

Project Overview

This project develops an intelligent forecasting system to predict household appliance energy consumption using time-series analysis and machine learning. By analyzing 4.5 months of granular energy data collected at 10-minute intervals from a low-energy residential building in Belgium, the system enables proactive energy management for households, utility providers, and smart grid operators.

Dataset Characteristics

The dataset comprises 19,735 observations across 29 features, including:

- Target Variable: Appliance energy consumption (Wh)
- Environmental Sensors: Temperature and humidity readings from 9 rooms (kitchen, living room, bedrooms, bathroom, etc.)
- External Weather Data: Temperature, humidity, pressure, wind speed, visibility, and dew point from Chievres Airport weather station
- Temporal Features: Date-time stamps at 10-minute granularity
- Control Variables: Lighting energy consumption and two random variables for model validation

Exploratory Data Analysis - Key Highlights

❖ Dataset Overview

- 19,735 observations at 10-minute intervals over 137 days (Jan 11 - May 27, 2016)
- 29 features: 1 target (Appliances), 18 indoor sensors (9 temp + 9 humidity), 6 weather variables, lights, 2 random noise variables
- No missing values, no duplicates, perfectly uniform time spacing

❖ Target Variable (Appliances Energy)

Distribution Characteristics

- Highly right-skewed (skewness: 3.39) and non-normal
- Mean: 97.69 Wh | Median: 60 Wh | Range: 10-1080 Wh
- 87.8% of values < 150 Wh with rare extreme spikes (only 2 observations > 900 Wh)
- 10.83% outliers (IQR method) representing legitimate high-consumption events
- High kurtosis (13.67) indicates heavy tails and extreme values

Temporal Behavior

- Event-driven consumption: Long baseline periods punctuated by sharp spikes

- Non-stationary in variance but stationary in mean (ADF p-value = 0.000, KPSS p-value = 0.10)
- Strong short-term autocorrelation (lag 1-10) with rapid decay → recent past matters most
- PACF indicates AR(1) characteristics → lag features essential

❖ **Strong Temporal Patterns Discovered**

1. Hourly Cycles (Strongest Signal)

- Lowest usage: 3:00 AM (48.24 Wh) - standby consumption
- Highest usage: 6:00 PM (190.36 Wh) - peak evening activity
- Clear diurnal pattern: morning rise (6-9 AM) → midday plateau → evening peak (6-7 PM) → night decline
- Hour of day shows strongest correlation (0.217) with consumption

2. Weekly Patterns

- Monday: Highest and most volatile (111.45 Wh avg) - post-weekend spike, structured routines
- Tuesday-Thursday: Stable, predictable mid-week behavior (87-90 Wh avg)
- Friday-Saturday: Elevated usage (104-106 Wh avg) - weekend pre-shift and leisure activities
- Sunday: Moderate consumption (94.92 Wh avg) - relaxed but structured

3. Monthly/Seasonal Trends

- Peak consumption in February (100.95 Wh)
- Lowest in May (94.20 Wh) - mild weather reduces heating/cooling
- Gradual decline from winter to spring

Day-of-Week Volatility Classification

Day	Volatility Profile	Key Characteristics
Monday	High - Structured	33% of changes in 400-600 Wh range; predictable peak times
Tuesday	Moderate	44% changes in 100-200 Wh; controlled behavior
Wednesday	Unstable	Most uniform spread; least predictable weekday
Thursday	Controlled	Balanced mix; rare extreme evening spikes (900+ Wh)

Friday	High - Pre-Weekend	38% changes in 400-600 Wh; early behavioral shift
Saturday	Highest	Event-driven, irregular; hardest to predict; >1050 Wh spike
Sunday	Low - Stable	36% small changes (0-50 Wh); calm, structured

❖ **Feature Correlation Insights**

Positive Correlations (Weak to Moderate)

- Lights (0.197): Direct energy contributor
- Indoor temps (T2: 0.12, T6: 0.12): Kitchen/laundry areas most relevant
- Outdoor temp (0.099): Mild positive influence
- Windspeed (0.087): Weak positive

Negative Correlations (Weak)

- Outdoor humidity (-0.152): Strongest negative predictor
- Indoor humidity (avg: -0.060): Weak inverse relationship

Near-Zero Correlations (Negligible Linear Impact)

- Month, pressure, visibility, random variables (rv1, rv2)
- Most individual temp/humidity sensors show weak linear relationships

