

# Transient Signature Detection of Appliances for Household Energy Consumption Disaggregation

Kyung Woo Min, Min Lwin, Surya Santoso  
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
The University of Texas at Austin

Title is too long and difficult to capture

real and reactive power time series data.

**Abstract**—Even with advances in smart grid technology and a growing demand for cost-effective energy consumption, detailed information about energy usage is often not available for residential electricity consumers. One reason is that household energy usage is monitored at no more than a single point by the utility, only providing information on the aggregate power consumption. In this paper, we attempt to disaggregate energy usage data into specific appliances from single-point sensing measurements. Our method involves extracting turn-on and turn-off signature windows from time-series real and reactive power data to obtain transient characteristics of each appliance. We focus on determining the appropriate window size for each appliance in order to capture unique signatures. We present the results of our approach on a publicly available dataset.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The objective of residential non-intrusive load monitoring (NILM) is to monitor the major loads in a home from a single-point. The alternative is to monitor each appliance individually, however, this scheme typically adds significant cost. Therefore, the challenge with NILM is to accurately disaggregate household energy consumption into the individual appliance level with data from single-point measurements.

Prior research in the area of NILM has focused on the use of aggregate power consumption patterns as features to identify what appliance is being used and how much energy it is consuming. For example, the authors in [1] discuss various approaches in NILM, including detecting changes in steady-state power measurements and characterizing them as different events. Some challenges reported by the authors include different loads not exhibiting unique signatures in the 2D feature space and the difficulty in determining steady-state features due to turn-on transient noise. Some recommended advanced techniques are to include the 3rd order harmonics as a feature and using turn-on transients for event detection. The methodology in [2]–[9] follows a similar strategy, however, the training and test data are manually generated, resulting in a clean dataset that may not be representative of real household energy usage patterns. Furthermore, the classification can become challenging if the number of appliances in the home is large. Additionally, the signature of some appliances may drift or vary over time due to operating conditions and the mode in which they are used.

In this paper, we present a method that focuses on extracting turn-on and turn-off signature windows to obtain transient characteristics of each appliance. The transient characteristics are observed from the difference of two moving average

windows from time-series real and reactive power data. We focus on determining the appropriate window length for each appliance in order to capture unique signatures. We present the results of our approach using a publicly available dataset from the Belkin Energy Disaggregation Competition on kaggle.com [10]. The dataset and methodology are described in detail in Section II. Section III describes the approach for extracting signature windows for each appliance from the training data. Section IV describes the cross-validation procedure using the training data. Section V describes application of our approach to the test data. Finally, Section VI discusses results and topics for future

reads awkward

## II. APPROACH

In this section, we describe the dataset that was used and our methodology for detecting appliances in the test data. Because the set of appliances in each home includes multiple small devices with similar steady-state load characteristics, our methodology focuses on identifying the unique features when a device turns on and off (the transient periods). Out of approximately 37 appliances per home, only a small subset of appliances have pronounced steady state features that allow discrimination from other appliances or background noise.

### A. Dataset

In this paper, we utilize the complete dataset from the Belkin Energy Disaggregation Competition hosted on kaggle.com, provided by Belkin Energy [10]. The dataset is publicly available on the competition website and contains single-point sensing measurements of the first five harmonics of rms voltage and current on two phases for four households (labeled H1-H4). The dataset also contains high frequency noise (EMI) data for each household, but is not required with our approach (see further discussion in Section VI). Although both training and test datasets are provided, only the training data provides labels and corresponding timestamps for each appliance. Table I shows the number of distinct appliances in each home and the number of training and test sets provided.

Each training set consists of manually generated power consumption data for each appliance in each home. The training data is a time-series where only one appliance is switched on at a time, although background noise can be present from untagged appliances. Tagging labels in the training data are also provided, however, these are not always precise enough to correctly identify device turn-on and turn-off times. Correction

TABLE I  
NUMBER OF DISTINCT APPLIANCES AND DATASETS FOR EACH HOME

Home No.	Appliances	Training	Test
H1	38	6	4
H2	37	4	4
H3	37	3	4
H4	36	2	4




Fig. 1. Example of (a) training and (b) test data from Home 2. In each plot, real power consumption measured from a single point is shown for both phases.

of tagging labels for training data is therefore needed and is discussed in Section III. Fig.1 shows an example of both training and test data from H2. The observations recorded in each training and test set cover approximately 24 hours.

