European Union came up with a definition (a "standard") of how a "programmable automation controller" should function ... that "standard" specified an ASYNCHRONOUS scan cycle mainly to increase the processor's scanning speed ... Allen-Bradley's existing processors had always used a scan cycle which was SYNCHRONOUS in operation and therefore their existing controllers could not be sold on the European market ... so ... the ControlLogix and CompactLogix systems were developed to meet the new ASYNCHRONOUS scan specification and provide a product which could be sold in Europe ... again I have ZERO proof that the explanation offered above is correct but it seems to make sense ... if someone has a better story, I'd love to hear it ... notes for beginners ... BASICALLY a processor using a scan cycle which is SYNCHRONOUS in operation works in the following BASIC manner ... (1) the processor updates the input bit/boxes from the input devices in the field ... then (2) the processor executes the programming code ... then (3) the processor sends the on/off status of the output bit/boxes to the output devices in the field ... this "Step 1 Step 2 Step 3" arrangement is often called the processor's "scan cycle" ... on the other hand ... BASICALLY a processor using a scan cycle which is ASYNCHRONOUS in operation works as fast as it can go ... the updating of the input bit/boxes from the input devices in the field can take place at ANY time during the processor's execution of the code ... in simple terms there is no easy to nail down "Step 1 Step 2 Step 3" arrangement to the processor's "scan cycle" ... that, of course, is a simplification but some folks just don't understand that the two operations are DIFFERENT "under the hood" ... party on ... The Micro800 and MicroLogix are supposed to compete with lower cost competitors, while not cannibalising sales of CompactLogix in particular. Exactly. Car makers don't put features from their luxury or performance brands into their entry level or economy brands for the exact same reason. Marketing 101. I understand the argument that it makes sense for Rockwell, and every vendor in every business does it. Your analogy implies that compactlogix/controllogix are simply better version of micrologix, but that is not the case. There are fundamental feature differences meaning that you cannot simply chose the PLC based on the features you need or dont need. In case you need both low-end and high-end PLCs, with Rockwell you must accept that you have to develop code on 2 totally different platforms. IMO it is acceptable to differentiate on such things as memory size and performance, or features such as motion and safety, but IMO the code architecture should be the common denominator. Its the same reason Siemens doesn't return back to their older models and update them, all products eventually mature and farther invention does not yield a return-on-investment. Sure, lots of technical issues why it would be nice but the bottom line \$\$\$ is the deciding factor in business. jstolaruk.What ... ? What I mean is that the hardware (embedded processor) used in the Micrologix may not be able to support the software used in the Compactlogix, either technically not capable, or without a dollar investment that is so high and it could never yield a return (profit). Its matured. Already the price of the smallest Compactlogix is very close to the ML1400 (within a couple hundred USD), so the upgrade path is there. I am sure that in 1997, Logix code could only run in an expensive microprocessor, but I am equally sure that it is not the case in 2016. Again, the way RA has rolled out new products and versions of s/w for ControlLogix/Compactlogix further indicates to me that RA's focus on ML is minimal. 1766-L32AWA (20/12 integrated I/O) list price 881 USD. 1769-L16ER-BB1B (16/16 integrated I/O) list price 1520 USD. Right, true, forgot about list pricing. There is a difference in the OEM discount schedules and the ones I get favor the Compactlogix over the Micrologix just like the ControlLogix favors over the PLC-5/1771 family (also too mature to invest further development in). Personally, I would prefer that Rockwell cut the prices in general on CompactLogix, removed artificial limits (max 6 expansion modules on the 1769-L16ER-BB1B for example), and focused on only 1 hardware platform (POINT would be my choice). And then they could ditch the all MicroLogix for what I care. But I dont think it will happen. Rockwell will keep the policy of relatively high prices on CompactLogix, and also keep MicroLogix for the low end, which leaves the end-users with 2 incompatible platforms. I used to use Rockwell PLCs, but not any longer. The above considerations are some of the reasons for that, as we need to cover both very