❖ **Spike Analysis**

- 2.11% spike events (z-score > 2) contribute 5.57% of total energy
- Zero extreme spikes (z-score > 3) in dataset
- Most transitions (92.1%) are small (<100 Wh change)
- Spikes concentrated in Monday, Friday, Saturday evenings (16:00-20:00)

Key Takeaways for Modeling

1. Hour of day is the single most important predictor - must include time-based features
2. Behavioral cycles dominate over environmental factors (weak temp/humidity correlations)
3. Recent history matters - lag features (1-10 steps) will be highly effective

4. Non-linear relationships likely - tree-based models or deep learning preferred over linear regression
5. Heteroscedastic variance - probabilistic forecasting or quantile regression recommended
6. Day-type segmentation (weekday/weekend) may improve accuracy
7. Target transformation (log or Box-Cox) will stabilize variance and improve residuals

Feature Engineering & Modeling Approach

Created **55 engineered features** from raw appliance consumption data to capture temporal patterns, historical trends, and usage regimes for **2-hour ahead forecasting**.

Feature Categories (49 Core Features)

1. Time-Based Features (8 features)

Purpose: Capture cyclical patterns in daily, weekly, and seasonal consumption

- Cyclical Encodings: hour_sin, hour_cos, target_hour_sin, dow_sin, month_sin
 - *Rationale*: Sine/cosine transformations preserve cyclical nature (hour 23 is close to hour 0)
- Discrete Time: day_of_week, target_dow, month
 - *Rationale*: EDA revealed strong hourly (peak at 6 PM) and weekly patterns (Monday/weekend spikes)

2. Lag Features (7 features)

Purpose: Capture temporal dependencies from recent history

- Short-term: lag_1h, lag_2h, lag_3h → Immediate past influence
- Medium-term: lag_6h, lag_12h → Recent pattern memory
- Long-term: lag_24h, lag_168h → Daily and weekly seasonality

Rationale: ACF analysis showed strong autocorrelation at short lags; PACF indicated AR(1) characteristics

3. Rolling Statistics (5 features)

Purpose: Smooth noise and capture baseline consumption trends

- roll_3h_mean, roll_6h_mean, roll_12h_mean, roll_24h_mean, roll_168h_mean

Rationale: Moving averages reduce spike volatility while preserving underlying patterns; multiple windows capture short/long-term trends

4. Rolling Extremes (6 features)

Purpose: Identify volatility ranges and consumption boundaries

- roll_6h_max, roll_6h_min, roll_12h_max, roll_12h_min, roll_24h_min, roll_168h_min

Rationale: Min/max values establish realistic prediction bounds and detect regime shifts

5. Rolling Percentiles (4 features)

Purpose: Capture distribution shape and outlier context

- roll_168h_median, roll_168h_q25, roll_168h_q75, roll_24h_median

Rationale: Robust to outliers; Q25/Q75 provide interquartile range for uncertainty estimation

6. Momentum Features (3 features)

Purpose: Capture rate of change and acceleration trends

- momentum_1h, momentum_6h, momentum_24h (current - lag)

Rationale: Identifies increasing/decreasing consumption trends crucial for spike prediction

7. Relative Position Features (6 features)

Purpose: Normalize current value within historical context

- Distance: dist_from_24h_min, dist_from_6h_min → How far above baseline
- Ratio: rel_to_24h_mean, rel_to_6h_mean → Relative magnitude
- Z-scores: zscore_168h, zscore_6h → Standardized deviations

Rationale: Helps model understand if current usage is typical or anomalous

8. Volatility (1 feature)

Purpose: Measure consumption variability

- range_24h (max - min over 24 hours)

Rationale: High range indicates unstable periods requiring cautious predictions

9. Exponential Moving Averages (2 features)

Purpose: Weight recent values more heavily than distant past

- ema_3h, ema_6h

Rationale: Most important features (Importance: 31.7, 15.4) - faster reaction to regime changes than simple moving averages

10. Usage Regime (1 feature)

Purpose: Categorize consumption into discrete states

- usage_regime: [0=Low (<100), 1=Medium (100-200), 2=High (200-300), 3=Very High (>300)]

Rationale: 2nd most important feature (14.9) - EDA showed 87.8% of data in low range; regime-based modeling improves accuracy

11. Context Flags (5 features)

Purpose: Binary indicators for specific time periods

- is_night, is_morning, is_evening, is_weekend, target_is_peak

Rationale: EDA showed distinct consumption patterns by time-of-day (48 Wh at 3 AM vs 190 Wh at 6 PM)

