

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Michele Mattetti, Mirko Maraldi, Nicola Lenzini, Stefano Fiorati, Eugenio Sereni, Giovanni Molari,

Outlining the mission profile of agricultural tractors through CAN-BUS data analytics,

Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, Volume 184, 2021, 106078, ISSN 0168-1699,

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016816992100096X>

The final published version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2021.106078>.

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

OUTLINING THE MISSION PROFILE OF AGRICULTURAL TRACTORS THROUGH CAN-BUS DATA ANALYTICS

1 Michele Mattetti^{a*}, Mirko Maraldi^a, Nicola Lenzini^b, Stefano Fiorati^b, Eugenio Sereni^c,
2 Giovanni Molari^a

3 ^a Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum – University of Bologna, viale G.
4 Fanin, 50, 40127, Bologna, Italy

5 ^b CNH Industrial – Tractor Innovation Engineering, viale delle Nazioni 55, 41100, Modena, Italy
6 ^c, viale delle Nazioni 55, 41100, Modena, Italy

7 * tel. +39 051 2096174, fax +39 051 2096178, email: michele.mattetti@unibo.it
8

9 Abstract

10 Tractor manufacturers need to know how farmers use their agricultural tractors for an
11 optimal machine design. Tractor usage is not easy to assess due to the large variability of field
12 operations. However, modern tractors embed sensors integrated into the CAN-BUS network
13 and their data is accessible through the ISO 11783 protocol. Even though this technology has
14 been available for a long time, the use of CAN-BUS data for outlining the tractor usage is still
15 limited, because a proper post-processing method is lacking. This study aimed to present a novel
16 classification scheme of CAN-BUS data which permits to outline the tractor usage. On a tractor,
17 a CAN-BUS data logger and a GNSS receiver were installed, and real-world data were recorded
18 for 579 hours. Thus, data was obtained in the most realistic condition. Tractor positions were
19 classified using GIS layers while operating conditions were classified depending on the usage
20 of the tractor's subsystems. The method highlights that showed to be able to detect the 97% of
21 the logged data and that the tractor operated on the field in working, on idle, and moving duties
22 for 65%, 18% and 16% of the time, respectively. The method allows a far more precise outline
23 of tractor usage opening opportunities to obtain large benefits from massively collected CAN-
24 BUS data.

25

Table 1: Nomenclature

D_{OFF}	Distance travelled in out-of-work state	[m]
D_{ON}	Distance travelled in in-work state	[m]
$GNSS$	Global navigation satellite system	[–]
n_e	Engine speed	[rpm]
$n_{PTO,f}$	front PTO speed	[rpm]
$n_{PTO,r}$	rear PTO speed	[rpm]
P_e	Engine power	[kW]
RWI	Rear hitch in work indication	[–]
T_e	Actual engine-percent torque	[%]
T_f	Nominal friction-percent torque	[%]
T_H	Headland turns duration	[s]
T_r	Engine reference torque	[Nm]
V_t	Tractor ground speed	[km h ⁻¹]

27

28

Introduction

29 The typical usage of a tractor model is described through its mission profile, which is a
 30 synthetic description of a tractor use. Mission profiles report the factors that influence the
 31 operational durability of tractor components (Johannesson & Speckert, 2013). A mission profile
 32 may report:

- 33 • the typical tractor service life;
- 34 • the typical contribution of each operating modes on the service life (e.g. ploughing, on-
 35 road, and off-road transportations, etc);
- 36 • how each component is typically used (e.g. the input power and speed on gearboxes,
 37 vehicle ground speed, etc).

38

39 Mission profiles are essential for a proper design/selection of tractor components (Sehab et
 40 al., 2011) or for designing durable and reliable machines with an optimal balance between
 41 under-designs and over-designs (Plaskitt & Musiol, 2002).

42 Mission profiles of agricultural tractors include several factors, and these factors make their
43 mission profile estimations much more challenging than that of road vehicles. Indeed, a road
44 vehicle may travel on only three different types of roads (e.g. highway, city, country road) and
45 two types of load levels (the driver alone and with 4 passengers and luggage) (Marchesani et
46 al., 1992); on the other hand, row crop tractors may be used for a larger variety of uses (e.g.
47 road transportation, soil preparation, sowing, haying, etc.), and each can be accomplished at
48 different load levels due to the different ground conditions.

49 To estimate a mission profile, tractor usage from a sample of farmers is necessary. This is
50 typically carried out through surveys aimed at obtaining information about the farm size, yearly
51 usage of tractors, list of farming operations carried out in the farm, and how each operation is
52 performed (Mattetti et al., 2012). This approach is usually adopted for its easiness in obtaining
53 data from large samples, but the obtained information is biased toward subjective judgements,
54 which could lead to unreliable mission profiles. A different approach consists in installing
55 switchboards inside tractor cabs (Paraforos et al., 2017) or through specific smartphone apps
56 (e.g. 365Farmnet) which allow farmers to assign the task they are accomplishing with the
57 tractor. However, these approaches require a manual effort of farmers, who may forget the task
58 assignment.

