SmartSPEC: Customizable Smart Space Datasets via Event-Driven Simulations



Andrew Chio¹, Daokun Jiang¹, Peeyush Gupta¹, Georgios Bouloukakis², Roberto Yus³, Sharad Mehrotra¹, Nalini Venkatasubramanian¹

Virtual, March 23, 2022

IEEE PerCom 2022



¹ University of California, Irvine

² Télécom SudParis, IP Paris

³ University of Maryland, Baltimore County





IoT-Enabled Smart Spaces



Towards Smarter Buildings: The Need for Realistic Data

Heterogeneity, Scalability, Portability, Robustness



Fire Evacuation in a High-Rise Building

- Realistic data is necessary to test and validate smart space approaches in heterogeneous human environments
 - Evaluating robustness of algorithms
 - Failure testing
 - Scalability testing
 - Operating in extreme scenarios

Challenge: Obtaining Real Data

Deployment of Sensors

• Cost & sensor placement





Recruitment of Participants

- Reluctance to share data
- Time-consuming
- Limited in scale



Preservation of Participant Privacy

- Data regulations
- Leakage of sensitive data



FERPA

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act





Generating Realistic Synthetic Data with Simulators

Challenge: Modeling smart spaces accurately

- Variability/dynamicity of activities
- Faithfulness to reality

<u>Approach 1</u>: Extend previously captured dataset¹

 Issue: violates causality, limited to initial space

<u>Approach 2</u>: Generate data randomly based on sensor models²

• Issue: random ≠ realistic

<u>Approach 3</u>:

Create dataset based on interactions of people and their activities³

• Issue: *Semantic Explainability* - Why people visit the spaces that they do?



	?	
20°C	Tem	perature Data

Brushing

Walking

Activities of Daily Living

Toileting

¹Replication, Modification, Sampling: Tay et al., UpSizeR (Information Systems '13)
 ²Random Data Generation: Mockaroo, Hoag and Thompson, PSDG (ACM SIGMOD Record '07)
 ³Activities of Daily Living: Alshammari et al., OpenSHS, Sensors '17
 Mobility Models and Trajectory Models: Rhee et al., IEEE/ACM TON '11; Alessandretti et al., Nature '20
 Trajectory Models: Brinkoff, GeoInformatica '02; Pelekis et al., ACM Sigspatial '15
 Generative Models: Gupta et al., CVPR '18; Rossi et al., Pattern Recognition '21

The SmartSPEC Approach

Exploit semantics to generate realistic synthetic smart space datasets



The Contributions of this Paper



SmartSPEC : Semantic Model



Smart Space: A Semantic Characterization



9

SmartSPEC : Scenario Learning



SmartSPEC : Scenario Learning



Learning Events through Occupancy

				С	ccupar	ncy
Ρ	erson P	Space C	DateTime t		λ_D^{μ}	
ł	ob12b6	1100	2017-09-01 08:43:57			1
8	813a99	1100	2017-09-01 08:45:12			
:	18bcad	1100	2017-09-01 08:45:38			2
1	81d9c1	1100	2017-09-01 08:46:20			2
1	81d9c1	1100	2017-09-01 08:46:23			
Į	500bba	1100	2017-09-01 08:47:23			
	f079e1	1100	2017-09-01 08:47:36			4
8	8700e1	1100	2017-09-01 08:47:49			
	84ea3f	1100	2017-09-01 08:48:21			
ļ	500bba	1100	2017-09-01 08:49:38			

Dataset D

Person P	Space C	DateTime t
f28c94f	1412	2017-09-01 08:19:00
f20a461	6029	2017-09-01 08:19:00
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:07
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:26

Occupancy λ_D^{C,t_s,t_e}

• Number of unique people from dataset *D* that are in space *C* during time period (*t_s*, *t_e*).

For each space C

Learning Events

Intuition:

Algorithm 1: Extracting Events, Learning MetaEvents.



10 $\mathcal{ME} \leftarrow makeMetaEvents(clusters)$

11 return $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{ME}$

Create time-series of occupancy in space C on date d

Use *Change Point Detection* to learn when one event ends, and another starts



Presence \rightarrow Occupancy \rightarrow Events

Learning Events



Algorithm 1: Extracting Events, Learning MetaEvents.