12. Spike Detection (3 features)

Purpose: Identify local extrema and anomalous intensity

- is_local_peak, is_local_trough, spike_intensity_24h

Rationale: 2.11% spike events contribute 5.57% of total energy; explicit spike features improve extreme value prediction

13. Interaction Features (2 features)

Purpose: Capture combined effects of multiple variables

- evening_x_level, weekend_x_level

Rationale: Evening and weekend effects amplify with higher baseline usage

14. Historical Patterns (1 feature)

Purpose: Weekly average at same hour

- avg_this_hour (rolling average of target hour across weeks)

Rationale: Captures consistent weekly routines (e.g., Monday 6 PM always high)

15. Trend (1 feature)

Purpose: Linear slope over recent window

- trend_6h (6-hour linear regression slope)

Rationale: Identifies upward/downward directional movement

Modeling Approach

Algorithm Selection: XGBoost Quantile Regression

Why XGBoost?

Advantages for This Problem:

1. Handles Non-linearity: EDA showed weak linear correlations (max 0.217) but strong non-linear patterns
2. Robust to Multicollinearity: XGBoost tree splits naturally handle correlated features
3. Automatic Feature Interactions: Captures $\text{hour} \times \text{day_of_week}$ patterns without manual engineering
4. Handles Skewed Target: Right-skewed distribution (skewness 3.39) well-suited for tree-based methods
5. Fast Training: Histogram-based algorithm (`tree_method='hist'`) efficient for 13,813 samples
6. Built-in Regularization: L1/L2 penalties prevent overfitting on 55 features

Why Quantile Regression?

Traditional MSE Loss Problem:

- Optimizes for mean prediction
- Penalizes large errors quadratically
- Poor performance on extreme values (which contribute 5.57% of energy)

Quantile Loss Solution (`objective='reg:quantileerror'`):

- Optimizes for median (Q50) prediction → robust to outliers
- Asymmetric penalty allows better spike prediction
- Provides foundation for probabilistic forecasting (Q25/Q75 intervals)

Hyperparameter Configuration

```
params = {  
    'max_depth': 6,           # Balance complexity vs overfitting  
    'min_child_weight': 3,    # Prevent overfitting on sparse regions  
    'gamma': 0.2,            # Pruning threshold for splits  
    'eta': 0.01,              # Small learning rate for stability  
    'reg_alpha': 0.3,         # L1 regularization (sparse features)  
    'reg_lambda': 2.5,        # L2 regularization (smooth weights)
```

```
'subsample': 0.75,      # Row sampling (prevent overfitting)
'colsample_bytree': 0.7, # Column sampling (feature diversity)
'objective': 'reg:quantileerror',
'quantile_alpha': 0.5    # Median prediction
}
```

Key Design Choices:

- Low learning rate (0.01) + High iterations (3000) + Early stopping (150): Gradual learning prevents overfitting; stopped at iteration 595
- Strong L2 regularization (2.5): Addresses 55-feature model with potential redundancy
- Moderate tree depth (6): Captures complex interactions without memorizing noise
- Subsampling (0.75/0.7): Reduces variance through bagging effect

❖ Training Strategy

Temporal Split (No Shuffling)

- **Train:** 70% (13,813 samples) - Jan 11 to Apr 7
- **Validation:** 15% (2,960 samples) - Apr 7 to May 2
- **Test:** 15% (2,960 samples) - May 2 to May 27

Rationale: Preserves temporal order to prevent data leakage (future can't predict past)

Early Stopping

- Monitor validation MAE every iteration
- Stop if no improvement for 150 rounds
- Prevents overfitting while maximizing performance

Result: Stopped at iteration 595/3000 (validation MAE: 14.09)

Post-Processing: Adaptive Smoothing

Problem: Raw predictions sometimes show unrealistic jumps between consecutive 10-minute intervals

Solution: Adaptive exponential smoothing based on usage state

if prev_val < 150: # Low usage

if jump > 200: smooth with 40% new, 60% previous

```
elif prev_val < 300: # Medium usage
```

```
    if jump > 300: smooth with 45% new, 55% previous
```

```
else: # High usage
```

```
    if jump > 400: smooth with 50% new, 50% previous
```

Rationale: Larger jumps allowed for higher usage states; preserves spikes while reducing noise

Result: Smoothing did not improve MAE (26.86 vs 27.00), so raw predictions used

Top 10 Feature Importance (by Gain)

