

A Solution to the Generalized ROS Hardware IO Problem – A Generic Modbus/TCP Device Driver for PLCs, Sensors and Actuators

Arne Wendt

Institute for Aircraft-Production-Technology
Hamburg University of Technology
Hamburg, Germany
0000-0002-5782-3468

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Thorsten Schüppstuhl

Institute for Aircraft-Production-Technology
Hamburg University of Technology
Hamburg, Germany
0000-0002-9616-3976

Abstract—The Robot Operating System (ROS) provides a software framework, and ecosystem of knowledge and community supplied resources to rapidly develop and prototype intelligent robotics applications. By standardizing communication, configuration and invocation of software modules, ROS facilitates reuse of device-driver and algorithm implementations. Using existing implementations of functionality allows users to assemble their robotics application from tested and known-good *capabilities*. Despite the efforts of the ROS-Industrial consortium and projects like ROSIN to bring ROS to industrial applications and integrate industrial hardware, we observe a lack of options to generically integrate basic physical IO. In this work we lay out and provide a solution to this problem by implementing a generic Modbus/TCP device driver for ROS.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Robot Operating System (ROS) is a meta-operating system for robots. It shall provide users with "hardware abstraction, low-level device control, implementation of commonly-used functionality, message-passing between processes, and package management" [1]. Supplied by either ROS itself, or as community supplied resources. By building an ecosystem of knowledge and supplemental community supplied software resources, it allows to rapidly assemble and prototype intelligent robotics applications. By standardizing communication, configuration and invocation of software modules, ROS facilitates reuse of device-drivers, algorithm implementations and tooling. Using existing implementations allow users to assemble their robotics application from tested and known-good *capabilities*.

ROS has a strong focus on service-robotics and intelligent autonomous mobile robotics application, providing out-of-the-box solutions to common high level problems like e.g. path-planning, navigation and execution of (mostly) wheeled locomotion, using the *navigation stack* [2], as well as trajectory planning and execution for multi-axis manipulators and grippers using *MoveIT* [3]. These high level solutions are complemented by sensor-drivers, enabling the necessary perception for the planning tasks and subsequent execution. Founded In 2012, and supported by projects like ROSIN

[4], the ROS-Industrial [5] consortium aims to bring ROS to industrial applications and integrate industrial hardware into the ROS ecosystem. Industrial applications, especially automation in production and handling, are starkly characterized by their interaction with and physical manipulation of the real world. Thus, for a successful application of ROS in industrial application, there exists a strong demand for integration of actuators and sensors of different modalities.

Even tough these components are readily available, and usually implement well defined and standardized interfaces, we observe a lack of options to integrate this wealth of existing sensors and actuators from (not limited to, but especially) industrial applications into the ROS environment in a generic way. This deficiency is as far ranging, as the integration of a simple button or switch poses a serious hurdle in ROS application development. To our knowledge, no solution to this broader problem, providing IO integration with sufficient scalability, portability and flexibility, exist within the ROS ecosystem today.

With the following work we want to show a way, and provide the accompanying tools (software), we deem an acceptable solution to the problem stated above; in industrial, as well as research and hobbyist applications.

II. HARDWARE DRIVERS IN ROS

Reviewing the official ROS community resources [6] and [7], the ROS industrial resources [8], as well as publicly available projects on [9], we identify *five main* categories of drivers: ¹

- 1) 2D vision sensors (cameras)
- 2) 1D - 3D depth sensors: mostly LiDAR, ToF and stereo-vision
- 3) Robotic arms/manipulators
- 4) Vendor specific "robotics" platforms

¹We abstain from providing a (exemplary) list of reviewed driver, as we are neither conducting a systematic review, nor do we believe that a - under all circumstances non-exhaustive - list would be of particular benefit to the reader

- 5) *non-ROS-enabled* wrappers for (field bus) communication protocol implementations

The last category mostly just wraps libraries for ROSs' dependency management and build system (*catkin*) and is of no further interest here.

We can further classify the first *four* driver categories by the following properties:

- A well defined hardware-interfaces with same **semantic** output (data class) and small variable-parameter-vector
- B high market penetration of targeted hardware, or low availability of competitive products

Where an example for category **A** would be the `usb_cam` driver [10], providing an interface from `v4l/v4l2` (**Video for Linux (2)**) compatible cameras to ROSs' standardized `sensor_msgs/Image` format. Category **B** would be covered by (mostly) vendor specific drivers for e.g. LiDAR-Scanners, like *SICK* (cmp. [11]), or *Intel RealSense* depth cameras (cmp. [12]). The two categories are non-exclusive though: Common drivers for each (most) all e.g. *ABB* or *Universal Robots* industrial robotic arms (cmp. [13], [14]), or *iDS uEye* cameras (cmp. [15]), fit both categories.

