INDiC: Improved Non-Intrusive load monitoring using Division and Calibration

Nipun Batra
Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology
India

Author2
Twentieth Century Fox
Springfield, USA
Email: homer@thesimpsons.com

James Kirk
Starfleet Academy
San Francisco, California 96678-2391
Fax: (888) 555–1212

***Abstract*—The residential sector contributes significantly to overall energy consumption in most parts of the world. This is a growing concern as energy resources are limited and increased energy demands negatively impacts the environment [1]. Providing detailed feedback in the form of appliance level consumption to building occupants improves awareness and paves the way for reduction in electricity consumption. Non-intrusive appliance load monitoring (NIALM) is the process of disaggregating the overall home electricity usage measured at the meter level into constituent appliances with minimum in-home intrusion. In this paper we present Improved Non-Intrusive load monitoring using Division and Calibration (INDiC) which provides preprocessing steps to simplify NIALM by dividing the appliances across multiple instrumented points (meters/phases) and calibrating appliance power. The technique is presented in the Combinatorial Optimization (CO) framework and evaluated on the popular REDD dataset. Empirical results suggest significant improvement both in computation time and accuracy by using INDiC.**

I. Introduction

Buildings account for significant proportion of overall energy use in both the developing (e.g. 47% of total energy in India [2]) and the developed (e.g. 41% and 45% in US and UK respectively) countries. Modest improvements in building energy use can result in significant aggregate impact at the national scale. While several automation and management systems have been proposed for improving the operational efficiency of building systems, such systems typically lack the ability to provide detailed consumption information (e.g. appliance level consumption). Prior work [3] has shown that better feedback systems, enabling appliance level consumption, that provide insights about occupant's energy usage information further encourages energy saving behavior resulting in 5-15% savings in electricity usage.

Measuring each appliance's consumption separately, for providing such a feedback, is both prohibitively expensive and difficult to manage. Alternatively, prior research has proposed Non Intrusive Appliance Load Monitoring (NIALM) that involves disaggregating the aggregated electricity consumption obtained at the meter level into individual appliance consumption. Several modeling and inference approaches have been proposed (e.g. Factorial Hidden Markov Model [4], Combinatorial Optimization [5]) in the past to address NIALM with varied level of accuracy. NIALM work typically assumes that all the loads are assigned to the same meter. However, many practical scenarios (e.g. use of 2-phase supply in many homes in USA and 3-phase supply for many homes in India) involve load division across different phases coming at the home level. Automated assignment of different loads in a home to each phase followed by NIALM application on each phase separately can reduce the overall modeling and inference complexity.

Further, the measurements, both at the meter level and at the appliance level, are often taken with different equipments (Current Transformers, in-line measurements, ICs[1]) each with their own accuracy levels. Calibrating these diverse measurements will be beneficial for NIALM modeling and inference. Grid conditions such as voltage fluctuations further motivate calibration. Motivated by these practical scenarios, we propose INDiC- **I**mproved **N**IALM using load **Di**vision and **C**alibration. Specific research contributions of our work are:

- Novel approach named INDiC that involves two simple pre-processing steps - Load division (i.e. automated assignment of different loads in a home to each of the separate mains) and calibration (accounting for varied measurement accuracy across different equipments), that can be applied in a generic manner across several proposed NIALM modeling and inference approaches to further improve their accuracy.
- Extensive empirical validation, using publicly available REDD [6] dataset, establishing the effectiveness of INDiC as a preprocessing step, specifically for Combinatorial Optimization based NIALM.
- Release of open source implementation of the proposed work[2] for comparative analysis with other NIALM approaches as an IPython notebook[3].

We believe that this is the first extensive release of a generic NIALM code base that can be used across many of the publicly available datasets and with several existing NIALM modeling and inference approaches.