- 10 $\mathcal{ME} \leftarrow makeMetaEvents(clusters)$
- 11 return $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{ME}$



Use *Change Point Detection* to learn when one event ends, and another starts

Use Agglomerative Clustering to learn types of events

Intuition: Agglomerative Clustering

- Each event starts in its own cluster, and is merged with other "nearby" clusters
- Terminates once distance between clusters \geq threshold ϵ
- Cluster distance based on set of attendees and time of event

Jaccard Index

- Given two sets A and B, define similarity ratio $r = \frac{card(A \cap B)}{card(A \cup B)}$
- *Interpretation*: r = 1 only if A = B.

Presence \rightarrow Occupancy \rightarrow Events

Learning People-Event Interactions

Learned Events:

- Event e_1 : attendees = { p_1, p_2, p_3 }
- Event e_2 : attendees = { p_2 , p_3 }
- Event e_3 : attendees = $\{p_1\}$
- Event e_4 : attendees = $\{p_3\}$

Characterize people based on attended events attended: $\{e_1, e_3, e_5\}$ attended: $\{e_1, e_5\}$ attended: $\{e_1, e_2, e_4\}$

Person p_1

• Event e_5 : attendees = { p_1 , p_2 }

Apply Agglomerative Clustering to group people by similarity of attended events (until a threshold ϵ)

Person p_2

Person p_3

SmartSPEC : Scenario Generation



SmartSPEC : Scenario Generation



Entity Generator: Generating Events and People

Given types of events and profiles of people, how can we create a new set of events and people for our synthetic dataset?



Synthetic Data Generator: Generating Synthetic Data





- Get date/time that person is in the smart space
- Choose an event to attend, preferably a previously attended periodic event

Semantic Constraints on spaces, people, events



Estimate travel time; estimated arrival must be within a threshold ϵ

Move to an event space

Record data in log file

SmartSPEC : Assessing Realism



SmartSPEC : Assessing Realism



Assessing Realism of Smart Space Datasets



Person P	Space C	DateTime t
f28c94f	1412	2017-09-01 08:19:00
f20a461	6029	2017-09-01 08:19:00
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:07
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:26

How to quantify the realism of D, D'?

- Occupancy: a space's perspective of the dataset
- *Trajectory*: a person's perspective of the dataset

Similarity of Space's Occupancy



- Occupancy of space C: number of unique people in space C during time period (t_s, t_e) .
- Occupancy Distance is the mean squared error in occupancy over time.

Similarity of People's Trajectory



Person P	Space C	DateTime t
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:07
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:26
238be6	3254	2017-09-01 08:20:50
238be6	3256	2017-09-01 08:21:13

- Trajectory of person P: sequence of spaces C visited by P over datetime t
 Should we naïvely compare all trajectories against each other?
 - Should we naively compare all trajectories against each other?

Similarity of People's Trajectory



Person P	Space C	DateTime t
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:07
238be6	3231	2017-09-01 08:19:26
238be6	3254	2017-09-01 08:20:50
238be6	3256	2017-09-01 08:21:13

• **Control Variables** are applied to *partition* trajectories into comparable bins. e.g., $V = (t_s, t_e) = (1:00, 1:30)$ contains trajectories with $t_s \approx 1:00$, $t_e \approx 1:30$.



Distance Function Φ

 $t_s, t_e = (1:00, 1:00)$

 $\Phi(\land \land \land \land)$

$t_s, t_e = (1:00, 1:30)$

	••••	1:30	1:00	t_s
t_s , t_e =		L >	A /	1:00
Ф(⇒ ¥	Ø	1:30
- (Ø	Ø	

$$f_{e} = (1:30, 1:30)$$

$$\Phi(3^{\circ}, 3^{\circ}, 3^{\circ})$$

Distance Function Φ

- Let $\phi(\delta_D^{(i)}, \delta_{D'}^{(j)})$ be a function that computes the distance between two trajectories
- e.g., Fréchet Distance Metric



 $\Delta_D^V{\prime}$

How do we compare multiple trajectories against one another?