The first category poses a high incentive for the community and community developed drivers, as standardized interfaces usually increase the available options and this decrease the price; ultimately increasing availability and accessibility. The second category allows for two driving mechanism in driver development: First, manufacturers targeting the ROS community as a market. Second, a demand for specific sensor modality or properties, driven by the community.

ROS has ever been targeting *NIX based computer platforms in general, and the Ubuntu platform in particular [16]. It is thus not surprising to observe another common property across the available ROS drivers:

- C ROS drivers target Hardware with interfaces commonly found on general purpose computing platforms, e.g. Universal Serial Bus (USB), serial COM interfaces (RS232/RS485/UART) or Ethernet connections.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Basic industrial IO components (sensors and actuators) usually expose their functionality as one input or output per individual function; either logic/digital (on/off) or analog (continuous range of values). These interfaces adhere to the basic specifications of $\{5V, 10V, 24V\}$ for digital and logic IO, and voltage and current signal in the ranges of $[0V, 10V]$ and $[4mA, 20mA]$ for analog signals as defined by [17], [18].

When comparing the above mentioned interfaces to property **C** of available ROS drivers, we can immediately observe a problem:

Recent general purpose computing platforms do not provide individual connections for general purpose logic or analog signal inputs.

For common IO components or simple applications like switch/contact readout, we can further imagine property **B** to not be fulfilled. Applying the abstraction of all functionality




Fig. 1. Schematics of information flow from hardware IO to ROS, showing components and properties to identify, as well as their relations and interfaces; class or set of GPIO capable hardware, as *Device A* to *Device N*

to the two generic interface modalities, logic IO for discrete binary states, and analog IO for the representation of a closed continuous interval of values, it is trivial to see property **A** to not apply in this case as well.

The lack of physical interfaces on current computing platforms poses a serious technical hurdle to the implementation of ROS drivers for sensors and actuators; without additional hardware and specifications, an integration is impossible. The lack of a ubiquitously available hardware interface, and knowing property **A** to not apply, further lowers the interest of the community to drive a generic driver development.

To provide a solution to the *generalized problem* of a flexible, portable and scalable *hardware IO* integration into the ROS ecosystem, we first need to identify a set or class of possible hardware interfaces providing the necessary general purpose IO (GPIO) capabilities, a common communications protocol to mediate between hardware and software layer, and subsequently define and implement a generalized software abstraction on top of its concepts. The general structure of which is show in fig. 1

IV. CHOOSING A HARDWARE INTERFACE AND COMMUNICATIONS PROTOCOL

Providing general purpose IO capability and transferring acquired data or accepting setpoint values over a standardized communications protocol is a common application in industrial automation system. Vendors like e.g. *Beckhoff*, *Wago* and *Phoenix Contact*, provide bus couplers for all major industrial communication protocols and busses. These devices themselves are then expandable in their IO capabilities by adding additional IO-modules; the same applies to PLCs. Bus coupler and PLC manufacturers usually provide a wealth of IO modules for their respective platform, enabling sufficiently *general purpose IO* in respect to the problem at hand. Consequently, for the remaining part of the work, we will assume the device-class of bus couplers to be the best representation of a solution to the hardware-facing portion of the overall problem; mapping GPIOs to a standardized protocol. *Further evaluation and selections will be made with bus couplers as the primarily targeted hardware.*

To provide an as generic as possible solution to the generalized problem, we want the following requirements to be met:

Scalability:

- Support hardware interfaces with an extendable IO count; enabling *vertical* scalability
- Support a scalable number of small (cheap) devices to increase IO count; enabling *horizontal* scalability

Portability:

- Not target one specific device
- Not target vendor-specific hardware or communication protocols
- Prefer technical solutions without the need for specialized communications hardware
- Be hardware-agnostic regarding the hardware platform running ROS
- Shall use commonly available hardware interfaces on the hardware platform running ROS, e.g. USB, serial COM, Ethernet or WiFi

Flexibility:

- Provide a single integrated conceptual solution to generic logic and analog IO
- Allow for mapping of hardware/protocol data to basic ROS message types and topic trees

A. Communications Protocol

Bus couplers and PLCs usually implement fieldbus interfaces. The resulting challenge is the identification of an interface to be used in combination with the hardware running ROS. As analyzed by [19], recent developments of fieldbuses - and communication protocols in industrial applications in general - show an increase in the use of ethernet media access (MAC) and physical layer (PHY). Reviewing the current bus coupler offerings of major manufacturers (as above in section IV) we support these findings, while simultaneously identifying Ethernet and RS232/RS485 based solutions as the only commonly available protocols with a suitable PHY. As manufacturers are increasingly adopting ethernet based solution, and serial COM ports are on the decline on recent computer hardware, we rule out the use of serial COM protocols in favor of ethernet based solutions.