II. Related work

Non-intrusive appliance load monitoring was first studied by Hart [5] in the early 1990s by examining signatures in aggregated load to indicate activities of appliances. The problem has been well studied in recent years ([7], [1], [8]) and NIALM systems can broadly be divided into two categories based on

[1]Example IC for power measurement is Maxim 78M6612
[2]Add link to website
[3]http://www.ipython.org

whether supervised or unsupervised disaggregation methods are used. Supervised learning techniques include optimization-based methods such as integer programming [9] and genetic algorithms [10]. These approaches are compute intensive and appliances with similar or overlapping load signatures are difficult to discern. Other machine learning techniques (such as Artificial Neural Network (ANNs) [11] and Hidden Markov Models (HMM) [12]), have also been shown to work well for the task. Variants of HMMs such as factorial hidden Markov models (FHMMs) [4], additive FHMMs [13], conditional factorial hidden semi-Markov models [14] and difference HMMs [15] have been studied. In factorial HMMs several models evolve independently and in parallel and the observed output is some joint function of all the hidden states; additive HMMs allow emission of a single real-valued (unobserved) output from each HMM and the output is the sum of these HMMs. In difference HMMs [15] each appliance's load is modeled using a graphical model and it is disaggregated from the aggregate power – this process is repeated iteratively until all appliances for which general models are available are disaggregated. It is therefore possible to infer the probability that a change in aggregated power was generated by two consecutive states of an appliance. The applicability of these sophisticated techniques are generally hindered by the difficulty of inference from models with a large number of HMMs. Rahayu et. al. [16] propose a discriminative model for energy disaggregation that predicts the most likely appliance state configuration from aggregated load using nonparametric classification algorithms. They posit that "subset sum" type techniques are not very effective since a large portion of the home energy is not monitored directly. In this paper, we put forward a simple idea – the aggregated load can be further split up by information on mains and knowing which appliance is assigned to which main. This would make the task of disaggregation inherently easier by solving a simpler optimization problem and most of the above sophisticated machine learning based modeling approaches can still be applied to the task[4].

Several datasets have been made publicly available for benchmarking energy disaggregation algorithms including REDD[6], Blued[17], Pecan[18] and Smart*[19]. Our empirical analysis is on the REDD data primarily because this is the most popular data set for evaluating state-of-the-art NIALM approaches.

III. NIALM

A typical NIALM setup involves measuring the power mains with smart meters and individual appliances with appliance meters for ground truth. The NIALM problem in the supervised setting is formulated as predicting the power sequence for n^{th} appliance, y^n, given the measured power sequence for each appliance θ^n (measured via appliance meters) and the total aggregate power sequence x (measured via smart meters). Remaining terminologies and functions are defined in Table I [6], [15], [5]. Figure 1 shows the process of disaggregation applied to a house mains, whereby the consumption patterns of 3 appliances: refrigerator, lighting and microwave can be seen. It must be highlighted that it is improbable to instrument all the appliances in a home, thus, there will be some unaccounted power, which can also be seen in the figure. We now explain

[4]The use of combinatorial optimization is only for the purpose of illustration and there is clearly no requirement to adhere to this modeling technique alone.



(a) Aggregate home power measured by smart meter

(b) Aggregate home power disaggregated into 3 appliances: refrigerator, lighting and microwave. Some power is unaccounted as complete information about all appliances is not available.

Fig. 1: Disaggregating a home's electrical mains

Combinatorial optimization which was proposed by Hart [5] for solving NIALM.