59 In modern tractors, the operating parameters of all the tractor subsystems can be monitored
60 using CAN-BUS technologies together with SAE J1939, and ISO 11783 protocols (ISO, 2012;
61 Molari et al., 2013; SAE, 2006). In previous studies, CAN-BUS messages were successfully
62 used to outline the usage of specific tractor components (Mattetti et al., 2019), to determine
63 field efficiencies of agricultural machinery (Pitla et al., 2014, 2016) or to monitor specific
64 tractor operating modes (Molari et al., 2019). The best approach for a proper mission profiling
65 would be recording and analysing real-world CAN-BUS data of a large fleet of tractors. In this
66 way, the recording process would not interfere with farming activities and data would be

67 recorded in the most realistic conditions. But then, the environment where vehicles operate is
68 unknown, and advanced classification approaches are essential for a reliable estimation of the
69 mission profile (Fugiglando et al., 2019). Data classification is the process of grouping together
70 portions of signals related to the same work state (Zhang et al., 2017). A sort of data
71 classification is already provided by telemetric data service supplied by each tractor
72 manufacturer (New Holland MyPLM Connect, John Deere JDLink). In these tools, the work
73 states are defined on the basis of simple threshold-rules, in other words a work state is defined
74 when any signal exceeds a threshold. For example, in telemetric data services, tractors are:

- 75 • on fieldwork state when the three-point linkage is down, but farmers may drive bare
76 tractors on the field with the three-point linkage in the down position.
- 77 • on moving state when its speed exceeds a threshold specified by the driver (i.e.
78 25 km h⁻¹), but the proper value may change in function of the road state (i.e. presence
79 of speed humps, road damages, etc).

80 For these reasons, this approach is far too simplistic and data misclassifications are not
81 infrequent. More advanced rule-based algorithms were proposed for specific tractor operations
82 (Ettl et al., 2018), and forage harvesters (Harmon et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2017). Rule-based
83 algorithms require knowledge from the experts and a reasonable amount of effort to design and
84 implement effective rules for real-world data. Indeed, in real-world conditions, tractor
85 operativity may change according to a variety of operating conditions (in terms of soil,
86 implement type, driving style). Thus, for outlining the tractor usage, a robust and flexible
87 method must be developed, which can deal with the variability induced by the variability of
88 tractor manoeuvres (Mattetti, Molari, et al., 2017).

89 This article aimed to develop a robust and automatic classification scheme able to identify
90 the tractor mission profile using real-world CAN-BUS, and trajectory data.

91

Materials and methods

Data acquisition

93 The analysis was applied to a New Holland T7 tractor (CNH Industrial N.V., Amsterdam,
 94 NL) whose specifications are reported in Table 2. This was chosen because tractors of this class
 95 are rich in terms of embedded sensors allowing for comprehensive monitoring of the activity
 96 of the different embedded subsystems.

Table 2 – Specifications of the tractor used in this study.

Maximum engine power	(kW)	198
Engine displacement	(m ³)	6.728
Number of cylinders	(-)	6
Engine tier	(-)	4B
Transmission	(-)	Continuously variable transmission
Number of auxiliary hydraulic valves	(-)	4
Three-point linkage	(-)	Rear
PTO	(-)	Front and rear

97

98 The tractor was in use between the June 2018 and October 2019 by 5 professional drivers
 99 with more than twenty years of experience. The tractor was used in the Agricultural Farm of
 100 the University of Bologna. The size of the farm is 500 ha, where 67%, 10% and 23% of the
 101 land are devoted to cereals, orchards, and haying, respectively. The farm is distributed in three
 102 different units (i.e. areas where tractors are stored overnight) located in three different towns;
 103 the farther locations are 35 km apart. In this farm, this tractor is mostly used for transportation
 104 tasks and primary and secondary tillage tasks.

105 A stand-alone CAN-BUS data-logger optimised by CNH Industrial was installed on the
 106 tractor. The data-logger was set up to automatically record all the CAN-BUS messages anytime
 107 the tractor engine was turned on so that the recording process did not interfere with farming
 108 activities. In particular, the CAN-BUS data logger is equipped of two separated CAN-BUS
 109 channels compatible with the standards: SAE J1939-14 (SAE, 2016a) and SAE J1939-15 (SAE,

110 2018b). The data-logger embeds a BLE (Bluetooth low energy) scanner which scans the BLE
111 beacons in its surroundings (up to 10 meters) every second. Commercial BLE beacons
112 (Mokosmart M1 Beacon, Shenzhen, China) were attached to the implements available at the
113 farm as suggested in other studies (Calcante & Mazzetto, 2014) (Fig. 1).



