

---

---

# [TBD: NAME OF TOOL]

*TBD: A tool to study microclimates in an orchard*

---

---

By

Adam Sidnell

Supervised by Professor Ruzanna Chitchyan



Department of Computer Science  
UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in  
accordance with the requirements of the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE in the Faculty of Engineering

September 2025

Word count: TBD

# **Executive summary**

## Dedication and acknowledgments

## **Author's declaration**

# Table of contents

<b>Executive summary</b> . . . . .	i
<b>Dedication and acknowledgments</b> . . . . .	ii
<b>Author's declaration</b> . . . . .	iii
<b>1 Introduction</b> . . . . .	1
<b>I Background</b> . . . . .	2
<b>2 Microclimates</b> . . . . .	3
2.1 Microclimates in agriculture . . . . .	3
2.2 Microclimates in apple orchards . . . . .	3
<b>3 Internet of Things</b> . . . . .	4
3.1 What is IoT? . . . . .	4
3.2 Examples of IoT in agriculture . . . . .	4
3.3 IoT enabling technologies . . . . .	4
<b>4 LoRa</b> . . . . .	5
4.1 What is LoRa? . . . . .	5
4.2 How LoRa works . . . . .	5
4.3 Benefits and limitations . . . . .	5
4.4 Current applications of LoRa . . . . .	5
<b>II Hardware development</b> . . . . .	6
<b>5 Overview of hardware</b> . . . . .	7
<b>6 Design</b> . . . . .	8
6.1 Nodes . . . . .	8
6.1.1 Components . . . . .	8
6.1.2 Programming the nodes . . . . .	12
6.1.3 Repeater node . . . . .	12
6.2 Gateway . . . . .	12

6.3	LoRa settings . . . . .	12
6.3.1	Compliance with regulatory limits on radio power . . . . .	13
<b>7</b>	<b>Development and testing . . . . .</b>	<b>14</b>
7.1	Hardware assembly . . . . .	14
7.2	Programming the hardware . . . . .	14
7.3	Range tests . . . . .	14
7.4	Battery tests . . . . .	16
7.5	Solar testing . . . . .	17
<b>8</b>	<b>Deployment in the field . . . . .</b>	<b>18</b>
8.1	Placement of nodes . . . . .	18
<b>III</b>	<b>Software development</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Software design . . . . .</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>IV</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>References</b>		<b>22</b>
<b>V</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Example . . . . .</b>	<b>24</b>

## List of Figures

1	iLabs Challenger RP2040 . . . . .	8
2	Low range PCB antenna . . . . .	9
3	iLabs whip style LoRa antenna (868mhz) . . . . .	9
4	Waveshare DHT11 temperature/humidity sensor . . . . .	10
5	The Pi Hut capacitive soil moisture sensor . . . . .	10
6	DFROBOT wind speed sensor . . . . .	11
7	Waveshare solar power management module (left), solar panel (right) . . . . .	11
8	Raspberry Pi 5 (8GB) . . . . .	12
9	Google earth image of data collection points . . . . .	15
10	Elevation profile of test area (ignore large dip at start) . . . . .	15
11	Graph to show signal loss from different receiver and transmitter configurations (higher is better) . . . . .	16

# 1 Introduction

In this report, I give details of an online tool called [TBD: NAME OF TOOL] which was deployed alongside an IoT weather sensor network that I built myself. The tool aims to provide farmers with accessible, specific climate data to support real-time decision-making.

The IoT hardware deployed consisted of four separate custom built components: two field nodes capable of reading weather data and transmitting this using LoRa; a repeater that boosts received LoRa signals; and an internet-connected gateway that uploads weather data to an online database.

The nodes were placed at two different locations on the farm that the owner had identified as having distinct climate characteristics (see section on microclimates), meaning wider-area weather forecasts were unrepresentative.

# Part I

## Background

## 2 Microclimates

### 2.1 Microclimates in agriculture

A microclimate is generally understood as a set of distinct climatic conditions within a small, localised area [1]. The maximum size of a microclimate is debated, but the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) regards it as occupying an area of anywhere from less than one metre across to several hundred metres [2]. In practice, microclimates can occur in spaces such as gardens, valleys, caves, or fields. Even human-made structures can generate their own microclimates; for example, tall buildings can create *street valleys* that reduce wind flow and lead to the formation of localised pockets of warmer air, which can also trap higher concentrations of pollution from vehicle emissions [3]. Vegetation plays a critical role in influencing microclimates. The addition of trees to an urban environment can reduce air temperature by as much as  $2.8^{\circ}\text{C}$  [4].