TABLE I: Terminologies and Functions

Symbol	Meaning
$t \in 1,..T$	Time slice
$n \in 1,..N$	Appliance number
$\theta^n = \{\theta_1^n, ..., \theta_T^n\}$	Measured power sequence for n^{th} appliance
$\theta^{M_1} = \{\theta_1^{M_1}, ..., \theta_T^{M_1}\}$	Measured power sequence for Mains 1
$\theta^{M_2} = \{\theta_1^{M_2}, ..., \theta_T^{M_2}\}$	Measured power sequence for Mains 2
$x = \{x_1, .., x_T\} = \theta^{M_1} + \theta^{M_2}$	Measured aggregate power sequence
$e = \{e_1, ..., e_T\}$	Aggregate noise power sequence
p	Number of electrical mains in a home
$N_i \; where \; i \in 1, p$	Number of loads in i^{th} mains
$y^n = \{y_1^n, ..y_T^n\}$	Predicted power sequence for n^{th} appliance
$k \in 1,..K$	Appliance power state eg. Stove has 2 states: On and Off
$z^n = \{z_1^n, ..z_T^n\}$	Appliance state sequence for n^{th} appliance,$z_i^n \in [1,..K]$
$z_{t,k}^n \in 0, 1$	Whether n^{th} appliance is in k^{th} state at time t
$\mu^n = \{\mu_1^n, ..\mu_K^n\}$	Power draw by n^{th} appliance in k^{th} state
θ_{k^1,k^2}^n	Measured power sequence when n^{th} appliance transitions from k^1 to k^2 state
$Mapping[n] \in M_i$ where $i \in 1, 2$	Mapping of n^{th} appliance to i^{th} Mains
s_t	Value of a timeseries s at time t
$Event(s, threshold)$	An event in timeseries s occurs when $\lvert s_t - s_{t-1}\rvert > threshold$ An event has an associated $time \; t$ and $magnitude \; \lvert s_t - s_{t-1}\rvert$
$Downsample(s, filter, resolution)$	Function to downsample a timeseries s to a $resolution$ according to specified $filter$
$Timeseries\_sync([s^1, ..s^n], method)$	Function to ensure that n timeseries start and end at same times and handling missing data using specified $method$
$Sort([s^1, ..s^n], parameter, order)$	Function to sort n timeseries according to $parameter$ in specified $order$
$Event\_Detection(s, threshold)$	Function returning magnitude and times of $Events(s, threshold)$ in timeseries s
$Cluster(s, K, clustering\_algorithm$	Function to divide timeseries s into K clusters based on $clustering\_algorithm$

Combinatorial Optimization(CO): At a given time an appliance can only be in a single state which is given by:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k=K} z_{t,k}^n = 1$$

The power consumption by n^{th} appliance in k^{th} state at time t is given by:

$$\hat{\theta}^n_{t,k} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} z^n_{t,k}\mu^n_k$$

The overall power consumption of all appliances at a given time t is given by:

$$\hat{x}_t = \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{K} z^n_{t,k}\mu^n_k$$

The error in power signal (unaccounted power) after the load assignment explained above is given by:

$$e_t = |x_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{K} z^n_{t,k}\mu^n_k|$$

Combinatorial optimization tries to find the optimal combination of appliances in different states which will minimize this error term, by the following state assignment scheme:

$$z_t = argmin_{z_t}|x_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{K} z^n_{t,k}\mu^n_k|$$

The corresponding predicted power draw by n^{th} appliance is given by:

$$y^n = \{\mu^n_{z^n_1}, ..\mu^n_{z^n_T}\}$$

This optimization problem resembles subset sum problem [20] and is NP-complete. The state space size of this optimization function is K^N, which means it is exponential in the number of appliances.

Load division: In the US, homes have 2 electrical mains corresponding to different phases. Many Asian countries have multiple meters per home. Different loads are electrically connected to different mains/meters. Since an NIALM deployment requires monitoring different electrical mains/meters, we leverage the load division to perform disaggregation on these mains separately to improve load disaggregation. Assuming that a home has p mains/meters, out of a total of N loads in the home we assign N_i loads to i^{th} mains where $Mapping[n]$ indicates the mapping of an appliance to a mains. After load assignment to different mains, the state space size for i^{th} mains is given by K^{N_i}. This leads to an exponential reduction in state space. As a practical example, if a home has two mains and 20 loads with 10 loads across each of the two mains, state space size before load division is given by 2^{20} and after load division is 2^{10}.

