Neural Network Ensembles to Real-time Identification of Plug -level Appliance



Measurements

NILM Workshop 2016, 14th May Karim Said Barsim, <u>Lukas Mauch</u>, and Bin Yang Institute of Signal Processing and System Theory University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany {karim.barsim,lukas.mauch,bin.yang}@iss.uni-Stuttgart.de

Introduction and motivation

- Appliance identification
 - A sub-task of the NILM problem
 - Sometimes a disjoint process
- An upper bound

Introduction

Task & tools

Signatures

Prediction

Training data

frequency

variations

L. Mauch

Stuttgart University

Label space

Discussion

Model

Sampling

Signature

- Raw signatures (current i(n) and voltage v(n))
- High resolution signals
- Plug-level measurements
- Plug-level appliance identification
 - Smart outlets
- Aspects of the identification process
 - Training data
 - Sampling frequency
 - Signature variations



Appliance Identification



Task & tools

Signatures

Model

Prediction

Training data

Sampling frequency

Signature variations

Label space

Discussion

Task and tools



Generic appliance identification from high resolution raw measurements

- Neural network ensembles:
 - Suitable for raw-data learning
 - Unstable w.r.t training data (i.e. suited for models ensembles)

Plug Load Appliance Identification Dataset (PLAID) ^[1]

- Plug-level raw measurements
- Generic appliance categories

L. Mauch Stuttgart University

[1] J. Gao, S. Giri, E. C. Kara, and M. Berg´es, "PLAID: A Public Dataset of High-resolution Electrical Appliance Measurements for Load Identification Research: Demo Abstract". In proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Embedded Systems for Energy-Efficient Buildings:198–199, 2014.



Signatures

Model

- Prediction
- Training data
- Sampling
- Signature
- Label space

Appliances' Signature

- frequency
- variations

Discussion



Raw current i(n) and voltage v(n)

- Unsupervised feature learning
- $\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau} = [\hat{\boldsymbol{\iota}}_{\tau}^T, \ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_{\tau}^T]^T$
- Single period (~ 0.017 seconds @ 60Hz)
 - Real-time identification
 - $i_{\tau} = [i(\tau), i(\tau+1), \dots, i(\tau+d+1)]^T$
- Segment-based normalization
 - Discarding amplitude information
 - Generic labeling
 - $\hat{\iota}_{\tau} = \frac{2 \, i_{\tau} (\max \, i_{\tau} \min \, i_{\tau}) \, \mathbf{1}_{d,1}}{(\max \, i_{\tau} \min \, i_{\tau})}$
- Algorithmic expansion
 - Multiple phase shifts from 2 periods
 - Translation invariance and robustness to variations

•
$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{x}_{\tau} \mid \tau = \tau_o + m \epsilon \end{array}, \quad 0 \le m < \frac{d}{\epsilon} \end{array} \right.$$



Task & tools

Signatures

Model

- Prediction
- Training data
- Sampling frequency
- Signature variations
- Label space
- Discussion

Prediction model

- A neural network ensemble
 - Unstable models

L

- Similar to Bootstrap aggregation
- Ex. binary classification networks
- Ex. per class combination $\binom{11}{2} = 55$ nets
- Ex. shallow, feedforward, fully connected nets

$$\mathcal{D}_{\omega_i,\omega_j} = \{ x \in \mathcal{X} | \omega(x) = \omega_i \text{ or } \omega(x) = \omega_j \}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_{\omega_i,\omega_j}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}_{\omega_i,\omega_j}, & \hat{p}_{\omega_j,\omega_i} \end{bmatrix}$$

Confidence-weighted voting

 $\widehat{\omega}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\omega_i \in \Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{i} \widehat{p}_{\omega_j,\omega_i}(\mathbf{x})$



An example of the adopted prediction model



Task & tools

Signatures

Model

Prediction

Training data

Sampling frequency Signature variations

Label space

Discussion

Experiments (1) - Prediction



PLAID Dataset

- +200 instances
- +1000 measurements
- Category-based (11 cat.)
- High frequency (30 kHz)
- Residential dataset (55 homes)
- Prediction Training
 - Validation-based early stopping
 - Building-based validation
 - Leave-house-out cross validation ^[2]
 - Complete (54 houses, 30 kHz, 11 cat.)
- Prediction Evaluation
 - Category-based, F₁- score F1S
 - Building-based, Accuracy α
 - Total accuracy: $\alpha = 0.89\%$



Three best/worst predicted categories

[2] J. Gao, E. C. Kara, S. Giri, and M. Berg'es, "A feasibility study of automated plug-load identification from high frequency measurements". In proceedings of the 3rd IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP):220–224, Dec. 2015.



Task & tools

Signatures

Model

Prediction

Training data

Sampling frequency Signature variations

Label space

Discussion

Experiments (2) - Training data



- Building-based reduction
- Training on a ratio r of labeled data
- Sampling frequency $f_s = 30$ kHz
- Test sample: last period of each measurement
 - Label space $|\Omega| = 11$ categories

Notable degradation w.r.t training data





Experiments (3) - Sampling frequency
Complete training data (54 buildings)

Resampled signals

Introduction

Task & tools

Signatures

Prediction

Training data

frequency

variations

University

Label space

Discussion

Model

Sampling

Signature

- **Sampling frequency** $f_s = 2.5 30$ kHz
- Test sample: last period of each measurement
- Label space $|\Omega| = 11$ categories
- Almost stable for a wide range
 - Always +80%





(8/11) 14th May. 2016



Task & tools

Signatures

Model

Prediction

Training data

Sampling frequency Signature

variations

Label space

Discussion

Experiments (5) - Label space

- Complete training data (54 buildings)
- Sampling frequency $f_s = 30$ kHz
- Test sample: last period of each measurement
- Label space
 - A list of appliances in each building is known
 - A per-building label space $\widehat{\Omega}_h$
- Useful information but not always available.
 - Total accuracy: $\alpha \cong 95\%$





Introduction	Discussion		ISS
Task & tools			- All and the second se
Signatures			
Model			
Prediction			
Training data			
Sampling frequency			
Signature variations		Thank you	
Label space		for your attention	
Discussion		for your accention	
L. Mauch Stuttgar Universit	h rt ity		(11/11) 14 th May. 2016