SAF: The Design Of A P2P-IoT LoRa System For Smart Agriculture Supply Chains

Aristeidis Karras[1], Christos Karras[1], Georgios Drakopoulos[1,2], Dimitrios Tsolis[3], Phivos Mylonas[2], and Spyros Sioutas[1]

[1] Decentralized Systems Computing Group
Computer Engineering and Informatics Dept., University of Patras, Hellas
{akarras, c.karras, sioutas}@ceid.upatras.gr
[2] Humanistic and Social Informatics Laboratory
Department of Informatics, Ionian University, Hellas
{c16drak, fmylonas}@ionio.gr
[3] Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies Department
University of Patras, Agrinio Campus, Hellas
dtsolis@upatras.gr

Abstract. In the dairy industry farming as well as transportation conditions are paramount to product quality and to the overall supply chain resiliency. However, modern farms are complex installations with a broad spectrum of factors such as atmospheric conditions, including rain and humidity, ground composition, and highly irregular animal motion making difficult the deployment of digital telemetry systems. These conditions in turn translate to technical requirements including easy maintenance, scalability, wide coverage, low power consumption, strong signal resiliency, and high spatial resolution. Perhaps the best way to meet them is an LPWAN based IoT deployment. Along this line of reasoning, here is presented the architecture of SAF, an integrated IoT system built on LoRa technology for monitoring the supply chain of a dairy farm ensuring livestock and food safety with emphasis placed on monitoring the states of sheep, milk refrigerator, and milk trucks. LoRa was selected after an extensive comparison between the major latest generation LPWAN protocols. SAF is slated to be implemented in a local cooperative to monitor the production of protected designation of origin products.

Keywords: Internet of Things · Smart Agriculture · Supply Chain Management · Event Detection · Trajectory Modeling · LPWAN · LoRa

1 Introduction

Dairy product management is known to present some of the hardest challenges in the smart agriculture field due to the volatile nature of milk and the temperatures required to maintain it, which in fact are close to those at the core of *unbroken cold chains* for handling the transportation of cool cargo such as medical supplies. Moreover, the protected designation of origin (PDO) food and wine producers across the EU are obliged to satisfy additional quality restrictions on top of these for international standardization and safe marketing purposes. As a result, dairy production stakeholders have recently focused their attention to farm automation and manufacturing process automation in order to boost farm productivity while remaining in sustainable growth levels, ensure the safety of dairy goods, and maintain acceptable well being conditions for the animals [3].

Past attempts to introduce high tech solutions to dairy farming have had limited success [31] due to a number of factors such as atmospheric conditions including dust and humidity, irregular farm geometry preventing effective coverage unless a prohibitive number of monitoring equipment was employed, interference from nearby mountains and hills, and even in certain documented cases signal scattering attributed to high concentration of gases such as methane and ammonia caused by heated animal excrement. In this context and based on lessons from earlier attempts, integrating Internet of Things (IoT) with operations and the supply chain is the principal motivation behind this work.

The primary research objective of this conference paper is the presentation of the architecture and intended functionality of SAF, a system for monitoring milk production and distribution safety. It will be based on LoRa functionality for data transmission and collection, differentiating itself from the majority of previous smart farming approaches which rely on short range protocols.

The remainder of this conference paper is structured as follows. In section 2 the scientific literature for smart farming is overviewed. The SAF architecture, the criteria for selecting LoRa, and the intended functionality are described in section 3 and the analytics implemented over SAF in section 4. This work concludes in section 5. Technical acronyms are explained the first time encountered in the text. Finally the notation of this work is summarized in table 1.

Table 1. Notation of this conference paper.

Symbol	Meaning	First in
$\triangleq$	Definition or equality by definition	Eq. (1)
$\langle p \,\|\|\, q \rangle$	Kullback-Leibler divergence between p and q	Eq. (2)