The resulting list of commonly available and standardized communication protocols using an ethernet PHY, providing cross-vendor-compatibility, is given as column one of table I. Analyzing the properties of the potential candidates, with the help of [19]–[22], we can further compare their benefits and deficiencies and select an optimal solution to our problem. The compared properties and their rating will be made in reference to the satisfaction of our requirements. We identify the following parameters and their associated impacts as a first set of filters relevant to our problem and requirements:

- *Maximum number of devices per protocol*; impacts scalability and portability to existing environments
- *Requirement for special hardware*; impacts portability requirements

TABLE I
MAXIMUM DEVICE NUMBER AND SPECIAL HARDWARE REQUIREMENTS
INDICATION FOR ETHERNET BASED COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS
(PARTLY BASED ON [20])

Protocol	Max. no. Devices	Special Hardware Required
Profinet	60	yes
EtherNet/IP	90	yes
Modbus/TCP	-	no
EtherCAT	180	yes
OPC UA	-	no
MQTT	-	no

With the results, as given in table I, we can further narrow the selection to the three solutions not capping the maximum device number and not requiring special hardware for operations.

1) *Protocol Overview:* Properties of the three remaining contenders will be described briefly; focusing on conceptual differences and feature set, as well as a short analysis on the availability of protocol implementations in suitable hardware devices.

OPC UA: The OPC Unified Architecture defines a layered architecture for communications between devices [23]. While the specification mostly defines concepts and behaviors, standardized mappings ([24]) to concrete technical implementations exist and provide the flexibility to choose the application specific optimal technologies. At its core, OPC UA specifies a methodology for information modelling, specified in [25]. With this information model, OPC UA allows to describe, among other information, the available data/variables to be read from and written to a server (device), modelling e.g. hierarchical relationships and annotating values with datatype, physical unit and a (unique) name/identifier. Providing a descriptive information model of the provided data is a highly desirable trait of the OPC UA communication stack, as it allows for automatic and dynamic configuration of a driver (or client in general) from the devices' information model.

Implementations of OPC UA servers are commonly available in recent PLCs. Reviewing the functionality of implementations provided by *Wago*, *Beckhoff* and *Siemens*, we find that only variables present in a PLC program may be exposed over OPC UA. No direct access to IO modules attached to the PLC is possible via OPC UA without mapping these to a variable. While OPC UA server support in PLCs seems in place, reviewing the OPC foundations' list of certified products [26], we identify only a single device² implementing bus coupler like behavior and exposing its attached IO modules directly via OPC UA.

MQTT: The Message Queuing Telemetry Transport (MQTT) [27] provides means of network communication built on the TCP/IP stack, targeted at IoT applications. MQTT is a pure transport and messaging implementation and does not define payload data serialization. Without a standardized and

²Beckhoff EK9160

widely adopted serialization, MQTT alone cannot ever satisfy our requirement for flexibility. Sparkplug [28] is a specification for topic organization of the MQTT publish-subscribe-architecture and serialization of MQTT payloads, intended to provide compatibility of devices and applications in industrial IoT (IIoT) applications. Sparkplug provides means to discover device capabilities and provided data, as well as device/node discovery on the network.

While MQTT alone and in conjunction with Sparkplug seem to provide a desirable performance over competing protocols (cmp. [21], [22]) we are unable to identify a serious³ number of devices implementing Sparkplug.

For the remainder of this work, MQTT will be used to refer to the combination of MQTT and Sparkplug.

Modbus/TCP: Modbus/TCP, at its core, allows to call defined methods on a remote device and receive the corresponding function call result. Methods for data access build on the Modbus data model; both specified by [29]. This basic data model distinguishes between bit and register values, while methods for read and write operation for each singular or multiple of these values are provided. While Modbus does not provide any standardized means to communicate meta information like data type or physical unit, Modbus/TCP enabled devices commonly adhere to the data types specified by IEC-61131-3 [30].

Apart from specialized Modbus/TCP-bus couplers, virtually all PLCs and bus couplers with an ethernet connection provide a Modbus/TCP server/slave implementation. Modern PLCs using a IEC-61131-3 compatible runtime, without a vendor supplied server, may add Modbus/TCP compatibility as a software package/module [31].

2) *Protocol Selection:* As all three protocols are publicly available and open standards, and are either based on – or provide capability to leverage – standard ethernet based communications, we assume all three to directly satisfy all but our first requirements in regards to *portability*. Further, all protocols do support transmission of individual data points and types for representation of analog and digital IO, thus satisfying our requirements in relation to *flexibility*.