This localised climatic variation, characteristic of microclimates, is therefore significant in agriculture. The climate that crops are exposed has an enormous impact on overall agricultural yields. Indeed, farmers have modified the microclimate of crop fields for millennia, a clear example of this being the use of fencing to reduce soil erosion and damage to edible plants [5]. Therefore, the relationship between microclimates and agriculture has been the subject of extensive research - particularly as climate change introduces new threats to food security.

### 2.2 Microclimates in apple orchards

## **3 *Internet of Things***

### **3.1 What is IoT?**

The Internet of Things (IoT) refers to the concept of integrating networking capability in a range of devices, allowing for cooperation to reach common goals [6]. To this end, IoT is a very broad idea and there has been rapid ongoing growth of IoT in both domestic and business settings.

IoT therefore often involves the integration of wireless networking into objects which traditionally would not have had any such capability. As an example the use of smart lightbulbs, with the ability to control their status, brightness or even colour via a smartphone application, is a fairly standard demonstration of IoT. However

### **3.2 Examples of IoT in agriculture**

### **3.3 IoT enabling technologies**

# **4 LoRa**

## **4.1 What is LoRa?**

LoRa stands for Long Range radio. Long range systems are a way of transmitting data over much longer distances than Wi-Fi allows. LoRa has a range 4000 times greater than Wi-Fi.

## **4.2 How LoRa works**

## **4.3 Benefits and limitations**

## **4.4 Current applications of LoRa**

## Part II

# Hardware development

## 5 Overview of hardware

# 6 Design

## 6.1 Nodes

### 6.1.1 Components

The first step in the design process was selecting hardware components that could operate autonomously without mains power. This required devices that were highly power-efficient, while also capable of transmitting small data packets via LoRa. An equally important consideration was ensuring the final devices could be fully weatherproofed to protect the sensitive electronics from water ingress and environmental damage.

#### Challenger RP2040 LoRa

The iLabs Challenger RP2040 LoRa is an embedded computer that uses the Raspberry Pi RP2040 chip that was released in 2021. The RP2040 itself is a low-cost and power-efficient processor with ample power to perform the data encoding and transmission in my use case. Additionally, the chip is extremely popular with over 10 million units being produced in the first two years of release [7]. This popularity means there is ample documentation for developing with this processor and it is compatible with circuit python which was my preferred language for development.




Figure 1: iLabs Challenger RP2040

The challenger board itself is well suited for this project for several reasons. It uses the compact Adafruit feather form factor, giving a board dimension of just 5cm by 2cm, making it easy to mount in a small enclosure. The onboard Hope RF96 LoRa modem

is built directly into the board and the U.FL antenna connector allows for the swapping of antenna's to different varieties. This board's LoRa module is also set to transmit at a frequency of 868mhz which is a standard UK frequency for LoRa and gives a good balance between range and bandwidth.

Another useful aspect of the board is the abundance of GPIO pins (20 in total) allowing for a large number of sensors to be fitted to the board.


### **Antennae**

The selection of antennae is one of the largest determinants of range and reliability in the context of wireless communication systems [8]. Initially I used a simple PCB antenna as shown in Figure 2, however as explained in the next chapter, the range of this was insufficient for my use.



**Figure 2: Low range PCB antenna**

To improve overall range I switched to a more capable omnidirectional whip antenna that was made specifically for the Challenger RP2040. The antenna is tuned to perform best at the 868mhz frequency range - which is the range I was using.



**Figure 3: iLabs whip style LoRa antenna (868mhz)**

### **Sensor selection**

#### **Temperature and humidity sensor**

I used a DHT11 temperature/humidity sensor for each node to provide basic readings. It was chosen for it's low cost, availability and compatibility with both the RP2040 Chal-

lenger and CircuitPython (via libraries). The sensor can be connected to the microcontroller using a single GPIO pin as well as the usual power and ground pin.




Figure 4: Waveshare DHT11 temperature/humidity sensor

### Soil moisture sensor




Figure 5: The Pi Hut capacitive soil moisture sensor

### Wind speed sensor



Figure 6: DFROBOT wind speed sensor

### Powering the node

To allow for continuous operation away from power sources, I set up a 5.5v Monocrystalline Silicon Solar Panel to each of the nodes. As the output from the solar panels was too high voltage to directly power the nodes I also installed a solar power management module onto the Challengers. This module powers a battery that is installed on it using a solar panel. It then is able to power the RP2040 using this battery, allowing for overnight or overcast usage of the challenger.




Figure 7: Waveshare solar power management module (left), solar panel (right)

## Weather proofing

I 3D printed a water proof enclosure and a separate Stevenson weather shield for the temperature/humidity sensor to allow for accurate outdoor readings.