 $\Delta_{D'}^{V}$

<i>t_s t_e</i> 1:00 1:30 	1:00 ^ / / / Ø Ø	1:30 7 7 0 Ø	···· ··· ···	$t_s, t_e = (1:00, 1:00)$ $\Phi(\Lambda \land \Lambda \land \Lambda)$	1 0 0 1	$\frac{1}{ V }$	Trajectory Distance $\sum_{\substack{\nu \in V \\ (i), \delta^{(j)}) \in M}} \Phi(\delta^{(i)}, \delta^{(j)}) + \alpha (\Delta_D^{\nu} - \Delta_{D'}^{\nu})$
	Δ	V D		$t_s, t_e = (1:00, 1:30)$ $\Phi(7, 5, 7)$	1 1 0 0		Penalty Term for difference
t_s t_e 1:00	1:00	1:30		$t_s, t_e = (1:30, 1:30)$	0 1 0		in trajectory set sizes
1:30 	Ø	Ø		$\Phi(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$	1 0 0 1 0 0		

Distance Function Φ

•

• Match trajectories between corresponding bins

Matching matrix *M* does not need to be injective

Interpreting Dataset Similarity

How to determine if generator G produces realistic datasets?

 $D'_{i,k}$

Compare distances between pairs of real datasets

How do **real** datasets vary against other **real** datasets?

How well does synthetic data mimic the seed from which it was produced?

Compare distances between pairs of real and simulated datasets

How do **real** datasets differ from **synthetic** datasets?

Compare distances between pairs of real datasets

How do **real** datasets vary against other **real** datasets?



Simulated \approx Real?



How well have we extracted patterns from one dataset and applied them to the next?

Compare distances between pairs of real and simulated datasets

How do **real** datasets differ from **synthetic** datasets?



Experiment: 2 Distinct Scenarios

Scenario 1: Campus

- 6 floor campus building: 125+ faculty offices, 10 classrooms, 4 lecture halls
- 64 WiFi Access Points (WiFi APs)
- 5 weeks of WiFi connectivity events, ~300K connections/week, partitioned into 5 periods of 1 week each



Bren Hall, UC Irvine

1st Floor Blueprint

Scenario 2: City – GeoLife GPS Trajectories¹

- GPS trajectories in city of Beijing, China
- 1150 points of interest to cluster GPS data
- 63 people over 28 months, ~36K GPS data/month, partitioned into 1-month periods





GeoLife GPS Trajectories

Learned types of events / profiles of people from both scenarios

¹Zheng et al., "Geolife: A collaborative social networking service among user, location and trajectory." IEEE Data Eng. Bull., vol. 33, no. 2.

Events

- 510 "ground truth" events
- Best-effort mapping of events to WiFi APs
- Average paired difference between:
 - Event Start Time: $15 \pm 18 mins$
 - Event End Time: $21 \pm 27 mins$



Baselines and Metrics

Mobility Model Baselines

- *Random Waypoint (RAND)*: Next visited space is random
- Brownian Motion (BROW): Next visited space is adjacent
- Lévy Flight (LÉVY): Next visited space is chosen by following a power law distribution on distance
- Exponential Preferential Return (EPR): Same as Lévy Flight but selects previously visited spaces with higher probability

Comparison Metrics

- *Trajectory Distance*: Average paired Fréchet distance controlled over start/end times
 - Start/End Times on 30-minute blocks
- *Occupancy Distance*: Average difference in occupancy
 - Over 5-minute intervals
- Averaged results from 3 simulations, comparing against next week (campus scenario) or month (city scenario)

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Real	185.65	188.67	191.31	194.60
SmartSPEC	263.92	252.09	272.43	240.99
RAND	789.8	754.07	740.23	606.74
BROW	533.27	479.68	501.39	407.32
LÉVY	760.3	713.53	713.18	583.97
EPR	693.38	554.26	635.81	459.4

Campus Scenario

Trajectory Similarity (m)

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Real	6.67	5.45	7.29	5.96
SmartSPEC	8.63	10.0	7.16	8.61
RAND	14.20	13.92	14.01	13.65
BROW	12.29	12.37	12.75	12.34
LÉVY	13.83	13.49	13.64	13.23
EPR	14.75	12.86	14.83	10.05

Occupancy Difference

- On average, there was a 35% difference in trajectory distances between SmartSPEC and the campus dataset
- On average, there was a **36% difference in occupancy counts per space** between SmartSPEC and the campus dataset.
- Most mobility models do significantly worse.