MQTT and OPC UA, each seem to provide technically optimal solution to the integration and exchange of IO information with hardware acquisition devices, for the problem at hand. Both provide bidirectional data transmission, either explicit or implicit discovery mechanisms, and data typing. The goal of providing an actually **applicable** solution, prohibits the evaluation of communication protocols independently of the availability of suitable hardware. The fulfillment of our requirements relating to scalability is tightly coupled to hardware availability, and cost/simplicity of protocol implementation on devices to enable horizontal scalability.

Based on the analysis of available implementations in hardware, we conclude that neither OPC UA nor MQTT are sufficiently supported by available hardware. While OPC UA

³To the best of our knowledge, only two product lines of PLCs and one bus coupler do natively support MQTT and Sparkplug; namely *groov EPIC* and *groov RIO* by *Opto 22* and the *Wago PFC200 series*

has good support on PLCs, support in bus couplers – as object of consideration (compare section IV) – is negligible. The overall support of MQTT is considered negligible as well. The low number of hardware options supporting *vertical scalability*, makes both OPC UA and MQTT not fulfill our first requirement of *portability* and thus effectively not satisfying the requirement of *vertical scalability* itself. Modbus/TCP, on the other hand, constitutes a technically inferior solution, while showing significantly higher adoption and availability of supported hardware, thus fulfilling the requirements of *portability* and *vertical scalability*. The fitness for *horizontal scalability*, usually enabled by low cost – commonly implying low resources – of supporting devices, can be assumed to be inversely proportional to the complexity of a technology. Assessing each protocols complexity in comparison to each other, we can establish following order from least complex to most: Modbus/TCP, MQTT, OPC UA. Using this scale as an indicator for *horizontal scalability*, Modbus/TCP constitutes the preferred choice.

Based on the above evaluation, we identify Modbus/TCP as the currently optimal solution to our problem, and choose it as the common denominator for integrating hardware IO with current general purpose computing hardware running ROS.

As its core functionality, Modbus/TCP allows read and write access to memory regions – usually representing IO states or program variables – on a device. While not specifying data types and being able to deduce the data type from register data itself, most Modbus/TCP enabled devices adhere to the data types specified by IEC-61131-3. While the nature of Modbus/TCP requires the specification of addresses to be polled for data, thus demanding additional efforts for configuration, this property allows to map these individually requested values to ROS topics with a specified data type.

Being an old protocol, in comparison to its contestants, Modbus/TCP still has wide support - not limited to industrial applications. Internet of Things (IoT) cloud solution providers like Microsoft Azure [32], AWS IoT SiteWise [33] or Alibaba Link IoT Edge [34], support data integration for Modbus/TCP devices.

B. Hardware Compatibility Consideration

Our requirements for portability forbid the selection of specific hardware devices. Consequently the *hardware interface* is represented by a class of devices implementing our chosen communications protocol.

The simplicity of the Modbus/TCP protocol and its foundation on the TCP/IP protocol stack allow for good compatibility across a wide range of platforms. As support and availability of implementations in PLCs and bus couplers has been the driving factor in the protocol selection, compatibility for these classes of devices is granted.

For horizontal scalability, low cost and power IoT devices and hardware platforms provide a solution, while receiving good support for Modbus/TCP compatibility. This class of devices is targeted by operating systems like FreeRTOS [35]

with available ports of Modbus/TCP clients like FreeMODBUS [36], as implemented e.g. by the ESP-IDF (Espressif IoT Development Framework) [37] for the ESP32 System on Chip platform. Bringing Modbus/TCP capability to these low power and low cost microcontroller platforms, increases availability and allows horizontal scalability through low cost.

Generally, all device and operating system combinations providing a TCP/IP protocol stack are able to serve as the base for a Modbus/TCP IO device.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

Despite the listing of Modbus/TCP as a hardware interface protocol in the proposed ROS Industrial roadmap, since at least 2015 [38], [39], there exists no generic implementation of a driver for the ROS ecosystem.

To provide a solution to the generalized IO problem, based on Modbus/TCP, we choose to implement a driver with the following major properties:

- each driver-node instance represents each one slave device or subset of a slaves' mapped IOs
- each driver with associated mapping uses an individual topic namespace
- map each configured IO to a separate topic
- support read access for *discrete inputs* and *input registers(status registers)*
- support read/write access for *coils* and *output registers(holding registers)*
- perform data conversion for register data from IEC 61131-3 to ROS `std_msgs` types (or arrays thereof) and vice versa

The first three properties achieve a separation of concerns in functionality and allow to follow ROS' ideas of reusability and composition. The remaining properties establish a sufficient base functionality for a generic driver in the targeted domain. Mapping IOs to their own topics each is the best representation of our generic driver approach, while enabling integration of IOs via ROSs' topic remapping functionality.