CO formulation for i^{th} mains after load division is given by the following optimization function:

$$z_t = argmin_{z_t}|\theta^{M_i} - \sum_{n=1}^{N_i}\sum_{k=1}^{K} z^n_{t,k}\mu^n_k|\ where\ i \in 1, p$$

The corresponding predicted appliance power sequence for appliances belonging to i^{th} mains is given by:

$$y^n = \{\mu^n_{z^n_1}, ..\mu^n_{z^n_T}\}$$

The optimization is subject to the following constraints. Firstly, sum of number of loads assigned to different mains must be equal to the total number of loads. This is given by:

$$\sum_{1}^{p} N_i = N$$

Secondly, at a given time, an appliance can only be in a single state which is given by:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k=K} z^n_{t,k} = 1$$

Thirdly, an appliance can belong to one and only one mains. Thus, Mapping[n] is a one to one function.

Fourthly, the sum of power of appliance assigned to i^{th} mains is always lesser than or equal to the power of the corresponding mains, which is given by e_t term for i^{th} mains to be non negative.

IV. INDIC NIALM

In this section we explain our algorithm- Improved Non intrusive load monitoring using load Division and Calibration (INDiC). INDiC provides preprocessing procedures which can simplify NIALM. These procedures can broadly be classified as data cleaning (time series synchronization, downsampling and calibration) and problem division into subproblems (assigning loads to mains). INDiC can be used with any modeling technique described in Section II. Here, we present INDiC-CO (INDiC using Combinatorial optimization as modeling approach). CO proposed by Hart[5] is the simplest NIALM approach and by preprocessing using INDiC its shortcomings can be overcome. The various steps of INDiC-CO NIALM shown in Algorithm 1 are described below.

Time series synchronization: Mains power and appliance power data are measured using different hardware[5]. It is highly likely that some hardware malfunctions during the data collection process. In this step we ensure that the mains power and appliance power time series start and end at the same time. Further missing data is handled using techniques such as forward filling (padding)[6].

Downsampling: While performing CO it is desired that transients and fluctuations in the power signal are filtered[5]. The transients occur due to the high starting current of the appliance, whereas the fluctuations are a consequence of minor voltage fluctuations and oscillatory nature of appliances. Figure 2a and Figure 2b show how starting current and voltage fluctuations can be filtered by down sampling. Filters such as mean/median can be used to down sample a time series to a time window, where the value assigned to a time window is the mean/median of values occurring during that time window in the original series.

Assigning Loads to Mains[7]: This step aims to identify the mapping ($Mapping[n]$) between appliances and mains. Since an appliance can belong to a single mains, $Mapping[n]$ is a one-to-one function from an appliance n to a mains. Patterns corresponding to appliances having higher peak power are generally easier to extract from main signal, thus we sort the appliance in decreasing order of peak power. Starting from the appliance having highest peak load we compare its power at all times with the power of a mains. If at any time the power

[5]In REDD[6] TED meters(http://goo.gl/CEu2y) are used to measure mains and Power House Dynamics(http://goo.gl/9VQba) to measure appliance circuits

[6]http://goo.gl/FfR6o

[7]While our approach is fine tuned for 2 Mains it can be easily extended to support further load division



(a) When the compressor of refrigerator is turned on it consumes a very high starting power for a few seconds. This figure shows how these starting peak power can be filtered by downsampling to a suitable resolution



(b) Due to voltage fluctuations and oscillations the power consumed by an appliance can vary. This figure shows how these fluctuations can be reduced by downsampling to a suitable resolution

Fig. 2: Effect of downsampling appliance data



(a) Assigning refrigerator to Mains 2 since refrigerator power > Mains 1 power and events in Mains 2 and refrigerator occur at same time



(b) It can be seen that the magntude of event in mains 2 is significantly more than that in refrigerator. The ratio of these magntiudes is multiplied to refrigerator's power in this state (shown by black dotted line) to obtain calibrated power in this state (shown by yellow dotted line)

Fig. 3: Calibrating and assigning refrigerator to Mains 2

of the appliance is greater than the power of a mains, we can assign the appliance to the other mains. However, if we are not able to assign an appliance to mains this way, we find the times when $Events$ occur in the appliance power series. This should be a subset of times of $Events$ occurring in one of the mains to which this appliance is assigned. The threshold used to find events should be suitably chosen to ensure that minor voltage fluctuations are not counted as events. After an appliance has been assigned to a mains, its power sequence is subtracted from the corresponding mains to simplify mains assignment for remaining appliances. Figure 3a shows how refrigerator is assigned to mains 2 since during this time interval its power is more than that of mains 1. Also, one may verify it by observing that the events in mains 2 and refrigerator power series occur at same time.