### B. Methodology

Our goal is to develop an interpretable yet effective classification approach. It can be observed from Fig. 1 (b) that the test data is the aggregated load of multiple appliances. Therefore, at any given time, it is not possible to determine which appliances are operating by using only the level of power consumption. However, when an appliance is turned on or off, a step change is produced in real and reactive power. By comparing the average power consumed before and after these transient events, we can calculate averaged power differences, facilitating discrimination among appliances. For this reason, our methodology focuses on detecting unique turn-on and turn-off signatures in the power differences domain for each appliance. A flow chart of the proposed methodology is shown in Fig. 2.

The first step is to extract transient signature windows for each appliance. Raw data is converted from the power domain ( $P$  and  $Q$ ) into the power differences domain ( $\Delta P_{avg}$  and  $\Delta Q_{avg}$ ) by taking the difference of two moving average windows in  $P$  and  $Q$ . After  $\Delta P_{avg}$  and  $\Delta Q_{avg}$  are calculated, transient signature windows are extracted for each appliance. Choosing the appropriate window length is a key component




Fig. 2. Flow chart of proposed methodology. The procedure is separated into window extraction, cross-validation, and application to test data.

Briefly explain what quantities are being validated. Then refer to section 4

The procedure is explained in detail in Section III. Signature windows are extracted for each appliance and cross-validation is performed. This step involves calculating the root-mean-squared error (RMSE) using the signature window to calculate the root-mean-squared error (RMSE). Turn-on and turn-off events are detected when the RMSE falls below a specified threshold simultaneously for both real and reactive power differences. The ability of each signature window to detect other events of the same appliance in the training data is used to determine if the appliance is detectable or not. If an appliance cannot be detected during cross-validation, it will not be predicted in the test set. The procedure to determine the correct threshold and separability of each appliance is presented in Section IV.

Finally, for the test set, we use the cross-validated signature windows and threshold values to calculate RMSE and detect appliance turn-on and turn-off events. This process is discussed in Section VI.

### III. SIGNATURE WINDOW EXTRACTION

This section describes how transient signature windows are extracted by using averaged real and the reactive power differences. In particular, a pair of turn-on and turn-off signature windows are trained for every event of each appliance in the training data. The following sections describe how the signature windows are extracted.

incandescent

what are kettles?

#### A. Load Types

The appliances are first categorized into three load types based on their load shape in P and Q. The types include rectangular, non-rectangular, and cyclic loads:

1) Rectangular loads: These type of loads consume constant power when operating and their transient period is characterized by a sharp transition from zero to rated power consumption. Their load shapes are generally rectangular and consist of primarily resistive loads, such as lights, heaters, and kettles. Some inductive loads, such as small fans, also exhibit this load shape. A short duration window consisting of the real and the reactive power differences are used to detect these loads.

2) Non-rectangular loads: These type of loads have a longer transient period when turning on and include computers and TVs. Their transient period is characterized by a stepwise transition from zero to rated power consumption. Although the power consumed may be unique, allowing discrimination from other devices. These type of loads require a longer window length to capture the unique transient shape.

3) Cyclical loads: - The amount of real or reactive power consumed by these loads change depending on the operation. Dryers, ovens, and washers are cyclical. However, because they operate in a periodic manner, only a few possible periodic patterns can be identified. A modified approach is used for these type of loads: identifying a unique transient signature during appliance operation.

is this the standard term? I would say power difference series or power difference time series

#### B. Averaged Power Differences

Our approach relies on identifying appliance turn-on and turn-off events by detecting unique transient signatures in real and reactive power consumption. To extract transient signatures for each appliance, the averaged power differences are calculated from two moving average windows. The averaged differences for real power,  $\Delta P_{avg}(n)$ , is defined as,

$$\Delta P_{avg}(n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} P(n-k) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N+D}^{2N+D-1} P(n-k) \quad (1)$$

where  $N$  is the window size and  $D$  is the distance between the two windows. The averaged differences for reactive power,  $\Delta Q_{avg}(n)$ , is calculated using the same  $N$  and  $D$ . It should be noted that if a shorter window size is used, it is easier to distinguish events happening at the same incidence. However, the detector becomes less robust to noise.