### 6.1.2 Programming the nodes


On each challenger I flashed the drives with CircuitPython, an open source interpreted language similar to Python but simplified for use in microcontrollers.

### 6.1.3 Repeater node

To improve range I made one of the four RP2040 challengers I used act as a repeater. This meant it did not require sensors like I used for the other two nodes and instead it just had a solar panel and battery connected up to it. The repeater would receive signals from the two nodes before relaying them to the final gateway. This had the effect of significantly boosting the range.

## 6.2 Gateway

The gateway consisted of a fourth Challenger RP2040 connected to a Raspberry Pi (TBD version). The challenger only received messages from the repeater and then would transfer these to the Raspberry Pi. After receiving data the Raspberry pi uploaded this to the internet.



**Figure 8: Raspberry Pi 5 (8GB)**

## 6.3 LoRa settings

LoRa has many parameters that must be aligned for two devices to communicate successfully. These include:

1. Spreading factor:

2. **Frequency:** Must match across devices; this project uses 868 MHz, the UK LoRa ISM band.
3. **Bandwidth:** Determines how wide the signal is, I am using 125 kHz.
4. **Coding rate:**
5. **Transmit power:** Affects the power and therefore range. This must be set within legal limits (e.g., 14 dBm in the UK).

### 6.3.1 Compliance with regulatory limits on radio power

The UK has strict regulations on the usage of radio transmitters under the Ofcom ISM band rules. For the 868MHz band, the maximum effective radiated power that can be used is 25mW. This corresponds to a transmit power of roughly 14dB.

Additionally, the UK has rules on duty cycle rates. This is essentially how long radio signals are permitted to be on air. For example at a spreading factor of 12 a message may take approximately 1 second to send. The duty cycle limit in the UK is 1%, meaning you may only transmit for 1% of the time on a given day. 1% of a day is 864 seconds. This means to stay in line with UK regulations only 864 messages could be sent on a given day - or roughly 1 message every 2 minutes.

# 7 Development and testing

## 7.1 Hardware assembly

## 7.2 Programming the hardware

## 7.3 Range tests

One of the most important tests to carry out prior to deployment in the field was testing the range of the devices.

In this experiment I took four challenger RP2040s to The Downs, a large public park in Bristol. Here I tested four different antenna configurations to compare how well the signal travelled across an increasing distance. Signal strength can be measured using the received signal strength index (RSSI), a measure of the difference in signal from the transmitter to the receiver and measured in decibels (CHECK THIS).

For the test, two challengers were programmed as transmitters, sending an example data packet similar to the data that would eventually be used at the farm. One of the transmitters used a simple PCB antenna (Figure 2) while the other used a higher range whip style antenna (Figure 3). Then I programmed two challengers as receivers, again one had a low range antenna and the other a long range one.

This meant that four different antenna configurations could be tested concurrently, as the receivers could pick up the signal from each transmitter. An estimate of their estimated relative performance before testing is shown below:

1. Whip antenna to whip antenna (Likely best result)
2. PCB antenna to whip antenna
3. Whip antenna to PCB antenna
4. PCB antenna to PCB antenna (Likely poorest result)

The reason PCB transmitter to whip receiver will likely outperform the whip to PCB configuration is that generally it is more important that the receiver has better "hearing" capabilities than the transmitter can "shout".

Nine different distances from transmitter to receiver were tested, in 200m increments starting from 0m as a baseline to a distance of 1600m (Figure 9). An important aspect in getting a successful LoRa connection is whether there is line of sight between the transmitter and receiver. Figure 11 shows the elevation profile of the test area, with the initial large dip being an inaccuracy from google earth's topology data as the 0m point is near a cliff edge. The lowest elevation point is at the starting point at around 83m above sea level, while the highest point was at the 1km mark at around 94m making

an elevation range of 11m. My hypothesis was that signal would likely drop off or stop entirely beyond this point as points beyond 1000m would be below the hill line. This would effectively mean that the receivers would be in a signal shadow point where the transmission waves would not be able to reach them. The only possibility for signal to reach this area would be from reflections either from nearby buildings or topology. However the effects of reflections are virtually impossible to account for in the real world and therefore no accurate predictions could be made.