Clustering: Prior knowledge and appliance circuitry[21] are used to identify the number of states associated with an appliance. For instance, a refrigerator is a compressor based appliance and exhibits three states in increasing order of power demand (compressor Off, compressor On, defrost mode). We use state of the art clustering techniques to cluster appliances' power draw using prior knowledge about number of appliance states.

Appliance Power Calibration: Power measured by appliance level meters may need calibration due to the following reasons:

- Different hardware report different measurement for same appliance [22]
- Fluctuation in voltage causes power to fluctuate as well[5]
- Missing meta data, whether real or apparent power is being measured at appliance level

In comparison to appliance data, mains data is usually measured using better precision hardware. Thus, we keep mains data as a reference and calibrate appliance data against it. In the clustering step, value of appliance power at each time is associated with corresponding cluster state ($k \in 1, K$). Since in Off state (k=1) appliance power consumption is almost zero, it does not require any calibration. We find out $Event$ times when appliance transitions from a lower state(k) to a higher state($k+1$). During these times, we find the ratio of the magnitude of power change occurring in the assigned mains and the appliance. This ratio serves as a corrective multiplicative factor for a particular state of an appliance. Cluster centroids obtained in the previous step are multiplied by this factor to obtain calibrated cluster centroids. This process is shown in Figure 3b where it is found that before calibration refrigerator power in state 2 was 162 W, after calibration with mains 2, it is found to be 210 W, where the calibration factor was found to be 1.3)

Combinatorial optimization: Combinatorial optimization is now performed separately for both mains as per the description in Section III.

V. Evaluation

We use Reference Energy Disaggregation Data Set (REDD) [6] for validating our algorithms based on metrics such as Mean normalized error (MNE) and RMS error (RE) proposed in previous work.

A. About dataset

REDD contains power data for mains (2 phases) as well as appliances from 6 homes in Boston area collected in the summer of 2011. The data is made available as raw, high frequency (sampled at 15 KHz) and low frequency (Mains at 1 Hz, appliances at 0.3 Hz). Considering the practical implications of residential smart meter installation, we believe that low frequency data represents the most realistic scenario and thus we use this data for analysis.

B. Evaluation Metric

We use the following metrics which have been used in the past work [15], [6]:

Mean Normalized Error (MNE%): Normalized error in the energy assigned to an appliance n over time period T, given by:

$$MNE(n) = \frac{|\sum_{t=1}^{T} \theta_t^n - \sum_{t=1}^{T} y_t^n|}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \theta_t^n} \quad (1)$$

The above metric will give a 0% MNE for cases such as follows: $y^n = [0, 10, 0, 10]$ and $\theta^n = [10, 0, 10, 0]$, which can be misleading. Thus, we propose a modified Mean Normalized Error metric further referred as MNE which is sensitive to such cases.

$$MNE(n) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} |\theta_t^n - y_t^n|}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} \theta_t^n} \quad (2)$$

Since it is a known fact that $|\sum a - \sum b| \leq \sum |a - b|$ where a and b are vectors containing floating point numbers, our results

Algorithm 1: INDiC-CO

Input: $x, \theta^n, \theta^{M_1}, \theta^{M_2}$
Output: y^n, μ_k^n

Time series synchronization

$\theta^1, ..\theta^n, \theta^{M_1}, \theta^{M_2} \leftarrow Timeseries\_sync([\theta^1, ..\theta^n, \theta^{M_1}, \theta^{M_2}], forward\, fill)$