2 Related Work

Animal identification and traceability are in continual demand driven by quality control and welfare management requirements [21]. Additionally, infectious diseases like the bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), popularly known as mad cow disease, have prompted the creation of such systems [18]. Safety and quality considerations developed over the past decade provide yet another reason to utilize computerized methods of farmed animal identification [24]. Radiofrequency identification (RFID) technology has been among the first to be utilized to monitor both domestic and wild animals, however RFID tag techniques have yet to be standardized [25]. Moreover, RFID technology despite its wide adoption in smart farming [31] falls short on performance factors as it is affected by animals and the environment [1]. More recently Arduino systems for tracking cattle position and speed have been proposed [7] as well as concurrent actuator networks assessing environmental variables such as temperature and humidity for remote vineyard irrigation [9]. Blockchain for smart farming is explored in [11] and smart contracts for vineyards in [33]. LoRa systems gather vital signals from grazing cattle as in [20]. In particular, portable nodes with STM32 microcontrollers equipped with accelerometers and GNSS position collect data and communicate them to a Raspberry gateway. LoRa is also used in [23] to regulate ammonia diffusion coefficient in pig farms with gas concentration values being processed by a neural network for event detection.

Streaming applications such as sensor-based deployments can often be considered as graph signal processing methods as in [12] in which, the data associated within two graphs is processed in a compressed way. In the modern era, IoT as well as cloud, edge, and fog computing have recently gained popularity [10] where the latter paves the way for more research. Numerous research communities are vested in the study of spatio-temporal events. Trajectories have been employed in a variety of disciplines, among social sciences, genetics, pharmacy, geology, and data mining. The robustness of each attribute trajectory can be evaluated by stacking-based visualizations [30] or graph structural resiliency methods [14]. With the rapid emerge of Industry 4.0, graph analytics and multi-layer graphs have developed in order to aid in process mining [13].

3 SAF Description

3.1 Objectives and design

SAF as stated earlier is designed for facilitating agribusiness and ensuring food and animal safety by monitoring in real time critical variables of the primary entities of the milk supply chain. The latter along with the associated variables and the respective monitoring frequency are listed in detail in table 2.

The system proposed here can contribute to the dairy product quality in two ways. First, by the timely discovery of ill animals, either by measuring its temperature or by predicting an imminent abnormality through neural networks, any disease can at best have a limited spread in the farm. Second, predictive analytics can reveal hidden defects along the milk production process. In either case, identifying and solving problems early in the supply chain frequently translates to saving considerable costs, downtime, and personnel efforts.

SAF architecture can be represented as a pyramid as shown in figure 1 where higher layers are related to management and analytics, whereas lower ones to data collection and communication. The role of each layer is as follows:

- **Sensors and microcontrollers:** This is the physical layer of SAF. It includes the sensors and actuators attached to farm animals or to the other entities transmitting the appropriate data to a LoRa gateway and subsequently to upper layers through the SAF API.

– **SAF API:** It is the system middleware for communication between the physical and the upper layers. Each API call fetches the data from the sensors and creates an HTTP post request to the database for each parameter.
– **Database:** In this layer data obtained from the SAF API in a serialized JSON format is transformed to and stored as key-value pairs in a local NoSQL database for short- and mid-term analysis purposes.
– **Cloud:** The cloud service complements the database as a reliable storage space and additionally makes the overall project available worldwide for registered farmers. Communication takes place through Google Firebase.
– **App:** The mobile application displays all monitored instances in real-time to interested parties. This allows the easy localization of problems in the supply chain and consequently their early correction.



Fig. 1. SAF layers.

SAF constantly monitors the variables shown in table 2 along with the respective monitor frequency. For farm animals temperature is a primary health indicator and hence measurements for it are taken in real time. Moreover, as certain patterns in their respective trajectories may denote agitation, declining health, or any other abnormality, herd motion is tracked at regular intervals. Heat stress levels, caused by temperature, humidity, sun radiation, wind direction, and precipitation, is evaluated through indicators [5]. The same holds for hunger stress levels since affected animals produce significantly less [8].

Regarding the farm living conditions including temperature, humidity, and methane concentration are crucial for livestock well being and they are monitored in real time. Milk tanks have certain operating profiles determined by temperature, humidity, milk pH, and the weight and level of milk. The latter two are relative and they are recorded only at the start of milk production process. Finally, milk trucks must provide viable transportation environments by

Table 2. SAF Variables.