fig. 2 shows an example of the drivers functionality. We map a Modbus/TCP device to ROS namespace `/device`, a *coil* (logic output) as `/out_Z`, a *discrete input* as `in_A` and a 4 word (8 bytes) wide *input register* as `/measure_v`. The 4 words of the *input register* are interpreted as IEC 61131-3 LREAL (*long real*, 64bit floating point number), corresponding to ROSs' `std_msgs/Float64`. The driver polls the slave device at a constant rate and publishes the acquired values to the mapped topics. On reception of messages on a topic mapping an output, the received value will be transformed if necessary, by applying the inverse of t (compare fig. 2); compatible and driver-supported (implemented) IEC 61131-3 types and corresponding ROS `std_msgs` types are shown in table II.

A. ROS to Modbus/TCP interface

Following, we will give an overview of how the data acquisition process from a slave device to ROS topics, and the process of writing data from a topic to a slave




Fig. 2. Basic ROS Modbus/TCP driver principle. Mapping Modbus/TCP items to individual ROS topics. Data interpretation from registers show as conversion-method t , converting from register value v to ROS compatible representation with data type T .

TABLE II
IEC 61131-3 TYPES TO ROS `std_msgs` MAPPING

IEC 61131-3	<code>std_msgs/</code>	IEC 61131-3	<code>std_msgs/</code>
BYTE	<code>Bool[8]</code>	DWORD	<code>Bool[32]</code>
WORD	<code>Bool[16]</code>	LWORD	<code>Bool[64]</code>
SINT	<code>Int8</code>	DINT	<code>Int32</code>
INT	<code>Int16</code>	LINT	<code>Int64</code>
USINT	<code>UInt8</code>	UDINT	<code>UInt32</code>
UINT	<code>UInt16</code>	ULINT	<code>UInt64</code>
REAL	<code>Float32</code>	CHAR	<code>Char</code>
LREAL	<code>Float64</code>	STRING	<code>String</code>

is implemented. For this we will use the simplified and abstracted class relationship diagram from fig. 3, omitting intermediate classes responsible for state management and implementing behaviors not relevant to the overall operation principle. We further want to assume all behavioral differences to be implemented by class inheritance and specialization, while implementing the shown interfaces in fig. 3. We begin with a brief description of the non-ROS classes, followed by a description of the process for reading and writing data.

The driver itself provides an abstraction over one Modbus/TCP device with a selection of mapped IOs. The ROS node holds and manages an instance of a `ModbusSlaveDevice`, provides configuration and manages ROS publishers und subscriptions (`rospy.Publisher` and `rospy.Subscriber` in fig. 3).

ModbusSlaveDevice: Abstracts a Modbus/TCP device. Manages and persists a connection to the Modbus/TCP slave, holds class instances of all mappings from Modbus addresses to ROS topics and associated `RangeReaders`.




Fig. 3. Simplified and abstracted class relationship diagram of the Modbus/TCP slave device wrapper `ModbusSlaveDevice`.

The `fetch()` method triggers read operations for all `RangeReaders`.

Mapping: Each input and/or output and its associated topics are represented by a class instance implementing the `Mapping` interface. Mappings are (for the sake of simplicity, assumed to be) specialized on *discrete inputs*, *input registers*, *coils* and *output registers*, as well as the type of register data. The `decode()` method will fetch the registers' value from a `Decoder` and call all associated `callbacks` with the decoded value. Calling `write()` method will encode the passed data according to type and instantly trigger a write operation to the Modbus/TCP slave.

RangeReader: Aggregates read operations for multiple `Mappings` to one read operation of a continuous memory region, reducing polling operations and network traffic. Depending on slave behavior, reads from discontinuous memory regions can be aggregated while discarding unmapped memory.

Decoder: Container, owning and representing the raw data returned by a `RangeReaders'` `read()` operation. Implements data decoding functionality from raw data to requested type. `Mappings` decode their value from the `Decoder` depending on type.

1) *Writing Outputs*: The driver node attaches the respective `Mappings'` `write()` method as callback function to a ROS subscriber (`rospy.Subscriber`) instance for the associated topic. The `Mapping` class specialization handles encoding of the data in relation to its type and triggers a write operation on the provided `ModbusClient` instance.

2) *Reading/Polling Inputs*: Polling a slave is performed by the driver node by calling the `ModbusSlaveClients'`

LISTING I
EXAMPLE DEVICE MAPPING, CORRESPONDING TO THE EXAMPLE
DEPICTED IN FIG. 2

```

name: device

address: mbdev
unit: 1

rate: 20

mapping:
  coils:
    out_Z: 1

discrete_inputs:
  in_A: 10001

input_registers:
  measure_v:
    address: 30001
    type: LREAL

```

`fetch()` method. This in turn triggers the individual processes described above: Triggering all `read()` methods of the `RangeReaders`, which will start the decoding process for all mappings on data reception, in turn leading to a call of the `publish()` method of the respective `rospy.Publisher`.