Downsampling

for $n \in 1, N$ **do**
  $\theta^n \leftarrow Downsample(\theta^n, filter, resolution)$
$\theta^{M_1} \leftarrow Downsample(\theta^{M_1}, filter, resolution)$
$\theta^{M_2} \leftarrow Downsample(\theta^{M_2}, filter, resolution)$
$j \leftarrow Sort([\theta^1, ..\theta^n], peak\, power)$

Appliance to Mains mapping

for $Appliance\, n \in j$ **do**
  if $\theta_t^n > \theta_t^{M_1}\ for\, any\, t \in 1, T$ **then**
    $Mapping[n] = M_2$
  else if $\theta_t^n > \theta_t^{M_2}\ for\, any\, t \in 1, T$ **then**
    $Mapping[n] = M_1$
  else
    if $Event\_Detection(\theta^n, threshold).Times \subset Event\_Detection(\theta^{M_1}, threshold).Times$ **then**
      $Mapping[n] = M_1$
    else
      $Mapping[n] = M_2$
  $\theta^{Mapping[n]} \leftarrow \theta^{Mapping[n]} - \theta^n$

Divide data into train and test set

Clustering on train set

for $n \in 1, N$ **do**
  $\mu_k^n \leftarrow Cluster(\theta^n, K, clustering\_algorithm)\ for\, k \in 1, K$

Calibration on train set

for $n \in 1, N$ **do**
  for $k \in 2, K$ **do**
    $\mu_k^n \leftarrow \frac{\mu_k^n * Event\_Detection(\theta_{k-1,k}^{Mapping[n]}, threshold).Magnitude}{Event\_Detection(\theta_{k-1,k}^n, threshold).Magnitude}$

Combinatorial optimization on test set

Solve combinatorial optimization as described in Section III
return y^n, μ_k^n

might look worse than if the original definition of MNE were used.

RMS Error (RE Watts): RMS error in power assignment to an appliance n per time slice t given by:

$$RE(n) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\theta_t^n - y_t^n)^2} \tag{3}$$

Both these quantities represent error, the lesser they are the better is the prediction.

C. Empirical Analysis

We performed empirical analysis on REDD dataset Home 2, which consists of 11 channels (including 2 mains and 9 appliances)[8]. We believe that the same analysis can be easily repeated across multiple homes. Timeseries synchronization was applied since the appliance level data collection begun about 6 hours after mains data collection. Moreover, there were small intervals of missing data, which we filled using forward filling. Two appliances - washer dryer and disposal were ignored from further analysis since washer dryer had a peak power consumption of 8 W (which means it was Off throughout) and the contribution of disposal to overall power was less than 0.1 %. We downsampled this time synchronized data to one minute resolution using mean filter. 1 minute is a sufficient resolution to get rid of startup transients and voltage fluctuations. As per the Appliance to Mains step in INDiC-CO algorithm described earlier we assigned loads to the two different mains. Table II shows the assignment of loads to different mains. Further this table also shows the learnt power states of these appliance via KMeans++[9] [23] clustering. Refrigerator and lighting showed significant difference in power states post calibration. Based on prior experience and appliance circuity[21], we believe that since only these two appliances needed calibration, it may be a case that the appliance level monitor measured real power instead of apparent power. These two loads constitute a major chunk of mains 2 power. Figure 4 shows the reduction in unassigned power due to calibrating these two appliances.

To show the significance of load division and calibration as a preprocessing step to NIALM algorithm, we considered 4 possible cases: i) no calibration, no load division; ii) no calibration, load division; iii) calibration, no load division; iv) calibration, load division (INDiC). The results after applying INDIC-CO are presented in Table III. For the overall dataset, it can be seen that MNE reduces from 187% to 39%, RE reduces from 478 W to 168 W, after applying INDiC-CO. All appliances show reduction in MNE and RE after applying INDiC-CO. However, there is significant improvement in correctly predicting refrigerator and lighting. Figure 5 shows the confusion matrix for refrigerator prediction using CO (without and with INDiC). It can be seen that after applying INDiC there is a vast improvement in predicting refrigerator's state 1 and 2.