SAF Variables, Intervals and Technologies			
Entities	Variables	Intervals	Technologies
Sheep	Temperature	5m	LoRa and GPS
	Daily Average	24h	
	Location	varies	
Farm	Temperature	5m	WiFi and RFID
	Humidity	5m	
	Methane	5m	
Milk Tank	Temperature	5m	WiFi and Arduino
	Humidity	5m	
	pH	1m	
	Level	30m	
	Weight	varies	
Milk Truck	Temperature	10m	GSM and GPS
	Humidity	10m	
	Level	30m	
	Location	varies	

having low temperatures and low humidity. GPS and GSM technologies provide real time measurements with the latter consuming a significantly less energy.

For the sheep monitoring and management, the system is built around a Lilygo[4] T-Beam LoRa transceiver module with an integrated GPS and a battery holder. The ability to either receive or transmit with a single chip reduces the complexity to one per farm animal plus one more chip acting as a stationary gateway to the cloud. This results in a p2p IoT network where each farm animal is uniquely identified by its respective chip id. In the farm itself the measurements are transferred to the cloud via a static WiFi component.

Figure 2 depicts the four instances being posted to the API and fetched through the mobile application. Initially, data is gathered from ESP32 chips. Then, HTTP post requests publish data to the cloud. The JSON objects carrying sensor data are marked by timestamps. JSON has been selected since it is a common standard for text information exchange [15]. The JSON values supplied to the Firebase API vary depending on the instance. For example, for a sheep are reported its id, temperature, latitude and longitude, and timestamp.

- $doc["SheepID"] = ESP.getChipId();$
- $doc["SheepTemperature"] =< temperature\_sensor >;$
- $doc["SheepLat"] = GPS_x;$
- $doc["SheepsLon"] = GPS_y;$
- $doc["Timestamp"] =< current\_time >;$

[4] https://www.lilygo.cn/



Fig. 2. SAF system data flow.

The above information is shown in the pop-up notification along with the location and temperature once an animal is identified as being ill. Additionally, beeper linked to the animal sounds to indicate its position. As a result, the affected animal will be swiftly isolated from the herd and will not be milked. Hence not only will the milk will be safer, but the milk tank and farm will also be safeguarded from disease transmission. All these actions fall in the context of the generic aim of SAF system which is to abide by to a food ISO.

3.2 Food safety certificates

Given the importance of high quality food to human well-being, it is imperative that certain good practices and procedures are enforced. In table 3 the food certificates are shown along with their scope.

The Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) approach prioritizes four types of hazards: microbiological risks, chemical dangers, physical hazards, and allergic reactions. ISO 22000, a globally recognized approach for increasing food safety, integrates ISO 9001, Quality Management System, and HACCP, Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point, into one standard (HACCP). ISO 22000:2005 has a significant impact on the effectiveness and maintenance of food quality and safety. ISO 22000, abbreviated for Food Safety Management System (FSMS), is a worldwide standard that incorporates more comprehensive critical control point and hazard analysis methods.

RASFF is an example of an EU-wide food safety strategy. Establishment of a platform for rapid information exchange and action planning on food safety issues. These are new reports of a health danger found in food or feed shipments. So it protects consumers while allowing speedy information interchange.

Table 3. Food Quality Certifications.

Certificate	Type	Release	Scope
HACCP [22], [2]	Global	1971	FSMS
ISO 22000 [2],[4]	Global	2005	FSMS
ISO 22000:2018 [4]	Global	2018	FSMS
ELOT 1416 [26]	Hellenic	2005	FSMS
ISO 9001 [28]	Global	1987	QMS
ISO 9001:2015 [32]	Global	2015	QMS
ISO 14001 [17]	Global	1996	EMS
ISO 14001:2004	Global	2004	EMS

A quality management system (QMS) is a tool that an organisation uses to coordinate and regulate the business operations related with quality. It encompasses the structure of an organization as well as the planning, procedures, resources, and documentation that the firm use to meet quality targets and to continuously improve its goods and services to meet consumer expectations.

An EMS is a collection of rules defining how a company can manage any potential negative affects on the natural environment or on the well-being of its workers. Thus, it establishes an integrated system for evaluating, documenting, and quantifying the total environmental effect of a given enterprise.

3.3 Wireless network protocol comparisons

The protocols suitable for livestock management are shown in table 4. Having successfully analysed all available network protocols, we select the LoRa technology for this particular use case due to high range and low-power consumption.