114
115 *Fig. 1: A trailer used during the project. Enclosed in the yellow circle, a BLE beacon that permitted the*
116 *identification of the trailer.*

117 The BLE scanner records the identifiers of the detected BLE beacons to record implement
118 connected to the tractor. Moreover, a Garmin Dash Cam 55 (Garmin Ltd., Olathe, KS, USA)
119 was installed on the windshield of the tractor to document the tractor activity in order to ensure
120 the reliability of the classification scheme.

121 For the purpose of this study, only signals with the following Suspect Parameter Numbers
122 (SPNs) and Parameter Group Numbers (PGNs) (ISO, 2012; SAE, 2013) were used for the
123 analysis:

- 124 • SPN 544 and PGN 65251: “*Engine Reference Torque*” that reports the torque as a
125 percent of Engine Reference Torque (SPN 544 and PGN 65251) and it is denoted as T_r
126 in the following.

- 127 • SPN 513 and PGN 61444: “*Actual Engine - Percent Torque*” that reports the torque as a
 128 percent of T_r , and it is denoted as T_e in the following.
- 129 • SPN 513 and PGN 5398: “*Nominal friction-percent torque*” that reports the frictional
 130 and thermodynamic loss of the engine itself, pumping torque loss and the losses of fuel,
 131 oil and cooling pumps as a percent of T_r , and it is denoted as T_f in the following.
- 132 • SPN 190 and PGN 61444: “*Engine Speed*” that reports the revolution speed of the engine
 133 crankshaft, and it is denoted as n_e in the following.
- 134 • SPN 1883 and PGN 65090: “*Rear PTO output shaft speed*”, that reports the speed of the
 135 rear PTO.
- 136 • SPN 1882 and PGN 65090: “*Front PTO output shaft speed*” that reports the speed of the
 137 front PTO.
- 138 • SPN 1877 and PGN 65093: “*Rear hitch in-work indication* ” that reports the rear hitch
 139 is positioned below (in-work) or above (out-of-work) 85% of the position of the rear
 140 three-point linkage (SPN 1873 and PGN 65093). This signal is denoted as RWI in the
 141 following.

142 Moreover, a GNSS (global navigation satellite system) receiver with an update rate of 10
 143 Hz, with no differential correction, and with a claimed accuracy of 2.5 m (in terms of circular
 144 error probable) (IPESpeed, IPETronik GmbH, Baden Baden, Germany) was installed in the
 145 tractor to monitor its position and its tractor ground speed (V_t).

146 *Data analysis*

147 All the signals were interpolated at 10 Hz using a cubic spline so that the sampling rate of
 148 all the signals was the same. From the recorded data, the delivered engine power (P_e) was
 149 calculated as follows:

$$150 \quad P_e = T_r \cdot \frac{T_e - T_f}{100} \cdot n_e \frac{2\pi}{60}$$

151 All the portions of the recorded signals acquired when the tractor position was not logged
152 (because the GNSS receiver did not obtain a strong enough satellite signal, e.g. when the tractor
153 was moved out from an indoor environment) were excluded from the analysis. Tractor positions
154 were classified into three categories:


- 155 • **road**, anytime the position was closer than 3 m to any road stretch. The 3 m
156 threshold was chosen based on the circular error probability of the GNSS receiver
157 used in this study. For a full automation of the process, this was carried out by
158 checking if there is any intersection point between any road stretch and a circle, with
159 a radius of 3m, centred in the tractor position.
- 160 • **field**, anytime the position was inside the boundary of any field plot.
- 161 • **farm**, anytime the position was inside the boundary of any farm unit.

162 For the classification of the tractor position, a shapefile containing the road network, the
163 boundaries of field plots, and the boundaries of the farm units were created. The creation of the
164 shapefile started by downloading the soil use and the road network from the geoportal of the
165 Emilia Romagna region (*Dati preconfezionati — GeoER*, 2019). To this shapefile, the
166 boundaries of three farm units were added.

167 The tractor operating conditions were classified into three categories: idling, moving, and
168 three-point linkage use. Idling condition was defined as the state where the tractor was standing
169 with no use of any PTO for more than 5 s; the duration threshold was added in order to not
170 include portions where the tractor was temporary still during manoeuvring, like reversing the
171 tractor direction at the headlands. *Moving* condition was defined as the state where tractor
172 ground speed was greater than 0 km h⁻¹ with no use of the three-point linkage or both PTOs.
173 *Three-point linkage use* was defined as the state where the three-point linkage was used for
174 field operations. This occurs anytime a sequence of a pass, headland, and pass was repeated.
175 *RWI* signal shows a rectangular waveform, but when the tractor operates on field operations,

176 repetitive pulses could be observed (Fig. 2 - right). A method for discerning field operations
177 from implement hitching or machine moving activities was developed and it is described in the
178 following.