VI. Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper we present INDiCwhich consists of preprocessing steps to reduce the complexity of disaggregation by dividing the loads across mains and calibrating appliance power. We

[8]Highest accuracy has been reported for this Home in previous work[6]

[9]We used DBScan, SOM, EM and Hierarchial clustering apart from KMeans++, but found KMeans++ to be most scalable



(a) Without applying calibration, more than one-thirds of total power in mains 2 is unaccounted. This can significantly reduce accuracy when any NIALM model is applied

(b) After applying calibration, unaccounted power reduces to less than 10% of mains 2 power. The contribution of refrigerator and lighting to overall mains 2 power increaes.

Fig. 4: Mains 2 Break down by load

State	# of usage events	1	2	3
1	5070	4259	213	598
2	4810	40	2158	2612
3	200	0	0	200

(a) Confusion matrix for refrigerator after applying CO based NIALM. State 2 is predicted to be in state 3 more than in state 2

State	# of usage events	1	2	3
1	5070	4457	513	100
2	4810	193	4368	349
3	200	4	10	186

(b) Confusion matrix for refrigerator after applying INDiC-CO based NIALM. There are more instances along the diogonal sginfifying improvement in prediction. State 2 shows significant improvements.

Fig. 5: Confusion Matrices for refrigerator disaggregation. [m,n] in the matrix represents appliance's m^{th} state to be predicted as n^{th} state. Grey cells along the diagonal show true positive.

TABLE II: Mains assignment and appliance states power. Lighting and refrigerator power shows change after calibration

Appliance	Mains	States Power (W)					
		Pre calibration			Post calibration		
Refrigerator	2	7	162	423	7	210	423[10]
Microwave	2	10	832	1730	10	832	1730
Lighting	2	9	96	156	9	110	178
Dishwasher	1	0	256	1195	0	256	1195
Stove	1	0	374	-	0	374	-
Kitchen	1	5	727	-	5	727	-
Kitchen 2	1	1	204	1032	1	204	1032

TABLE III: MNE and RE for CO based NIALM with and without INDiC. Results for INDiC-CO are highlighted in grey

	Without calibration				With calibration			
	Without load division		With load division		Without load division		With load division	
Appliance	R.E. Watts	M.N.E. %	R.E. Watts	M.N.E. %	R.E. Watts	M.N.E. %	R.E. Watts	M.N.E. %
Refrigerator	136	109	71	32	130	95	59	21
Microwave	102	98	97	110	104	97	96	109
Lighting	51	164	48	195	44	83	38	60
Dishwasher	406	2947	63	100	377	2517	63	100
Stove	77	1191	36	281	75	1118	36	281
Kitchen	64	182	58	168	69	196	58	168
Kitchen 2	95	267	91	117	92	230	91	117
Overall	478	187	161	58	450	157	168	39

empirically show the improvements in disaggregation when INDiCis used to divide home's appliances across 2 mains and further calibrating appliance power from a home in REDD dataset. In the future we intend to apply INDiCas a preprocessing step to other classes of NIALM approaches. We plan to look into additional features such as correlation between multiple appliance usage, taking time of day into account. We also intend to apply INDiCon other datasets, especially the ones from developing countries where loads are significantly different from the ones used in developed countries.

References

[1] A. Zoha, A. Gluhak, M. A. Imran, and S. Rajasegarar, "Non-intrusive load monitoring approaches for disaggregated energy sensing: A survey," *Sensors*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 16 838–16 866, 2012.

[2] M. Evans, B. Shui, and S. Somasundaram, "Country report on building energy codes in india," *PNNL*, vol. 177925, 2009.

[3] S. Darby, "The effectiveness of feedback on energy consumption," *A Review for DEFRA of the Literature on Metering, Billing and direct Displays*, vol. 486, 2006.