The main disadvantage of current animal tracking systems mounted on Arduino and operating on competitive wireless network protocols is the short battery life span. Given that farm animals continuously move and change position and may well roam up to a few kilometers, the microcontroller must be power-efficient. LoRa chips besides being able to operate with few recharges can be put into a deep sleep mode for hours, thereby prolonging system life. Because of the same reasons, a long range network must be employed. LoRa provides the best combination of range, signal resilience and simultaneously free to use, which is important given the volatile conditions of large animal farms. For this specific use case, LoRa is the superior alternative to Sigfox in terms of cost-effectiveness, deployment, and maintenance, as compared to Sigfox.

Moreover, the selection of LoRa technology falls in the benefits that it has to offer including free license across the globe as well as low maintenance cost of devices. Additionally, users can deploy their own personal network with ease and in just a few clicks. On the otherhand, SigFox cannot be deployed anywhere on the world and it also requires a paid subscription service. Noteworthy, is the fact that a fixed frequency exists for each continent.

Table 4. Comparison of LPWAN technologies (Compiled from [29][16][27]).

Parameter	LoRa	SigFox	NB-IoT
Standard	LoRa Alliance	SigFox / ETSI LTN	3 GPP Release 13,14
Bandwidth	250 kHz	100 Hz	200 kHz
Modulation	FSS/CSS	D-BPSK	QPSK
Spectrum	1175 kHz	200 kHz	200 kHz
Frequency band	EU : 868MHz	EU : 868MHz	7 − 900MHz
Range (urban)	2 − 5 km	3 − 10 km	1 − 5 km
Range (rural)	20 km	50 km	10 − 15 km
Max Data Rate	50kbps	100bps	200kbps
Throughput	50kbps	-	-
Energy Consumption	Very low	Very Low	Low
Security	AES 128b	Optional encryption	L2 security
Localization	TDOA	RSSI	-
Topology	Star-of-stars	Star	Star
Battery Life	∼ 10 years	∼ 10 years	∼ 10 years
Cost	Moderate	Moderate	High

4 Analytics And Events

Event detection is crucial in IoT deployments. Since in the proposed architecture data comes in a streaming format, it makes sense to rely on reservoir approaches to collect samples for event detection [19].

Under ideal operating conditions each LoRa chip will have the same amount of energy. Still because of a number of factors such as the irregular animal motion, each transmission may require more power. At a reference time the empirical energy distribution will be that of the normalized energy level with respect to the sum of the remaining energy over the N chips. Therefore, probability p_k that the k-th chip will have energy level e_k will be defined as in (1):

$$p_k \triangleq \frac{e_k}{\sum_j e_j}, \qquad 1 \leq k \leq N \tag{1}$$

In this case computing the Kullback-Leibler divergence of 1 from the uniform distribution as shown in (2). This results to the difference between the entropy of the uniform distribution H_r and that of the empirical distribution H_p.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p \,||\, r \rangle \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k \log \left(\frac{p_k}{\frac{1}{N}} \right) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k \log p_k - \log \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k \log p_k + \log N \;=\; H_r - H_p \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The way animals move can denote conditions such as agitation or illness depending on certain characteristics. To this end, trajectory analytics will be used. In particular, n GPS measurements are taken per a reference time interval T in latitude and longitude pair format. First, the average velocity v of each farm animal is computed as in equation (3).

$$v \triangleq \frac{n-1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sqrt{\left(x_{k+1}-x_k\right)^2+\left(y_{k+1}-y_k\right)^2} \tag{3}$$

The least squares (LS) reference line for the i-th animal during T can be computed by the LS solution of the system (4) by any standard method.

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ x_n & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_i \\ b_i \end{bmatrix} \tag{4}$$

Once the LS coefficients a_i and b_i are computed, then the deviation of each animal from the respective reference line is the residual error r_i defined as in (5):

$$r_i \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left| y_k - (a_i x_k + b_i) \right| \tag{5}$$

Once the direction coefficients a_i are computed for each animal, then the general herd direction a_0 can be defined as the average or median value. Then the deviation angle ϑ_i for the i-th animal can be found as in (6).

$$\vartheta_i \triangleq \arctan a_i - \arctan a_0 \tag{6}$$

Finally, the temperature-humidity index (THI) of (7) is a major indicator of the farm condition where T is the farm temperature is Celsius degrees and R is the percentage of relative humidity [6].

$$\mathrm{THI} \triangleq (1.8\,T+32)\,(0.55-0.0055\,R)\,(1.8\,T-26) \tag{7}$$

Note that the above analytics are indicative and can be enriched should the need arise. The events of interest in the context of SAF are listed in table 5. For each such event, an event notification is generated and sent to the mobile app.