Using the averaged power differences to determine true appliance event indices, tagging labels from the raw data are first corrected. A threshold in real power differences is then set to indicate whether an event occurred, (i.e., an event occurred if  $|\Delta P_{avg}(n)| > \text{threshold}$ ). Then the corrected indices are




Fig. 3. Difference of two moving average windows to detect transient signatures.




Fig. 4. Provided tagging labels are corrected in the power differences domain.

used as the actual event index instead of the tagging info provided in the raw data. On the top plot of Fig. 4, the tagging labels of the bedroom lights do not align with the actual event incidence. The bottom plot shows when the first index of the averaged power difference is greater than the threshold; this index is used as the corrected tagging label. It should be noted that some appliances that consume very small real or reactive power are discarded as they cannot be detected. For these appliances, using real and reactive power differences will cause false detections in the test data due to the effects of the noise. Additional features must be considered to detect such appliances.

#### C. Window Extraction

After taking the power differences, the next step is to extract the signatures for turn-on and turn-off events. The windows are extracted using the corrected tagging labels. For rectangular




Fig. 5. Example of how choosing the appropriate window length can affect classification.

load shapes. The window is extracted from the start of the turn-on event until the load reaches steady-state power consumption. If an appliance has longer transient characteristics (non-rectangular load shapes), longer window sizes are used to capture the entire unique transient period. For example, consider the dining room light and the laptop charger profile shown in Fig. 5. Both the appliances consume about 38 W at event incidence. However, the laptop charger then spends additional 38 Watts to fully turn on. Therefore, a longer window length is needed to detect the laptop charger than the dining room lights.

Cyclical loads exhibit unique characteristics that are different from the rectangular and the non-rectangular loads. These types of appliances are detected by using turn-on and turn-off events. Each step change in power consumption during the cycle can be mistaken for other appliances. Therefore, for cyclical loads only, a window is trained to capture unique signatures during their operation. Consider the dryer in Home 2 as shown in Fig. 6. The load shape of the dryer has multiple sharp peaks during its operation. Therefore, a single window can be trained to detect these sharp peaks. In this case, the following rule can be made: "While the recurrent pattern window is detecting an event, the appliance is operating."

Outlier detection is also held during this stage. Consider the four on/off events of a computer as shown in Fig. 7. It can be seen that when event two occurred, some background noise affected the turn-on signature of the computer. In this case, the second event is regarded as an outlier and is not used in training the windows. When the window extraction procedure is complete transient signature windows are defined for all detectable events.

#### IV. CROSS-VALIDATION

In this section, we present the procedure for cross-validating the signature windows trained in Section III in the training

The unit is in service but goes into specific process of drying. It is specific to the unit characteristics.




Fig. 6. Unique Characteristics of Dryers in Home 2.




Fig. 7. Computer turn-on event outlier shown in the 2nd event.

set. The objective of cross-validating the signature windows of each appliance is to verify the ability to detect other events of the same appliance in the training data. The root-mean-squared error (RMSE) is chosen as the metric to determine how well the signature window matches with the measured signal. The equations for calculating RMSE are shown in (2) and (3).

$$\text{RMSE}_P(n) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (w_{i,j}(k) - \Delta P_{avg}(n+k))^2} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{RMSE}_Q(n) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (w_{i,j}(k) - \Delta Q_{avg}(n+k))^2} \quad (3)$$

where  $w_{i,j}$  is the transient signature window for  $j$ -th turn-on or turn-off event for appliance number  $i$ . For each  $w_{i,j}$  the procedure for cross-validation is presented in Fig 2.

Both  $\text{RMSE}_P$  and  $\text{RMSE}_Q$  will simultaneously reach a minimum when the associated appliance turns on or off in the averaged power differences domain. However, other appliances switching on and off can cause  $\text{RMSE}_P$  and  $\text{RMSE}_Q$  value to rise, fall, or stay the same. It is possible that both the RMSE values drop when the window is detecting different






Fig. 8. Cross-validation of appliance "breadmaker" for two events in the training data.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF APPLIANCES VALIDATED AND DISCARDED FOR EACH HOME

Home No.	Total Appliances	Discarded	No. Validated (%)
H1	38	11	27 (71.1%)
H2	37	6	31 (83.8%)
H3	37	5	32 (86.5%)
H4	36	9	27 (75.0%)

appliance. This happens when the signature windows of the two appliances have a very similar shape and amplitude. To prevent this scenario, RMSE thresholds ( $\theta_P$  and  $\theta_Q$ ) are set to prevent other appliances from being detected. If such thresholds ( $\theta_P$  and  $\theta_Q$ ) can not be set, the window is discarded. Figure 8 shows an example of this procedure. The window successfully detects the breadmaker turning-on with all the other events being rejected.