B. Configuration

Creating a device abstraction and mapping its hardware IOs to ROS topics, is accomplished by defining the abstraction as device configuration. The configuration may be supplied in ROSS' standard configuration file format *YAML*, or *JSON*. Assuming a slave with hostname `mbdev`, Modbus unit 1 and matching IO addresses, we can create a device mapping, representing the example in fig. 2 as in listing I.

The complete drivers' implementation can be acquired and studied at [40].

VI. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Translating from ROS messages to Modbus/TCP and vice versa, we will use the time difference between TCP-packets, for ROS messages to Modbus/TCP write-request, and Modbus/TCP read-responses to ROS messages, being available on the network as the relevant performance metric. Read- and write requests from the driver node will be handled by a dummy Modbus/TCP slave, accepting all request and responding with a success-responses, returning 0-values in case of read operations. All data is generated and captured in its own docker container, transferring data over the container internal loopback interface. Each container is running the complete software stack necessary for data acquisition, where n is the number of configured inputs or outputs for the case examined:

- 1 local *roscore*
- 1 driver node

TABLE III
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RESULTS FOR *discrete inputs* AS DESCRIBED
IN SECTION VI-A

No. Inputs	$\overline{\Delta t_0}$	$\overline{\Delta t_P}$
1	$341\mu s (\sigma = 94\mu s)$	-
32	$471\mu s (\sigma = 192\mu s)$	$182\mu s (\sigma = 9\mu s)$

TABLE IV
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RESULTS FOR *input registers* AS DESCRIBED
IN SECTION VI-A

No. Inputs	$\overline{\Delta t_0}$	$\overline{\Delta t_P}$
1	$388\mu s (\sigma = 86\mu s)$	-
32	$522\mu s (\sigma = 203\mu s)$	$187\mu s (\sigma = 10\mu s)$

- n *rostopic* nodes as publisher or subscribers
- 1 *Diagslave* [41] Modbus/TCP slave simulator
- 1 *tshark* (*Wireshark*) instance for data capture

This test setup allows to capture measures for the actual delay introduced by the driver and the ROS stack, while being independent of network induced delays and the performance of the used Modbus/TCP slave.

Reading and/or writing occurs at a frequency of $10Hz$, while capturing network traffic for $100s$, resulting in each 1000 individual read or write operations to be evaluated. All containers are ran with a limit of $1GB$ RAM and 2 CPUs, running on a *Windows 10 Pro* host machine with an *Intel[®] Core[™] i7-8550U @ 1.80GHz* CPU and $8GB$ of RAM.

A. Reading

To evaluate read-performance, the driver node is configured for either one or 32 *discrete inputs* or *input registers*. For *input registers*, interpretation of a registers' value as a 16 bit integer value is chosen. Reading *coils* or *holding registers* uses the same implementation as *discrete inputs* or *input registers* and is thus not evaluated individually. For all inputs each one *rostopic* subscriber is instantiated. The average time difference between Modbus/TCP read-responses and first (or only) ROS-message $\overline{\Delta t_0}$ and average time difference between subsequent ROS-messages $\overline{\Delta t_P}$, for each single- and 32 -value read operations, is given in table III for *discrete inputs* and table IV for *input registers*.

B. Writing

Publishing to the `/write` topic associated with an output will directly invoke a write request to the Modbus/TCP slave; thus, only single value writes are technically possible and evaluated. For each evaluation, a *rostopic* publisher is instantiated, writing the value 0 (or the boolean equivalent `false`). For writing *holding registers* `std_msgs/Int16` is chosen as datatype, as in section VI-A. Evaluating write performance, analogously to section VI-A, $\overline{\Delta t_0}$ represents the time difference between a ROS-message and the associated Modbus/TCP write-request being available on the network.

Experiments yield a $\overline{\Delta t_0} = 158\mu s (\sigma = 17\mu s)$ for writing *coils*, and $\overline{\Delta t_0} = 163\mu s (\sigma = 15\mu s)$ for *holding registers*.