5 Conclusions

This conference paper focuses on the design specifications and architecture for SAF, an integrated IoT system for monitoring milk production and ensuring dairy product quality while being as less invasive as possible. To this end, SAF will monitor the status of the main entities of the milk supply chain including the livestock, the farm, the milk collection tank, and the milk trucks. The data collected will be transmitted over a p2p network to a central point where a range of analytics like animal trajectories and location clustering will be computed.

Table 5. SAF events of interest.

Entity	Farm event
Animals	Deviation from the herd Unusual temperatures Large percentage of slow animals Incoherent herd move
Farm	Milk production drop High methane concentration Low air humidity
Tank	Unusual temperatures Unusual milk level Unusual pH values
Truck	Unusual pH values Large route deviation

SAF will be based on the emerging LoRa technology, which was selected among competing LPWAN wireless communication protocols according to performance criteria such as range, coverage, signal resilience, and ease of maintenance. These are major technical specifications designed to overcome adverse geographical and environmental factors such as irregular farm geometry, high humidity, low temperatures, and high altitude. Once completed, SAF is scheduled to be deployed to a local cooperative for the production of milk and PDO cheese.

Acknowledgment This work has is part of Project 451, a long-term research initiative whose primary objective is the development of novel, scalable, numerically stable, and interpretable tensor analytics

References

1. Angeles, R.: RFID technologies: supply-chain applications and implementation issues. Information systems management **22**(1), 51–65 (2005)
2. Arvanitoyannis, I.S.: HACCP and ISO 22000: Application to foods of animal origin. Wiley Online Library (2009)
3. Bhat, S.A., Huang, N.F., Sofi, I.B., Sultan, M.: Agriculture-Food Supply Chain Management Based on Blockchain and IoT: A Narrative on Enterprise Blockchain Interoperability. Agriculture **12**(1), 40 (2022)
4. Chen, H., Liu, S., Chen, Y., Chen, C., Yang, H., Chen, Y.: Food safety management systems based on iso 22000: 2018 methodology of hazard analysis compared to iso 22000: 2005. Accreditation and Quality Assurance **25**(1), 23–37 (2020)
5. Correa-Calderon, A., Armstrong, D., Ray, D., DeNise, S., Enns, M., Howison, C.: Thermoregulatory responses of holstein and brown swiss heat-stressed dairy cows to two different cooling systems. International journal of biometeorology **48**(3), 142–148 (2004)
6. Council, N.R., et al.: A guide to environmental research on animals. National Academies (1971)