## V. TEST DATA

We then apply our algorithm on the provided test data and identify appliance on and off intervals. The detections are made from the signature windows we extracted from the training set with the threshold values acquired from cross-validation. The algorithm is shown below and is applied for every extracted signature window  $w_{i,j}(n)$ .

### Algorithm 1 Event Detection Algorithm

```

1: for every time instant  $n_0$  do
2:   Calculate  $RMSE_P(n_0)$  and  $RMSE_Q(n_0)$ 
3:   if  $RMSE_P(n_0) < \theta_P$  and  $RMSE_Q(n_0) < \theta_Q$  then
4:     Event is detected at time instant  $n_0$ 
5:   end if
6: end for

```

Although the competition has closed, we are able to submit our predictions and see its rank compared to past submissions. Our best submission would have placed 7th overall. However, the strategy for the test data is modified to achieve the best score. Because scoring is based on average Hamming distance,

thresholds are adjusted so that only the most likely predictions, i.e., low RMSE values are predicted.

## VI. CONCLUSION

From our cross-validation and test data submission results, the proposed strategy can be a simple yet effective method for household energy usage disaggregation. One of the advantages of this approach is that it is more interpretable because it follows an intuitive approach for detecting appliance on and off events. With the proposed approach, misclassifications can be traced back to the signature window length or detection thresholds. This is particularly true when compared to methods utilizing "black box" predictive models such as artificial neural networks. Furthermore, the proposed approach has the ability for real time processing. Because calculations are implemented as sliding windows, data can be streamed into the algorithm. Additionally, this method only utilized a subset of the entire dataset, needing only P and Q measurements. High frequency features could have been added to help classify smaller appliances that were discarded during cross-validation. However, one of the primary drawbacks is that manual identification of appropriate window lengths is required during training. Future work would consider automation of appropriate window lengths.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Laughman, K. Lee, R. Cox, S. Shaw, S. Leeb, L. Norford, and P. Armstrong, "Power signature analysis," *Power and Energy Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 1, pp. 56–63, Mar 2003.
- [2] R. Dong, L. Ratliff, H. Ohlsson, and S. Sastry, "Energy disaggregation via adaptive filtering," in *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2013 51st Annual Allerton Conference on, pp. 173–180, Oct 2013.
- [3] S. Gupta, M. S. Reynolds, and S. N. Patel, "Electrisense: Single-point sensing using emi for electrical event detection and classification in the home," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*, pp. 148, ACM, 2010.
- [4] M. Zeifman, "Disaggregating power signatures," *Communications, Control, and Computing*, pp. 23–31, February 2010.
- [5] G. Hart, "Nonintrusive load monitoring: A tutorial," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grids*, vol. 80, pp. 18–27, 2018.
- [6] S. Shaw, S. Leeb, L. Norford, and S. N. Patel, "Nonintrusive load monitoring and diagnostics in power systems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grids*, vol. 80, pp. 18–27, 2018.
- [7] Y.-H. Lin and M.-S. Chen, "The development of nonintrusive load monitoring system based on bp-ann," in *Computer Communication Control and Automation (3CA)*, 2010 International Symposium on, vol. 2, pp. 215–218, May 2010.
- [8] H.-H. Chang, L.-S. Lin, N. Chen, and W.-J. Lee, "Particle-swarm-optimization-based nonintrusive demand monitoring and load identification in smart meters," *Industry Applications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 49, pp. 2229–2236, Sept 2013.
- [9] H.-H. Chang, K.-L. Lian, Y.-C. Su, and W.-J. Lee, "Power-spectrum-based wavelet transform for nonintrusive demand monitoring and load identification," *Industry Applications, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 50, pp. 2081–2089, May 2014.
- [10] <http://www.kaggle.com/c/belkin-energy-disaggregation-competition>.

I'd like to see specific signatures you extracted from the power difference series for several loads described. Perhaps for dryer, what are the signatures/characteristics you are extracting and their ranges?

I would not mention this.