Metadata: (Real World) Example, Motivation, and Some Implications

WISHI Presentation Feb 5, 2018

Milan Milenkovic, IoTsense and Intel Corporation milan@iotsense.com, milanx.milenkovic@intel.com

Outline

- Industrial-grade (building) example, issues
- Objectives
 - Annotation, context for apps/services (M2M?) understanding
 - (ultimate challenge) How to model complex systems?
 - e.g. building, production line, or factory floor
- Metadata example
- (some) Learnings and observations

(Building) Industry Common Situation

- Commercial buildings, managed by BMS
 - Complex HVAC machinery chillers, heaters, pumps, valves, zones, thermostats
 - Other systems lighting, elevators, fire, security, occupancy
 - Large number of sensors and control points, "smart" 10s thousands
- Current practice: no semantic annotation
 - Point names assigned arbitrarily by installers/integrators, e.g. "zn3-wwfl4"
 - BMS control sequences are custom tailored using those names
 - Completely obscures structural relationships, layout of equipment
 - Each building looks different, even those using the same BMS

Problems

- Expensive, brittle, obscure, error prone, not scalable, prohibitive changes/additions
- Cannot have portable apps and services, e.g. Al, analytics
 - Even across buildings with the same BMS, let alone vendors...

Sensor data and meta-data use

- Sensor "zn3-wwf14"" "77.6" ??
- · Services, analytics, benefit from additional metadata info
 - Is a zone temperature
 - Is an exterior zone
 - Is South facing
 - Is supplied by VAV box
 - Is served by AHU-1
 - Is operated on occupancy schedule #1 (7:30 am 6:30 PM)
 - Has an occupied setpoint of 74 F
- So app can deduce anomaly, activate VAV and AHU-1 to cool until associated temp. sensor shows compliance (zn3---)
 - Also detect rouge zones (heating and cooling simultaneously on), ...

Metadata example (in Haystack notation)

```
//used to denote comments, not official syntax
"id": "150a3c6e-bef0ee0e",
                             // (G) UID
"dis": "zn3-wwf14"
                             //string, for UI display
"sensor": "m:",
                             // marker is Haystack notation for metadata
"temp": "m:",
                             // meta, measures temperature
                             // of air
"air": "m",
"curVal": "n:77.60",
                            // current value
"unit": "F",
                             // measurement unit, F
"zone": "m",
"floor": "n:4",
"scheduleRef": occSchedule1, //links, references
"equipRef": "@AHU-1"
```

Learnings and Observations

- (rich) Metadata needs to be handled in IoT systems
 - Lower cost, flexibility: flexibility to add sensors, new functions, e.g. predictive maintenance; market choices (vs, vendor single source)
 - Facilitate attribute-based search, a la SPARQL
- Common tag naming = pragmatic (almost) semantic substitute
 - Apps and services use common dictionary to "infer" meaning
- Descriptive, not prescriptive
 - Does not mandate which tags to use with which entity BUT
 - defines how to name and structure tags when used
- Metadata in IoT: many variations and combinations, rarely changing = require special treatment?
 - Opt1: allow variable metadata key, value pairs in info models
 - Does not fit well with fixed object structuring with metadata as prescribed properties
 - Opt2: separate APIs/queries to fetch metadata as an overlay?
 - Opt3: xxx?