VII. DISCUSSION

By providing a generic implementation of a Modbus/TCP driver for ROS we provide a solution to the generalized IO problem in ROS. While the provided driver only abstracts the workings of the communication protocol and data interpretation (i.e. handling byte and word orders), we believe this to be of great benefit to ROS developers. Using the driver, ROS developers mostly stay in their domain, using high level programming languages on general purpose computers, writing configuration files in standardized formats and interfacing the ROS by use of ROS topics. Mapping individual IOs as individual topics allow for great portability and flexibility while keeping the requirements for the driver low. Adapting topic descriptors to those required by a specific application can easily be achieved using ROSs' remapping methods; thus allowing simple code and application component reuse. Aggregating data from multiple individual IOs to higher level message/data types, conveying semantic information, we consider trivial in the instant all data is available to a developer via ROS topics.

Even though Modbus/TCP may seem like an outdated choice and solution for the problem at hand, it is the most widespread protocol understood by suitable hardware devices, when compared to OPC UA and MQTT as the identified competitors. Modbus/TCPs' simplicity results in good compatibility with a number of devices and allows good horizontal scalability of the solution across devices. With IoT cloud vendors supporting Modbus/TCP (compare section II), we do even expect to see an increase in Modbus/TCP implementations for low cost devices. The simultaneously good support for Modbus/TCP in industrial applications and good availability of bus couplers and compatible PLCs ensures applicability of our solution in industrial applications. This support, combined with the wealth of available IO modules, further ensures a high flexibility in IO choices and rapid prototyping of applications.

The performance evaluation shows the introduction of a time delay $< 0.5ms$ for the first value of a Modbus/TCP read-request to be available on the ROS network, with subsequent readings of a request being available after $< 0.2ms$ consistently. In our experience, these values are at least an order of magnitude lower than the response times of actual Modbus/TCP slaves. The performance penalty introduced by the driver is thus assumed to be negligible in ROS applications.

We have successfully used our solution with multiple *Wago* and *Beckhoff* PLCs and bus couplers, each with a range of different IO modules. The created IO capabilities have been used to control and read e.g. a robotic gripper, switches and high resolution distance sensors. The integration of each new device being in the range of minutes.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We have delivered the concept and necessary implementation of a solution to the generalized problem of hardware

IO integration into ROS systems. All while delivering a solid rationale for the choice of Modbus/TCP as the underlying technology.

As OPC UA and the combination of MQTT and Sparkplug do provide significant advantages over Modbus/TCP, we expect these technologies to replace a Modbus/TCP based implementation in the future. Building on these technologies allows to reduce configuration to an absolute minimum by leveraging the information model provided by the server in case of OPC UA and the metrics definition of Sparkplug birth certificates respectively.

The main value of this work is seen in the simplicity of the provided tools, and in presenting and delivering the idea, of using standardized industrial protocols to the ROS community; for researchers and hobbyists alike. Being aware of the options available to solve a particular problem and receiving minimal support in terms of tooling, has a great potential for keeping individuals from rolling custom communication protocols over non-scalable communication channels (e.g. using USB/UART and platforms like Arduino as IO hardware), and thus creating solutions adhering to the core idea of ROS: Creating reusable solutions to recurring problems.

Future Work

Future work is expected in the optimization of read and write processes, including batch writing of near-simultaneously published output data, and reducing traffic and load on the Modbus/TCP slave by building dynamic readers and querying subscribed topics only. Further, a notable improvement of the configuration process may be achieved by interpreting the configuration files of Modbus slave simulation and testing tools (e.g. WinModbus [42] or UnSlave [43]).