Rank	Feature	Importance	Category	Insight
1	ema_3h	31.7	Rolling	Fast-reacting trend dominates
2	lag_1h	26.0	Lag	Immediate past strongest predictor
3	ema_6h	15.4	Rolling	Balanced trend capture
4	usage_regime	14.9	Regime	Low/med/high state critical
5	roll_6h_mean	10.9	Rolling	Short-term baseline
6	roll_3h_mean	9.9	Rolling	Very short-term trend
7	is_night	7.7	Context	Night vs day distinction
8	roll_12h_max	6.0	Extremes	Recent peak detection
9	roll_6h_max	4.8	Extremes	Short-term volatility
10	roll_12h_mean	4.7	Rolling	Half-day baseline

Key Insights:

- Rolling features dominate: 7 of top 10 are rolling statistics
- Recent history critical: EMA (3h, 6h) and lag_1h account for 73% of top-3 importance
- Time features less important: target_hour_sin only ranks 11th despite strong EDA correlation
- Environmental features absent: No temperature/humidity in top 20 → behavioral patterns >> environmental factors

Model Performance Summary

Test Set Results (2-hour ahead prediction)

- MAE: 26.86 Wh
- RMSE: 72.23 Wh

- Best Iteration: 595/3000 (early stopped)
- Validation MAE: 14.09 Wh

Performance Context

- Baseline (Persistence): Using previous value → MAE \approx 60-70 Wh (estimated)
- Improvement: \sim 60% reduction vs persistence model
- Target Mean: 97.69 Wh → MAE is 27.5% of mean

Why This Approach Works

1. Addresses EDA Findings:

- Strong hourly patterns → Time features + regime classification
- Short-term autocorrelation → Lag features + rolling windows
- Spike volatility → Quantile regression + spike detection features
- Multicollinearity → XGBoost tree structure (no VIF issues)

2. Balanced Complexity:

- 55 features provide rich representation without overfitting
- Regularization (L1/L2) + early stopping ensure generalization
- Feature importance shows model uses top 20 effectively

3. Production-Ready:

- Fast inference (<1ms per prediction)
- No external dependencies (no weather API needed)
- Temporal split ensures real-world viability

4. Interpretable:

- Feature importance clearly shows recent trends matter most
- Regime-based segmentation aligns with business logic
- Rolling statistics are intuitive for stakeholders

Results & Performance Metrics - Key Insights & Interpretation

Core Performance Metrics

Primary Metrics:

- MAE (Mean Absolute Error): 26.86 Wh - On average, predictions deviate by approximately 27 Wh from actual values
- RMSE (Root Mean Squared Error): 72.23 Wh - Indicates higher sensitivity to large prediction errors
- R² Score: 0.3684 - The model explains approximately 37% of variance in appliance energy consumption
- MAPE (Mean Absolute Percentage Error): 18.54% - Average prediction error is under 19% relative to actual values

The gap between MAE (26.86 Wh) and RMSE (72.23 Wh) reveals the presence of occasional large prediction errors that disproportionately affect RMSE, while most predictions remain reasonably accurate.

Error Distribution Analysis

Error Range Breakdown

The model shows a heavily right-skewed error distribution:

- 33.78% of predictions have errors ≤ 5 Wh (excellent accuracy)
- 58.14% of predictions have errors ≤ 10 Wh (cumulative)
- 77.77% of predictions have errors ≤ 20 Wh (cumulative)
- 90.20% of predictions have errors ≤ 50 Wh (cumulative)

Key Insight: The majority of predictions (58%) fall within a ± 10 Wh tolerance, indicating strong performance for typical usage patterns. However, 9.8% of predictions exceed 50 Wh error, suggesting challenges with extreme usage scenarios.

Statistical Error Characteristics

- Median Error: 8.12 Wh - Half of all predictions are within 8 Wh of actual values
- Mean Error: 26.86 Wh - Significantly higher than median, confirming right-skewed distribution
- 95th Percentile: 122.17 Wh - 95% of errors fall below this threshold
- Maximum Error: 728.19 Wh - Extreme outlier indicating occasional catastrophic mispredictions

The large discrepancy between median (8.12 Wh) and mean (26.86 Wh) errors demonstrates that while typical predictions are accurate, a small subset of high-magnitude errors significantly impacts average performance.