179



180

181 *Fig. 2: Tractor trajectory (on left), and RWI signal (on right) during a field operation with a plough.*

182 First, the distance travelled by the tractor on each in-work (D_{ON}) and on the out-of-work (D_{OFF})
183 states of RWI signal was calculated. For field operations, D_{ON} and D_{OFF} represent the length of
184 passes and headlands, respectively. Both depend on several operating parameters like length of
185 fields, and headland strategy (Paraforos et al., 2018). For field operations, D_{OFF} was usually
186 included in a range between 1 and 70 m. Values of D_{OFF} below the lower bound occurred on
187 implement hitching and values of D_{OFF} above the upper bound occur when the tractor switched
188 from or to a moving operation. The above range was determined using the following approach:

- 189
- Identification of the portions where the tractor was operating in the field from video
190 data collected with the camera.
 - Extraction of all the logged signals in this portion.
 - Calculation of histograms of D_{on} data of 1200 headlands and from it the threshold
192 was set.
- 193

194 The algorithm started by calculating the series of D_{ON} and D_{OFF} , and *three-point linkage use*
 195 classification occurred in the timespan where D_{OFF} are included in the beforementioned range.
 196 When this classification occurs, the high levels of *RWI* described the passes, while the low
 197 levels of *RWI* described the headlands. Then, the headland duration was calculated as the time
 198 elapsed between the falling and rising edge of *RWI* signal when the tractor was in *three-point*
 199 *linkage usage*.

200 The work states were defined based on a combination of the classification of the tractor
 201 position and the tractor operating activity (Table 3).


Table 3 – Rule used for the work states which characterise the tractor use.

<i>Work states</i>	<i>Classified tractor position</i>	<i>Boolean operation</i>	<i>Classified tractor operating activity</i>
<i>On-road moving</i>	<i>Road</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>Moving</i>
<i>Off-road moving</i>	<i>NOT(Road)</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>Moving</i>
<i>Field work</i>	<i>Field</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>three-point linkage use</i>
<i>Idle@field</i>	<i>NOT(Road)</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>Idle</i>
<i>Idle@farm</i>	<i>Farm</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>Idle</i>
<i>Marginal</i>	<i>Otherwise</i>		

202


203 The idling on road was included into *marginal* because its contribution is of minor
 204 importance to the entire idling (Molari et al., 2019).

205 An example of the classification of the work states is reported in Fig. 3. One can note that
 206 in the first portion (in the first 6 min of the time histories) the tractor was classified as on-road
 207 moving task; indeed, the tractor was running at around 40 km h⁻¹ and P_e was on average low
 208 with peaks when high tractor accelerations occurred. On the other hand, the last portion (from
 209 13 min) was classified as field work, indeed V_t was lower than 10 km h⁻¹ and P_e is close to
 210 engine limit.



211 *Fig. 3: Classification example of tractor ground speed (on the top left) and engine power (on the bottom left)*
 212 *compared with the tractor trajectory data (on right).*

213 In this article, a task was defined as the portions where neither work states nor hitched
 214 implement was changed. For each task, the average values of all signals were calculated; for
 215 the subsequent dataset, outliers (i.e. misclassifications) were identified through the confidence
 216 ellipse method. This method consists of computing the confidence ellipse between two
 217 variables and considering outliers data points falling outside the confidence ellipse (Hodge &
 218 Austin, 2004). For drawn implements, the two variables were V_T and P_e (Fig. 4); as the power
 219 demand of this type of implements is mostly dependent on the working speed (Mattetti, Varani,
 220 et al., 2017), while for PTO-driven implements, the two variables were $n_{PTO,*}$ (* stands for f
 221 for front mounted implements and r for rear mounted implements) and P_e , as the power demand
 222 of this type of implements is dependent on the speed of the PTO (Balsari et al., 2020). The
 223 confidence level was set at 90%. A multivariate approach was necessary, since a low demanding
 224 ploughing may not be an outlier if the ground speed is low as well.



225
226
227

Fig. 4: An example of the outlier detection method for the field work tasks with plough. Only passes were considered.


228

Results and Discussion

229

The tractor was used for 107 days amounting to 579 hours overall. The tractor was used with 11 implements, but 5 of them were used for 84% of the time (Fig. 5). For 78% of the time, the tractor was used for ploughing, subsoiling, harrowing, and cultivating. Thus, the analysis was focused on the data related to those operations for the larger amount of available data. The tractor was used with no implement for 10% of the time, and in this configuration, the tractor was mostly moved from a farm unit to another.

234



235
236
237

Fig. 5: Pie chart reporting the contribution of each implement on the operating time. In the chart, the implements used for less than 20 hours were not plotted for sake of clarity.

238

The tractor was used for field work tasks for 65% of the time and 18% of the time for idling

239

activities (Fig. 6). The amount of idling is below the average value reported in the study by

240

Perozzi et al. (2016) where the idling of a large sample of tractors was analysed.





Fig. 6: Time contribution of each work state on the entire tractor activity.