REFERENCES

- [1] ROS introduction. [Online]. Available: <http://wiki.ros.org/ROS/Introduction>
- [2] ROS navigation stack. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ros-planning/navigation>
- [3] I. A. Sucas and S. Chitta. Moveit. [Online]. Available: <http://moveit.ros.org>
- [4] ROS-Industrial and ROSIN. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rosin-project.eu/ros-industrial-and-rosin>
- [5] ROS-INDUSTRIAL. [Online]. Available: <https://rosindustrial.org/>
- [6] ROS documentation. [Online]. Available: <http://wiki.ros.org/>
- [7] ROS discourse – drivers. [Online]. Available: <https://discourse.ros.org/c/drivers/54>
- [8] ROS industrial/supported_hardware. [Online]. Available: http://wiki.ros.org/Industrial/supported_hardware
- [9] ROS device drivers. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ros-drivers>
- [10] usb_cam: A ROS driver for V4L USB cameras. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/ros-drivers/usb_cam
- [11] sick_scan: an open-source project to support the laser scanner of the company SICK using the ROS-framework. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/SICKAG/sick_scan
- [12] realsense-ros: Intel(R) RealSense(TM) ROS wrapper for D400 series, SR300 camera and T265 tracking module. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/IntelRealSense/realsense-ros>
- [13] abb_driver: ROS driver for ABB IRC5/RW5 or RW6 controllers. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/ros-industrial/abb_driver
- [15] ueye_cam: A ROS nodelet and node that wraps the driver API for UEye cameras by IDS imaging development systems GmbH. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/anqixu/ueye_cam
- [14] Universal_robots_ROS_driver: Driver enabling ROS operation of UR robots. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/UniversalRobots/Universal_Robots_ROS_Driver
- [16] T. Foote and K. Conley, *Target Platforms*, ROS.org Std. ROS REP-0003. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ros.org/repos/rep-0003.html>
- [17] *Analogue signals for process control systems; Part 2: Direct Voltage Signals*, IEC Std. 60381-2.
- [18] *Analogue signals for process control systems; Part 1: Direct Current Signals*, IEC Std. 60381-1.
- [19] P. Gaj, J. Jasperneite, and M. Felser, “Computer communication within industrial distributed environment—a survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2013.
- [20] P. Danielis, J. Skodzik, V. Altmann, E. B. Schweissguth, F. Golatowski, D. Timmermann, and J. Schacht, “Survey on real-time communication via ethernet in industrial automation environments,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE Emerging Technology and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 92014.
- [21] S. Profanter, A. Tekat, K. Dorofeev, M. Rickert, and A. Knoll, “OPC UA versus ROS, DDS, and MQTT: Performance evaluation of industry 4.0 protocols,” in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT)*. IEEE, 22019.
- [22] J. Hottell, “Efficient IIoT communications: An OPC UA, HTTP, modbus and MQTT benchmarking discussion,” 30.04.2019, unpublished. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cirrus-link.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Johnathan-Hottell-IIoT-Protocol-Benchmarks.pdf>
- [23] *UA Specification Part 1 – Overview and Concepts*, OPC Foundation Std. 10000-1, Rev. 1.04, 22.11.2017.
- [24] *UA Specification Part 6 – Mappings*, OPC Foundation Std. 10000-6, Rev. 1.04, 22.11.2017.
- [25] *UA Specification Part 5 – Information Model*, OPC Foundation Std. 10000-5, Rev. 1.04, 22.11.2017.
- [26] OPC Foundation. (08.07.2021) Find products. [Online]. Available: <https://opcfoundation.org/products>
- [27] *MQTT Version 3.1.1*, OASIS Std., 29.10.2014. [Online]. Available: <http://docs.oasis-open.org/mqtt/mqtt/v3.1.1/os/mqtt-v3.1.1-os.html>
- [28] *Sparkplug™ Specification: MQTT Topic & Payload Definition*, Eclipse Foundation Std., Rev. 2.2, 11.10.2019.
- [29] *MODBUS APPLICATION PROTOCOL SPECIFICATION*, Modbus Organization Std., Rev. 1.1b3, 26.04.2021.
- [30] *Programmable controllers; Part 3: Programming languages*, IEC Std. 61131-3.
- [31] CODESYS modbus TCP device SL. [Online]. Available: <https://store.codesys.com/codesys-modbus-tcp-device-sl.html>
- [32] Microsoft. Modbus. [Online]. Available: https://azuremarketplace.microsoft.com/en-us/marketplace/apps/microsoft_iiot.edge-modbus?tab=overview
- [33] AWS IoT SiteWise launches support for Modbus TCP and EtherNet/IP protocols with enhancements to OPC-UA data ingestion. [Online]. Available: <https://aws.amazon.com/de/about-aws/whats-new/2020/12/aws-iiot-sitewise-launches-support-for-modbus-tcp-ethernet-ip-protocols/>
- [34] Connect a modbus slave device to an edge instance over modbus TCP. [Online]. Available: <https://www.alibabacloud.com/help/doc-detail/101055.htm>
- [35] FreeRTOS™: Real-time operating system for microcontrollers. [Online]. Available: <https://www.freertos.org/>
- [36] Embedded Experts GmbH. FreeMODBUS: A portable MODBUS ASCII/RTU and TCP implementation. [Online]. Available: <https://www.embedded-experts.at/en/freemodbus/about/>
- [37] “ESP-IDF – IoT development framework.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.espressif.com/en/products/sdks/esp-idf>
- [38] ROS-industrial consortium roadmapping. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ros-industrial-consortium/roadmapping/blob/master/RoadmappingDocument.md>
- [39] ROS industrial roadmap. [Online]. Available: <http://wiki.ros.org/Industrial/Roadmap>
- [40] A. Wendt. (02.11.2020) ros modbus device driver. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/bitmeal/ros-modbus-device-driver>
- [41] Diagslave modbus slave simulator. [Online]. Available: <https://www.modbusdriver.com/diagslave.html>
- [42] Abbeytek Ltd. WinModbus. [Online]. Available: <http://www.winmodbus.com/new/>
- [43] UnSlave. [Online]. Available: <https://unserver.xyz/products/modbus-slave-simulator/>