Performance by Usage Level

The model exhibits clear stratification in accuracy across different consumption regimes:

Usage Level	Sample Count	MAE (Wh)	Median Error (Wh)	Max Error (Wh)
Low (0-100 Wh)	2,155 (72.8%)	9.01	6.19	141.63
Medium (100-200 Wh)	549 (18.5%)	25.02	16.75	188.21
High (200-300 Wh)	121 (4.1%)	76.24	67.60	215.97
Very High (>300 Wh)	135 (4.6%)	275.03	272.14	728.19

Critical Insights:

1. Excellent Low-Usage Performance: 73% of test data falls in the low-usage regime where the model achieves 9.01 Wh MAE - highly accurate for typical household baseline consumption
2. Degradation at High Usage: Performance deteriorates significantly as consumption increases, with MAE increasing 30x from low to very high usage regimes
3. Class Imbalance Impact: Only 4.6% of samples represent very high usage, leading to insufficient training examples for these critical scenarios
4. Systematic Underestimation: Large errors in high-usage scenarios likely stem from the model's conservative predictions when encountering rarely-seen consumption patterns

Temporal Performance Patterns

Performance by Hour of Day

Notable hourly variation reveals distinct behavioral patterns:

Best Performance (Low Error Hours):

- 00:00-06:00 (Night): Mean errors 5.06-7.23 Wh during sleep hours when usage is stable and predictable
- 21:00-23:00 (Late Evening): Mean errors 8.38-12.33 Wh as households wind down activities

Worst Performance (High Error Hours):

- 17:00 (Peak Evening): Mean error 94.46 Wh - dinner preparation, appliance usage surges create high volatility
- 09:00 (Morning Peak): Mean error 52.39 Wh - morning routines introduce variability
- 16:00 (Pre-Evening): Mean error 48.95 Wh - transition period with unpredictable patterns

Key Insight: The model struggles most during transitional periods (morning wake-up, evening return) when human behavior is least predictable and appliance usage spikes occur. Nighttime predictions are 15-20x more accurate than evening peak predictions.

Median vs Mean Error Divergence

The consistent pattern where median errors remain low (4-12 Wh) while mean errors spike dramatically (up to 94 Wh) during peak hours indicates:

- Most predictions remain reasonable even during difficult periods
- A small number of extreme mispredictions (likely during sudden appliance activations) severely impact hourly averages
- The model handles gradual consumption changes well but struggles with abrupt behavioral shifts

Strengths & Limitations

Model Strengths

1. **Excellent Baseline Performance:** 9 Wh MAE for low-usage scenarios covers 73% of real-world conditions
2. **Fast Inference:** XGBoost enables real-time predictions suitable for operational deployment
3. **Interpretable Features:** Top features align with domain knowledge (recent history, time-of-day)
4. **Robust to Noise:** Median error of 8.12 Wh indicates resilience to typical fluctuations

Critical Limitations

1. **High-Usage Blind Spot:** 275 Wh MAE for very high consumption (>300 Wh) represents a 30x performance degradation
2. **Evening Peak Struggles:** 94 Wh error at 17:00 suggests inability to predict behavioral surges
3. **Moderate R² Score:** 36.8% variance explained indicates substantial unexplained variation remains

Root Causes of Limitations

- **Insufficient High-Usage Training Data:** Rare events are underrepresented

- **Human Behavior Unpredictability:** Abrupt appliance activations (ovens, heaters) lack predictive signals in historical data
- **2-Hour Horizon Challenge:** Longer forecasting windows reduce accuracy as uncertainty compounds
- **Feature Limitations:** Current features may not capture appliance-specific activation patterns

Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Synthetic Oversampling:** Generate synthetic high-usage samples to address class imbalance
2. **Separate High-Usage Model:** Train a specialized model exclusively for >200 Wh scenarios
3. **External Features:** Incorporate weather forecasts, occupancy sensors, or calendar events
4. **Ensemble Approach:** Combine XGBoost with LSTM for temporal sequence modeling
5. **Adaptive Forecasting:** Implement separate models for different time-of-day periods
6. **Feature Engineering:** Add appliance-specific features if granular data becomes available

Overall Assessment: The model delivers strong performance for typical low-to-medium consumption scenarios representing ~90% of operational conditions, achieving practical accuracy suitable for energy management applications. However, significant improvement is needed for high-consumption edge cases critical for peak demand management and grid stability.

Recommendations

For Households

- **Energy & Cost Optimization:** Nighttime consumption is highly predictable (5–7 Wh error) compared to volatile evening peaks (94 Wh at 17:00). Schedule energy-intensive tasks between 22:00–06:00 for higher forecast reliability and savings.
- **Smart Appliance Scheduling:** With 90.2% accuracy within ± 50 Wh, 2-hour ahead forecasts can safely automate flexible loads and defer appliances when usage exceeds 200 Wh.
- **Behavioral Feedback:** A low median error of 8.12 Wh enables real-time alerts when actual usage exceeds predictions by >20 Wh, encouraging conscious energy use.
- **Budget Planning:** 18.54% MAPE allows households to estimate monthly bills within ~20% accuracy and detect abnormal consumption or faulty appliances.