241
242

243 The time contribution of *off-road moving* state is lower than that of the *on-roading moving*
 244 state. This is because the farm where the tractor was used is spread over a large area, which
 245 leads to infrequent but prolonged *on-road moving* states. Indeed, for *off-road moving* work
 246 state, the number of tasks are 38% of all the identified tasks and their average duration is 172
 247 s. On the other hand, for *on-road moving* work states, the number of tasks are and 11% of all
 248 the identified tasks and their average duration is 478 s, respectively. The time contribution of
 249 *idle@field* work state is larger than that of *idle@farm* because the amount of idling stops on the
 250 field is much more frequent than those at the farm due to the varied source of stops, such as rest
 251 stops, driver turnover, checking the performance, removal of crop residual on implements (Hunt
 252 & Wilson, 2015). On the other hand, *idle@farm* state mostly occurs at the beginning and the
 253 end of the workday, and mostly for machine servicing or adjustment, implement hitching and
 254 machine parking (Molari et al., 2019). The sum of the time contributions for the *idle@field* and


255 *field work* states provide an insight of the portion of time where the tractor operated for field
256 related activities, and it includes the time for actual work, headlands, field setting, and
257 maintenance at field (Lovarelli et al., 2017). Headlands contribute to 24% of the entire *field*
258 *work* state and this figure is aligned to that of Ettl et al. (2018). Moreover, the time contribution
259 of the *marginal* is less than 3%, which means that the defined work states can describe most of
260 the tractor operations. In Fig. 7, the relative frequency of headland durations (T_H) for 10065
261 headlands is reported. T_H range from 3 s up to 230 s and it is strongly dependent on the headland
262 patterns. 50% of the headlands ranged from 20 and 40 s and this result is aligned with that
263 reported in other studies (Ettl et al., 2018; Paraforos et al., 2018).



264
265

Fig. 7: Relative frequency distribution of the duration of the identified headlands.

266 Headlands shorter than 20 s are not infrequent, and they account for 32% of the headlands.
 267 These occur when the tractor worked around the field border where the circuitous turn strips at
 268 corner diagonals working pattern is adopted (Hunt & Wilson, 2015). In the most extreme cases,
 269 T_H is lower than 10 s, this occurs for an unconventional type of headland pattern. In particular,
 270 the farmer tilled two different fields separated by a country road and no turns can be observed
 271 in the tractor trajectory (Fig. 8). In the same plot, also headlands longer than 100 s can be
 272 observed, which occurred because the overlapping alternation pattern was adopted.




273
 274

Fig. 8: Headland pattern where T_H was lower than 10 s and longer than 100 s.

275 The daily usage of the tractor ranges from 20 min to up 750 min; and the 50% of the days
 276 the tractor was used for more than 280 min (Fig. 9).

277




278
279

Fig. 9: Daily time of the tractor during the period of analysis.

280 In Fig. 10, a typical daily operating cycle of the tractor is reported. This is composed of the
281 following activities:

- 282 1. tractor idling at the farm at the beginning of the day for implement hitching or,
283 machine servicing and then moving the tractor from any farm unit to the field;
- 284 2. field work where idling stops may occur for field machine maintenance;
- 285 3. moving the tractor from the field to any farm unit.

286 When the driver turnover did not occur on field, or when changes in the tractor field
287 operation occurred during the day. The afore-described cycle was repeated twice in a day since
288 the driver went back to any farm unit for lunch or implement swapping.




289
290

Fig. 10: Typical daily operating cycle of the tractor

291 In Fig. 11, the daily time contribution of the different tractor work states is reported. The
 292 largest contribution is provided by the *field work* state for 50% of the days, and it contributed
 293 to 73% of the entire daily activity. The other work states contribute less than 30% (without
 294 considering the outliers). The tractor was not used for field activities for 4 days since the daily
 295 time contribution of the *field work* state is 0%. In those days, larger contributions of the idling
 296 and moving states can be observed and the tractor was used for off-field activities because the
 297 weather conditions did not permit any field activities. Those activities consisted of machine
 298 servicing or moving implements from a farm unit to another. The results reported in other
 299 studies are aligned to the median values of the daily time contribution calculated in this study
 300 (Ettl et al., 2018; Kortenbruck et al., 2017).

301




302
303
304

Fig. 11: Box-plot reporting the daily time contribution of the tractor work states. Red crosses correspond to the outliers.

305 The kernel smoothed probability distributions of V_t of the two moving states, and field work
306 states with the four most frequent implements are reported in Fig. 12. All the distributions have
307 unique modes except for that of the plough.

308

309



310
311
312

Fig. 12: Kernel smoothing distribution of tractor operating speed at various work states. Headlands were not considered on field operations.

313

In order to compare the distributions obtained in this study with those reported in the ASAE

314

D497.7 (2011), the 10th and 90th percentiles, and the modes are reported in Table 4.