Figure 9: Google earth image of data collection points





Figure 10: Elevation profile of test area (ignore large dip at start)

At the time of the actual test however a festival was being run between the 1200m and 1400m mark. The festival had a number of large tents and temporary buildings constructed which almost certainly blocked the signal. Therefore tests past this point should be heavily caveated. It is likely this contributed to the lack of signal past this point. Final data below:



**Figure 11:** Graph to show signal loss from different receiver and transmitter configurations (higher is better)

## 7.4 Battery tests

There is no mains electricity available in the apple field so the nodes must be able to operate without external power source. Even with the use of a solar panel the node must be able to work through the night and during periods of dense cloud coverage where the solar panel will not have sufficient power to keep the node running. This is where the use of a battery is particularly useful as the solar panel can charge the battery with excess energy during periods of excess solar radiation, such as during midday hours, and then store this energy for periods of low or no solar radiation.

However, while daylight will be of little concern during the summer months when this dissertation is being written, there will be far fewer days of usable sunlight over the winter period. As the UK has very high latitude, there is large seasonal variation in the length of a day. For the town of crediton (nearest town to Small Brook Farm), in the summer there are 16.5 hours of daylight while in winter it receives only 7.6 hours; meaning a night that is 16.4 hours long. Therefore the node must have a battery sufficiently large to power it for a minimum of 16.4 hours with some additional charge to account for high cloud cover during the early evening and morning period.

To see if the battery solution was sufficient for this environment a test was run on a fully charged 18650 battery that was then connected to the solar power manager to allow the voltage to be regulated up to the challenger's 5v input voltage. The node was then run

with it's software and full suite of sensors attached.

The node was then ran until the battery would no longer discharge, with the final battery life of the node being 19 hours and 17 minutes.

A digital multimeter was installed between the solar power manager and the challenger's usb c input to view the voltage and current in real time as well as running a timer for the test and a calculation of the number of watt-hours consumed by the node. During the test the node used 80ma at 5V for a wattage of 0.4W. The meter showed that the node consumed 7.96Wh of power. Considering the battery capacity is 9 Wh it may seem that the battery ran out too quickly. However, the solar power manager documentation tells us that the battery boost efficiency - being the conversion of battery voltage from native 3.7V to 5V output - is only 86%.

With that in mind effective battery capacity is roughly 7.74Wh, which is very similar to the actual result.

## 7.5 Solar testing

## **8 Deployment in the field**

### **8.1 Placement of nodes**

# Part III

# Software development

## 9 Software design

## **Part IV**

# **Evaluation**

## References

- [1] Met Office, “Factsheet 14: Microclimates,” Met Office, Tech. Rep., 2023, Accessed: 16 June 2025. [Online]. Available: [https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/metofficegovuk/pdf/research/library-and-archive/library-publications/factsheets/factsheet\\_14-microclimates\\_2023.pdf](https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/metofficegovuk/pdf/research/library-and-archive/library-publications/factsheets/factsheet_14-microclimates_2023.pdf).
- [2] World Meteorological Organization (WMO), *Guide to Instruments and Methods of Observation: Volume III – Observing Systems*, 2024 edition. Geneva: World Meteorological Organization (WMO), 2025, ISBN: 978-92-63-10008-5. DOI: 10.59327/WMO/CIMO/3. [Online]. Available: <https://library.wmo.int/idurl/4/68661>.
- [3] S. Yang, L. L. Wang, T. Stathopoulos, and A. M. Marey, “Urban microclimate and its impact on built environment—a review,” *Building and Environment*, vol. 238, p. 110334, 2023.
- [4] D. Lai, W. Liu, T. Gan, K. Liu, and Q. Chen, “A review of mitigating strategies to improve the thermal environment and thermal comfort in urban outdoor spaces,” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 661, pp. 337–353, 2019, ISSN: 0048-9697. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.062>. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969719300683>.
- [5] H. A. Cleugh, “Effects of windbreaks on airflow, microclimates and crop yields,” *Agroforestry Systems*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 55–84, 1998, ISSN: 1572-9680. DOI: 10.1023/A:1006019805109. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006019805109>.
- [6] L. Atzori, A. Iera, and G. Morabito, “The internet of things: A survey,” *Computer Networks*, vol. 54, no. 15, pp. 2787–2805, 2010, ISSN: 1389-1286. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2010.05.010>. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1389128610001568>.
- [7] L. Pounder. “Raspberry pi produced 10 million rp2040s in 2021, more pi stores likely.” Accessed: 02/07/25. [Online]. Available: <https://www.tomshardware.com/news/raspberry-pi-10-million-rp2040s>.
- [8] A. Q. Khan, M. Riaz, and A. Bilal, “Various types of antenna with respect to their applications: A review,” *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1–8, Mar. 2016, ISSN: 2045-7057. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ijmse.org/Volume7/Issue3/paper1.pdf>.

# Part V

## Appendices

## A Example