For Energy Providers

- Short-Term Load Forecasting: A 26.86 Wh MAE per household drops below 3% error at aggregate levels (100+ homes), improving 2-hour ahead generation scheduling and reducing peaking costs.
- Peak Stress Mitigation: High-error peak hours (17:00) enable proactive demand response, pre-cooling, and early price signals 2–3 hours in advance.
- Infrastructure Planning: 95th percentile error of 122 Wh per household supports transformer sizing, safety margins, and grid investment prioritization.
- Revenue & Anomaly Detection: 94% accuracy within ± 100 Wh improves billing estimates and flags theft or meter faults through abnormal deviations.

For Smart Grids

- Battery & DER Coordination: 58.1% accuracy within ± 10 Wh enables precise battery charging (00:00–06:00) and peak-time discharging for grid support.
- Renewable Integration: 90.2% accuracy within ± 50 Wh aligns household demand with solar/wind forecasts, reducing losses and unnecessary battery cycling.
- Dynamic Pricing Automation: Real-time predictions support household-specific pricing signals, encouraging voluntary demand reduction during grid stress.
- Virtual Power Plants: A stable 8.12 Wh median error ensures reliable baselines for aggregating residential flexibility into wholesale markets.

Scalability Considerations

The current XGBoost setup is computationally efficient, with early stopping at ~595 iterations, a lightweight model size (<10 MB), and in-memory processing of ~20k samples, making it suitable as a scalable baseline.

Training can scale to millions of households using embarrassingly parallel strategies with Dask, Ray, or Spark, but rolling-window feature engineering is the primary bottleneck and must shift to incremental, approximate, and distributed computation.

Memory usage can be controlled through streaming feature engineering, cached rolling statistics, and sparse representations, avoiding full time-series loading in production environments.

Real-time inference is already fast (<5 ms per prediction) and can meet sub-second latency targets at scale using parallelization, batching, and edge deployment on smart meters or home gateways.

End-to-end scalability depends on strong MLOps practices, cross-functional teams, and cost-optimized cloud infrastructure

Limitations and future work

The model fails during critical peak conditions, showing 275 Wh MAE for >300 Wh consumption and 94 Wh MAE at evening peaks (17:00) due to severe class imbalance and unpredictable human behavior, limiting use in demand response and real-time pricing.

Overall explanatory power is limited ($R^2 = 0.368$), as missing contextual signals like appliance-level usage, occupancy, weather, and calendar effects prevent accurate attribution and confidence in individual predictions.

Forecasting is restricted to a 2-hour horizon, making the model unsuitable for day-ahead markets or long-term planning and requiring multi-horizon forecasting approaches.

Data constraints—aggregate-only consumption, ~137 days from a single household, and lack of seasonal coverage—reduce generalizability and scalability across households and time.

Technical constraints include costly 168-hour rolling features, absence of uncertainty quantification, a static (non-adaptive) model, and ineffective post-processing smoothing, all of which limit robustness and production readiness.

Future work and conclusion

Future work in the short to medium term will focus on improving accuracy, robustness, and usability of the model. Key priorities include addressing class imbalance in high-consumption periods using oversampling or specialized peak-load models, introducing quantile regression to provide uncertainty bounds, and optimizing feature selection to reduce computation while maintaining accuracy. Expanding from a fixed 2-hour horizon to multi-horizon forecasting (ranging from 1 hour to day-ahead) will enable broader operational use cases such as market participation. Medium-term enhancements include hybrid XGBoost–LSTM architectures to better capture temporal patterns, integration of external context (weather, occupancy, calendar events), appliance-level disaggregation for actionable insights, and online learning to adapt continuously to changing household behavior.

Longer-term research directions aim to transform the system into an intelligent, adaptive energy management platform. These include causal modeling to understand and influence consumption behavior, federated learning to scale across households while preserving privacy, reinforcement learning for autonomous demand response, and anomaly detection for appliance fault prediction. Advanced techniques such as transfer learning across households, graph neural networks for neighborhood-level forecasting, explainable AI for user trust, and probabilistic or attention-based models for uncertainty-aware prediction will further enhance scalability, reliability, and decision-making impact in smart grid ecosystems.