Table 4 – Main statistics of the speed distributions

Tractor states	10 th percentile [km h ⁻¹]	Mode [km h ⁻¹]	90 th percentile [km h ⁻¹]
on-road moving	20.0	36.0	40.0
off-road moving	3.5	8.0	12.4
subsoiler - field passes	3.3	3.5	5.8
cultivator - field passes	3.0	4.2	6.0
power harrow - field passes	3.2	3.7	5.9
plough - field passes	2.6	3.0 / 4.2	5.5

315


316 The speed values observed in this study are slightly lower than those reported in the ASAE
317 standard. For example, according to the ASAE standard, the speed range of a mouldboard
318 plough is between 5 and 10 km h⁻¹, whereas it was found to be between 2.6 km h⁻¹ and 5.8 km
319 h⁻¹ in this study. This difference may be because data in the ASAE standard is based on data
320 collected in the US, where tractors and fields larger than those available in the farm used in this
321 study.

322 The *off-road moving* distribution is overlapped with the distributions of the *field work* states
323 for V_t lower than 8 km h⁻¹ (which corresponds to the 48th percentile of its cumulative
324 distribution), and it is overlapped with the distribution of *on-road moving* state for V_t higher
325 than 12 km h⁻¹ (which corresponds to the 85th percentile of its cumulative distribution). This
326 highlights that discerning the moving states only using a threshold-rule for the speed, as it is
327 usually done with many commercial telemetric data services, may lead to misclassifications.

328 In Fig. 13, the confidence level ellipses reported for three work states demonstrate that to
329 fully discern the work states, a multivariate approach is necessary. The ellipses are clearly
330 separated with only minor overlaps occurring between the ellipses of both moving work states,
331 and between the ellipses of *field work* and *off-road moving* work states. V_t is strictly related to
332 P_e depending on the type of the work state. Indeed, on *field work* tasks, the tractor is usually
333 used with high engine loads, low speed and low gear ratios; while for moving tasks, lower
334 engine loads and longer gear ratios are typically used with, high engine loads are limited to
335 acceleration events only. For both moving tasks, P_e increases with V_t , due to the fact that the
336 main resistance forces are the motion resistance which increases with the ground speed (Wong,
337 2001). The variability of V_t and P_e inside each operating condition depends on several factors,
338 including driving style, operating, and environmental conditions. Indeed, P_e ranges from 23 kW
339 up to 143 kW for the field work state on passes. Through a visual inspection of the recorded
340 video, it was observed that the tillage operations carried out at low ground speeds (below 3 km

341 h⁻¹) occurred because the soil was severely covered by crop residuals. In these conditions,
342 farmers preferred to work slowly to avoid that the implement could get clogged with crop
343 residuals, which could force the farmer to stop at headlands for implement clearing.

344



345
346

Fig. 13: Confidence level ellipses for three non-idling operating states.

347

Discussion

348 Few studies reported algorithms for classifying CAN-BUS data of agricultural tractors, and
349 in all of them, results are based on limited datasets, not collected in real-world conditions. The
350 strength of the classification scheme introduced in this study is the combined use of CAN-BUS,
351 trajectory, and geographical data. This allowed to obtain a finer description of the tractor usage.

352 Indeed, tractor movements were classified based on the road type (i.e. on-road and off-road).
353 On other similar studies, these two operating activities could not be distinguished because the
354 method relies only on CAN-BUS, and trajectory data. Indeed, Kortenbruck et al. (2017)
355 discriminated field from moving activities by evaluating the pattern of the tractor trajectory,
356 which was that of a field operation if parallel traces not further apart than the implement width
357 could be observed. The algorithm is not fully automatic because farmers have to input
358 implement widths, but CEPs of non-RTK- GNSS receivers are of the same order of magnitude
359 of typical implement widths. Thus, field operations cannot be reliably detected only with tractor
360 trajectories. Paraforos et al. (2018) detected headlands and field passes from trajectory data, in
361 particular, headlands were recognized when 180° overturns of tractor heading angle were
362 identified. However, tractors do not always overturns of 180° on headlands especially when
363 tractors work along the field contours (Fig. 8 – left). In Ettl et al. (2018), headland turns were
364 recognised by setting the threshold of the duration with the three-point linkage is fully up
365 position; however, the duration limit is dependent by the headland patterns (Paraforos et al.,
366 2018), and idling stops can be frequent during headlands (Molari et al., 2019) (Fig. 10 – right).

367 The approach for recognising the field operations adopted in this study is based on the
368 repetitive pattern of the *RWI* signal when tractors operate on field. This approach does not rely
369 on any threshold values of any CAN-BUS parameter, this makes it more effective in dealing
370 with real-world data. Setting the proper thresholds is a critical task because operating
371 parameters may change depending on the type of implement, soil conditions, ground slope, and
372 driving style (i.e. toward productivity or efficiency). The approach used in this paper works
373 only with mounted and semi-mounted implements where a variability on the *RWI* signal can
374 be observed, but the same principle could be used with other signals (e.g. steering angle) where
375 a repetitive pattern could be observed also with trailed implements.