7. Cousin, P., Dupont, C., Fatnassi, S., Pham, C., Thiare, O., Wussah, A., Koffi, S.: IoT, an affordable technology to empower africans addressing needs in africa. In: 2017 IST-Africa Week Conference (IST-Africa). pp. 1–8. IEEE (2017)
8. Das, R., Sailo, L., Verma, N., Bharti, P., Saikia, J., et al.: Impact of heat stress on health and performance of dairy animals: A review. Veterinary world **9**(3), 260 (2016)
9. Davcev, D., Mitreski, K., Trajkovic, S., Nikolovski, V., Koteli, N.: IoT agriculture system based on lorawan. In: 2018 14th IEEE International Workshop on Factory Communication Systems (WFCS). pp. 1–4. IEEE (2018)
10. De Donno, M., Tange, K., Dragoni, N.: Foundations and evolution of modern computing paradigms: Cloud, IoT, edge, and fog. IEEE Access **7**, 150936–150948 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2947652
11. Drakopoulos, G., Kafeza, E., Al Katheeri, H.: Proof systems in blockchains: A survey. In: SEEDA-CECNSM. IEEE (2019). https://doi.org/10.1109/SEEDA-CECNSM.2019.8908397
12. Drakopoulos, G., Kafeza, E., Mylonas, P., Iliadis, L.: Transform-based graph topology similarity metrics. NCAA **33**(23), 16363–16375 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-021-06235-9
13. Drakopoulos, G., Kafeza, E., Mylonas, P., Sioutas, S.: Process mining analytics for Industry 4.0 with graph signal processing. In: WEBIST. pp. 553–560. SCITEPRESS (2021). https://doi.org/10.5220/0010718300003058
14. Drakopoulos, G., Mylonas, P.: Evaluating graph resilience with tensor stack networks: A keras implementation. NCAA **32**(9), 4161–4176 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-020-04790-1
15. Drakopoulos, G., Spyrou, E., Voutos, Y., Mylonas, P.: A semantically annotated JSON metadata structure for open linked cultural data in Neo4j. In: PCI. ACM (2019). https://doi.org/10.1145/3368640.3368659
16. Hossain, M.I., Markendahl, J.I.: Comparison of LPWAN Technologies: Cost Structure and Scalability. Wireless Personal Communications **121**(1), 887–903 (2021)
17. Jiang, R.J., Bansal, P.: Seeing the need for iso 14001. Journal of Management Studies **40**(4), 1047–1067 (2003)
18. Johnson, R.T., Gibbs Jr, C.J.: Creutzfeldt–jakob disease and related transmissible spongiform encephalopathies. New England Journal of Medicine **339**(27), 1994–2004 (1998)
19. Karras, C., Karras, A., Sioutas, S.: Pattern recognition and event detection on IoT data-streams. CoRR **abs/2203.01114** (2022). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.01114
20. Li, Q., Liu, Z., Xiao, J.: A data collection collar for vital signs of cows on the grassland based on lora. In: 2018 IEEE 15th International Conference on e-Business Engineering (ICEBE). pp. 213–217. IEEE (2018)
21. Lin, J., Shen, Z., Zhang, A., Chai, Y.: Blockchain and IoT based food traceability for smart agriculture. In: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Crowd Science and Engineering. pp. 1–6 (2018)
22. Liu, F., Rhim, H., Park, K., Xu, J., Lo, C.K.: HACCP certification in food industry: Trade-offs in product safety and firm performance. International Journal of Production Economics **231**, 107838 (2021)
23. Liu, X., Huo, C.: Research on remote measurement and control system of piggery environment based on lora. In: 2017 Chinese Automation Congress (CAC). pp. 7016–7019. IEEE (2017)

24. McKean, J.: The importance of traceability for public health and consumer protection. Revue Scientifique et Technique-Office International des Épizooties **20**(2), 363–369 (2001)
25. Ntafis, V., Patrikakis, C., Xylouri, E., Frangiadaki, I.: RFID application in animal monitoring. The Internet of Things: From RFID to the Next-Generation Pervasive Networked Systems pp. 165–84 (2008)
26. Psomas, E.L., Fotopoulos, C.V.: Total quality management practices and results in food companies. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management (2010)
27. Qin, J., Li, Z., Wang, R., Li, L., Yu, Z., He, X., Liu, Y.: Industrial Internet of Learning (IIoL): IIoT based pervasive knowledge network for LPWAN—concept, framework and case studies. CCF Transactions on Pervasive Computing and Interaction **3**(1), 25–39 (2021)
28. Sampaio, P., Saraiva, P., Rodrigues, A.G.: ISO 9001 certification research: questions, answers and approaches. International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management (2009)
29. Singh Bali, M., Gupta, K., Kour Bali, K., Singh, P.K.: Towards energy efficient NB-IoT: A survey on evaluating its suitability for smart applications. Materials Today: Proceedings **49**, 3227–3234 (2022). `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2020.11.1027`
30. Tominski, C., Schumann, H., Andrienko, G., Andrienko, N.: Stacking-Based Visualization of Trajectory Attribute Data. IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics **18**(12), 2565–2574 (2012). `https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2012.265`
31. Trevarthen, A., Michael, K.: The RFID-enabled dairy farm: towards total farm management. In: 2008 7th International Conference on Mobile Business. pp. 241–250. IEEE (2008)
32. Tricker, R.: ISO 9001: 2015 in Brief. Routledge (2016)
33. Voutos, Y., Drakopoulos, G., Mylonas, P.: Smart agriculture: An Open Field for Smart Contracts. In: SEEDA-CECNSM. IEEE (2019). `https://doi.org/10.1109/SEEDA-CECNSM.2019.8908411`