[4] Z. Ghahramani, M. I. Jordan, and P. Smyth, "Factorial hidden markov models," in *Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 1997.

[5] G. W. Hart, "Nonintrusive appliance load monitoring," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 80, no. 12, pp. 1870–1891, 1992.

[6] J. Z. Kolter and M. J. Johnson, "Redd: A public data set for energy disaggregation research," in *proceedings of the SustKDD workshop on Data Mining Applications in Sustainability*, 2011, pp. 1–6.

[7] K. Carrie Armel, A. Gupta, G. Shrimali, and A. Albert, "Is disaggregation the holy grail of energy efficiency? the case of electricity," *Energy Policy*, 2012.

[8] M. Zeifman and K. Roth, "Nonintrusive appliance load monitoring: Review and outlook," *Consumer Electronics, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 76–84, 2011.

[9] K. Suzuki, S. Inagaki, T. Suzuki, H. Nakamura, and K. Ito, "Nonintrusive appliance load monitoring based on integer programming," in *SICE Annual Conference, 2008*, 2008, pp. 2742–2747.

[10] M. Baranski and J. Voss, "Genetic algorithm for pattern detection in nialm systems," in *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 2004 IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 4, 2004, pp. 3462–3468 vol.4.

[11] A. Ruzzelli, C. Nicolas, A. Schoofs, and G. M. P. O'Hare, "Real-time recognition and profiling of appliances through a single electricity sensor," in *Sensor Mesh and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks (SECON), 2010 7th Annual IEEE Communications Society Conference on*, 2010, pp. 1–9.

[12] T. Zia, D. Bruckner, and A. Zaidi, "A hidden markov model based procedure for identifying household electric loads," in *IECON 2011 - 37th Annual Conference on IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*, 2011, pp. 3218–3223.

[13] J. Z. Kolter and T. Jaakkola, "Approximate inference in additive factorial hmms with application to energy disaggregation," *Journal of Machine Learning Research - Proceedings Track*, vol. 22, pp. 1472–1482, 2012.

[14] H. Kim, M. Marwah, M. F. Arlitt, G. Lyon, and J. Han, "Unsupervised disaggregation of low frequency power measurements," in *SDM*, 2011, pp. 747–758.

[15] O. Parson, S. Ghosh, M. Weal, and A. Rogers, "Non-intrusive load monitoring using prior models of general appliance types," in *26th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2012.

[16] D. Rahayu, B. Narayanaswamy, S. Krishnaswamy, C. Labbe, and D. Seetharam, "Learning to be energy-wise: Discriminative methods for load disaggregation," in *Future Energy Systems: Where Energy, Computing and Communication Meet (e-Energy), 2012 Third International Conference on*, 2012, pp. 1–4.

[17] A. Filip, "Blued: A fully labeled public dataset for event-based non-intrusive load monitoring research."

[18] C. Holcomb, "Pecan street inc.: A test-bed for nilm," in *International Workshop on Non-Intrusive Load Monitoring*, 2007, pp. 271–288.

[19] S. Barker, A. Mishra, D. Irwin, E. Cecchet, P. Shenoy, and J. Albrecht, "Smart*: An open data set and tools for enabling research in sustainable homes," in *The 1st KDD Workshop on Data Mining Applications in Sustainability (SustKDD)*, 2011.

[20] S. Martello and P. Toth, *Knapsack problems: algorithms and computer implementations*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1990.

[21] K. Ting, M. Lucente, G. S. Fung, W. Lee, and S. Hui, "A taxonomy of load signatures for single-phase electric appliances," in *IEEE PESC (Power Electronics Specialist Conference)*, 2005, pp. 12–18.

[22] M. Berges, E. Goldman, H. S. Matthews, and L. Soibelman, "Training load monitoring algorithms on highly sub-metered home electricity consumption data," *Tsinghua Science & Technology*, vol. 13, pp. 406–411, 2008.

[23] D. Arthur and S. Vassilvitskii, "k-means++: The advantages of careful seeding," in *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007, pp. 1027–1035.