376

377

Conclusions

378 Information on the usage of agricultural tractors is not well-documented and very often
379 farmers, scientists, and engineers rely on handwritten logbook data. In this paper, a data
380 acquisition system which facilitates the data collection on agricultural tractors, and a novel
381 classification scheme were presented. The novelty of the data acquisition system is that it
382 combines a CAN-BUS logger, a GNSS receiver and a BLE beacon scanner, thus the hitched
383 implement could be recorded even if they are not ISOBUS compliant. Moreover, the novelty
384 of the data analysis method is on the combined use of CAN-BUS, trajectory and geographical
385 data which allowed to introduce a classification scheme more refined than those proposed in
386 similar studies. Indeed, the kinds of tractor activities were classified into 5 states depending on
387 the tractor operating condition and its position. Thanks to the proposed classification scheme,
388 engineers may benefit from massively recorded real-world data in uncontrolled conditions,
389 which may leverage their design method. Indeed, engineers may focus most of their efforts on
390 optimising the most frequently used components; or they may extract the most relevant duty-
391 cycle from a large dataset of real-world data (Bishop et al., 2012). The dynamic characteristics
392 of front axle and cabin suspensions could be optimised in order to achieve the best balance
393 between on and off-road performance based on the frequency of each moving state and of the
394 most frequent operating speeds. Future work should focus on defining work states in greater
395 details and adapting the classification scheme in order to analyse real-time CAN-BUS data. In
396 this way, the algorithm could be embedded in in-vehicle computer systems and thus vehicle
397 sub-systems could be controlled based on the actual work state. For example, parameters of
398 tractor subsystems could be preventively set when the tractor is approaching a specific road
399 type (i.e. on-road or off-road), and that could be especially useful for setting the damping
400 coefficient of semi-active suspensions or the tyre pressure if the tractor embeds central tyre
401 inflating system.

402

Acknowledgements

403 This project was supported within the PRIN national framework by MUR (Ministry of
404 University and Research), notification 2015 “Optimization of operating machinery through
405 analysis of the mission profile for more efficient agriculture” Grant number: 2015KTY5NW.

406

References

- 407 ASAE. (2011). *ASAE D497.7—Agricultural Machinery Management Data* (D497.7; ASAE
408 Standard, pagg. 1–15). <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.36431>
- 409 Balsari, P., Biglia, A., Comba, L., Alcatrão, L., Varani, M., Mattetti, M., Barge, P., Tortia, C.,
410 Manzone, M., Gay, P., & Ricauda Aimonino, D. (2020). Performance analysis of a tractor—
411 Power harrow system under different working conditions. *Soil and Tillage Research*.
412 <https://doi.org/Submitted>
- 413 Bishop, J. D. K., Axon, C. J., & McCulloch, M. D. (2012). A robust, data-driven methodology
414 for real-world driving cycle development. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and*
415 *Environment*, 17(5), 389–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2012.03.003>
- 416 Calcante, A., & Mazzetto, F. (2014). Design, development and evaluation of a wireless system
417 for the automatic identification of implements. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*,
418 101, 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2013.12.010>
- 419 *Dati preconfezionati—GeoER*. (2019). <http://geoportale.regione.emilia-romagna.it/it/download/dati-e-prodotti-cartografici-preconfezionati/pianificazione-e-catasto/uso-del-suolo-1/2014-coperture-vettoriali-uso-del-suolo-di-dettaglio-edizione-2018/dati-preconfezionati>
- 423 Ettl, J., Bernhardt, H., Pickel, P., Remmele, E., Thuneke, K., & Emberger, P. (2018). Transfer
424 of agricultural work operation profiles to a tractor test stand for exhaust emission evaluation.
425 *Biosystems Engineering*, 176, 185–197.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2018.10.016>
- 427 Fugiglando, U., Massaro, E., Santi, P., Milardo, S., Abida, K., Stahlmann, R., Netter, F., &
428 Ratti, C. (2019). Driving Behavior Analysis through CAN Bus Data in an Uncontrolled
429 Environment. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 20(2), 737–748.
430 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2018.2836308>
- 431 Harmon, J. D., Luck, B. D., Shinnars, K. J., Anex, R. P., & Drewry, J. L. (2018). Time-Motion
432 Analysis of Forage Harvest: A Case Study. *Transactions of the ASABE*, 61(2), 483–491.
433 <https://doi.org/10.13031/trans.12484>
- 434 Hodge, V. J., & Austin, J. (2004). A Survey of Outlier Detection Methodologies. *Artificial*
435 *Intelligence Review*, 22(2), 85–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-004-4304-y>
- 436 Hunt, D., & Wilson, D. (2015). *Farm Power and Machinery Management: Eleventh Edition*.
437 Waveland Press.