SmartSPEC produces trajectories and occupancy counts that are close to real data on the scope of a campus building

Evaluating Realism in City Scenario

- On average, there was a 13% difference in trajectory distances between SmartSPEC and the GeoLife dataset
- On average, there was a **37% difference in occupancy counts per space** between SmartSPEC and the GeoLife dataset.
- Brownian motion baseline creates similar trajectories to real data, but have very different occupancy

SmartSPEC produces trajectories and occupancy counts that are close to real data on the scope of a city

City Scenario









wifi_ap,cnx_time,client_id
1,2017-04-09 07:30:31,81
9,2017-04-09 10:39:13,72
8,2017-04-09 10:40:08,72
...

Sample Seed Data

[learners]		
start	= 2017-04-01	
end	= 2017-05-01	
unit	= 5	
validity	= 10	
smooth	= EMA	
window	= 10	
time-thresh	= 30	
occ-thresh	= 1	
[filepaths]		
spaces	= data/demo/Sp	paces.json
sensors	= data/demo/Se	ensors.json
metaevents	= data/demo/Me	etaEvents.json
metapeople	= data/demo/Me	etaPeople.json

Sample Configuration File for Scenario Learning

SmartSPEC: Workflow



[people]	
number = 500	
generation =	all

```
[events]
number = 5000
generation = diff
```

```
[synthetic-data-generator]
start = 2018-01-08
end = 2018-01-29
```

```
[filepaths]
```

metapeople	= data/demo/MetaPeople.json	
metaevents	= data/demo/MetaEvents.json	
spaces	= data/demo/Spaces.json	
sensors	= data/demo/Sensors.json	
people	= data/demo/People.json	
events	= data/demo/Events.json	
output	= data/demo/output/	

Sample Configuration File for Scenario Generation

SmartSPEC: Workflow



[people] number = 50 generation	0 = all
[events]	
number = 50	00
generation	= diff
[synthetic-	data-generator]
start = 201	8-01-08
end = 201	8-01-29
[filepaths]	
metapeople	= data/demo/MetaPeople.json
metaevents	= data/demo/MetaEvents.json
spaces	= data/demo/Spaces.json
sensors	= data/demo/Sensors.json
people	= data/demo/People.json
events	= data/demo/Events.json
output	= data/demo/output/

Sample Configuration File for Scenario Generation

PersonID, EventID, SpaceID, StartDatetime, EndDatetime 17,2698,1100,2018-01-15 09:51:50,2018-01-15 09:54:20 33,4200,1422,2018-01-15 09:59:55,2018-01-15 10:46:04 42,613,1420,2018-01-15 09:57:27,2018-01-15 10:44:10 60,1660,1422,2018-01-15 09:59:19,2018-01-15 10:37:00 71,401,1433,2018-01-15 09:59:55,2018-01-15 10:44:30 95,3609,1425,2018-01-15 09:58:32,2018-01-15 10:46:58 134,4200,1422,2018-01-15 09:58:26,2018-01-15 10:41:59 134,0,1100,2018-01-15 09:46:19,2018-01-15 09:48:21 166,1015,1300,2018-01-15 09:59:55,2018-01-15 10:47:16 175,1038,1200,2018-01-15 09:46:53,2018-01-15 09:49:37 177,3335,1422,2018-01-15 09:56:56,2018-01-15 10:41:38

Sample of Synthetic Data Output



Sample Generated Dataset

SmartSPEC: Applicability and Utility



TIPPERS: Testbed for IoT-based Privacy-Preserving PERvasive Spaces

- Design robust, experimental testbed
- Explore privacy technologies
- Real-world deployments

NAVWAR Trident Warrior:

- Explore potential benefits of IoT technologies for naval use cases
- Day in the life of a sailor in mission-critical scenarios and non-mission-critical scenarios
 - Simulated activities on a Navy Ship



- Realistic and Semantically Explainable data are required to test and validate smart space approaches
- We developed SmartSPEC: an **event-driven** smart space simulator
 - Customizable smart space datasets using models of entities in smart space ecosystems.
 - ML techniques to learn profiles of people and types of events from seed data
- We presented a **structured methodology to evaluate the realism of synthetic data**.
- Our experiments show that SmartSPEC produces data that is **1.4x -4.4x** more realistic than baselines.
- The SmartSPEC approach can also be employed to generate synthetic sensor data.
- Our code is publicly available on GitHub: https://github.com/andrewgchio/SmartSPEC