small and very large projects. Right now I'm running into the clumsiness of using TIA portal (required for the HMIs I'm using) but because its not up to full speed (last I was told) with the S7-3xx and ET-200 pro safety processors I have to use Step7 v5.5 with distributed safety. Hoping Siemens gets this discontinuity cleaned up soon. Again, the way RA has rolled out new products and versions of s/w for ControlLogix/Compactlogix further indicates to me that RA's focus on ML is minimal. Right, true, forgot about list pricing. There is a difference in the OEM discount schedules and the ones I get favor the Compactlogix over the Micrologix just like the ControlLogix favors over the PLC-5/1771 family (also too mature to invest further development in). Good view. Sometimes you have to watch what is happening at the tail of the snake to understand what is making the head go one way or the other. With AB/PLC, we see RIO and 1785 going-going-gone..., and can only wonder what is next. I know I have my ideas, but, of course, have no evidence to support them except 25 years of watching this happen. Silvering of old gear, for those who are following along.... There is a difference in the OEM discount schedules and the ones I get favor the Compactlogix over the Micrologix just like the ControlLogix favors over the PLC-5/1771 family (also too mature to invest further development in). Same with OEM's here in Aus. It makes sense when you think about it: obviously the MicroLogix series is starting to mature, and Rockwell will eventually want to retire it and focus on just one (Logix 5000) platform. Or two platforms, including CCW ("shudders"). If they jacked up the list price right now it would probably upset a lot of people, as the MicroLogix has been their "entry level" PLC for years, and all of these people using it would feel like they're being shafted. But if you cut all the margins out of a CompactLogix when selling to people building new equipment, all of a sudden the Compact will start to look very attractive to OEM's, and fewer and fewer new machines will be built with the MicroLogix series PLC's. After a while, the MicroLogix will start to fade out of the picture, and Rockwell can retire it gently. Page 2 Personally, I would prefer that Rockwell cut the prices in general on CompactLogix, removed artificial limits (max 6 expansion modules on the 1769-L16ER-BB1B for example), and focused on only 1 hardware platform (POINT would be my choice). Multiple revenue streams is an important concept especially with a company as large as Rockwell. It would be foolish and risky to reduce their PLC/PAC line down to one or two options. Its also hard to argue with success. Rockwell remains the leading PLC/PAC manufacturer in North America and one of the top manufacturers worldwide. What would they gain by getting rid of two of their more popular products (MicroLogix 1100 and 1400)? The European Union came up with a definition (a "standard") of how a "programmable automation controller" should function ... that "standard" specified an ASYNCHRONOUS scan cycle mainly to increase the processor's scanning speed ... I'd be really curious to hear if that's true, or what else the background might be. I've only ever heard of the Asynchronous type scan in the context of the Logix processors. It definitely isn't true of the Siemens processors, who I assume would be driving most of the European PLC standards. As is the Siemens way, there are about 100 complicating factors/exceptions for IO communication, but it is basically synchronous at its heart, and by default. Do the Codesys types go more to the asynch style? I understand what effects Asynch has on how things process, it just never made sense to me why it would be an advantage. From what I've seen, everyone buffers all their IO manually in the program anyway, is this just a crutch? Are we artificially limiting ourselves to a synchronous way of thinking, and missing out on the joys of asynchronous programming? 7 Common Servo Motor Failures As a seasoned engineer with extensive experience in industrial automation, I've seen my fair share Read More As an industrial automation engineer, I deal with PLCs (Programmable Logic Controllers) every day. If you're like me, you're interested in automation but often overwhelmed by those complex wiring diagrams. This article is definitely for you. Read More What is the Difference Between Sourcing and Sinking In PLC control systems, sourcing and sinking are two key concepts, especially Read More Skip to content TOP Whatsapp Tel sales@plc-pioneer.com Wechat error: Content is protected !!

Controllogix vs compactlogix vs micrologix. Micrologix vs controllogix. Compactlogix to micrologix messaging. Difference between micrologix to controllogix and compactlogix.