- 438 ISO. (2012). *ISO 11783-7:2012—Tractors and machinery for agriculture and forestry—Serial*
439 *control and communications data network—Part7: Implement messages application layer—*
440 *Implement messages application layer.*
- 441 Johannesson, P., & Speckert, M. (2013). *Guide to Load Analysis for Durability in Vehicle*
442 *Engineering.* John Wiley & Sons.
- 443 Kortenbruck, D., Griepentrog, H. W., & Paraforos, D. S. (2017). Machine operation profiles
444 generated from ISO 11783 communication data. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture,*
445 *140,* 227–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2017.05.039>
- 446 Lovarelli, D., Bacenetti, J., & Fiala, M. (2017). Effect of local conditions and machinery
447 characteristics on the environmental impacts of primary soil tillage. *Journal of Cleaner*
448 *Production,* *140,* 479–491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.011>
- 449 Marchesani, C., Parmigiani, F., & Vianello, M. (1992). *Integrated method to define the mission*
450 *profile of a passenger car.* Innovation and reliability in automotive design and testing,
451 Florence (I).
- 452 Mattetti, M., Maraldi, M., Sedoni, E., & Molari, G. (2019). Optimal criteria for durability test
453 of stepped transmissions of agricultural tractors. *Biosystems Engineering,* *178,* 145–155.
454 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2018.11.014>
- 455 Mattetti, M., Molari, G., & Sedoni, E. (2012). Methodology for the realisation of accelerated
456 structural tests on tractors. *Biosystems Engineering,* *113(3),* 266–271.
457 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2012.08.008>
- 458 Mattetti, M., Molari, G., & Sereni, E. (2017). Damage evaluation of driving events for
459 agricultural tractors. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture,* *135,* 328–337.
460 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2017.01.018>
- 461 Mattetti, M., Varani, M., Molari, G., & Morelli, F. (2017). Influence of the speed on soil-
462 pressure over a plough. *Biosystems Engineering,* *156,* 136–147.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2017.01.009>
- 464 Molari, G., Mattetti, M., Lenzini, N., & Fiorati, S. (2019). An updated methodology to analyse
465 the idling of agricultural tractors. *Biosystems Engineering,* *187,* 160–170.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2019.09.001>
- 467 Molari, G., Mattetti, M., Perozzi, D., & Sereni, E. (2013). Monitoring of the tractor working
468 parameters from the CAN-Bus. *AIIA 13.* Horizons in agricultural, forestry and biosystems
469 engineering, Viterbo.
- 470 Paraforos, D. S., Hübner, R., & Griepentrog, H. W. (2018). Automatic determination of
471 headland turning from auto-steering position data for minimising the infield non-working
472 time. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture,* *152,* 393–400.
473 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.07.035>
- 474 Paraforos, D. S., Vassiliadis, V., Kortenbruck, D., Stamkopoulos, K., Ziogas, V., Sapounas, A.,
475 & Griepentrog, H. W. (2017). Automating the process of importing data into an FMIS using
476 information from tractor’s CAN-Bus communication. *Advances in Animal Biosciences,* *8,*
477 650–655. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040470017000395>
- 478 Perozzi, D., Mattetti, M., Molari, G., & Sereni, E. (2016). Methodology to analyse farm tractor
479 idling time. *Biosystems Engineering,* *148,* 81–89.
480 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2016.05.007>

481 Pitla, S. K., Lin, N., Shearer, S. A., & Luck, J. D. (2014). Use of Controller Area Network
482 (CAN) Data To Determine Field Efficiencies of Agricultural Machinery. *Applied*
483 *Engineering in Agriculture*, 30(6), 829–839. <https://doi.org/10.13031/aea.30.10618>

484 Pitla, S. K., Luck, J. D., Werner, J., Lin, N., & Shearer, S. A. (2016). In-field fuel use and load
485 states of agricultural field machinery. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 121, 290–
486 300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2015.12.023>

487 Plaskitt, R. J., & Musiol, C. J. M. (2002). *Developing a Durable Product*. 1–20.

488 SAE. (2006). *Agricultural and Forestry Off-Road Machinery Control and Communication*
489 *Network* (N. j1939-2). https://saemobilus.sae.org/content/j1939/2_200608

490 SAE. (2013). *Vehicle Application Layer* (N. j1939-71; pagg. 1–1255).

491 SAE. (2016a). *SAE J1939-14—Physical Layer, 500 Kbps* (SAE J1939-14; pagg. 1–13).

492 SAE. (2018b). *SAE J1939-15—Physical Layer, 250 Kbps* (SAE J1939-15; pagg. 1–20).

493 Sehab, R., Barbedette, B., & Chauvin, M. (2011). Electric vehicle drivetrain: Sizing and
494 validation using general and particular mission profiles. *2011 IEEE International*
495 *Conference on Mechatronics*, 77–83. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMECH.2011.5971228>

496 Wong, J. Y. (2001). *Theory of Ground Vehicles*. John Wiley & Sons.

497 Zhang, Y., Ault, A., Krogmeier, J. V., & Buckmaster, D. (2017). Activity Recognition for
498 Harvesting via GPS Tracks. *2017 ASABE Annual International Meeting*.
499 <https://doi.org/10.13031/aim.201700813>

500