



Title	Building performance optimization using cross-domain scenario modeling, linked data, and complex event processing
Authors(s)	O'Donnell, James, Corry, Edward, Hasan, Souleiman, et al.
Publication date	2013-04
Publication information	O'Donnell, James, Edward Corry, Souleiman Hasan, and et al. "Building Performance Optimization Using Cross-Domain Scenario Modeling, Linked Data, and Complex Event Processing." Elsevier, April 2013. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.01.019 .
Publisher	Elsevier
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/4842
Publisher's statement	This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Building and Environment. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Building and Environment (62, , (2013)) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.01.019
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.01.019

Downloaded 2026-05-01 23:36:17

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

1 **Building Performance Optimization Using**
2 **Cross-Domain Scenario Modeling, Linked**
3 **Data, and Complex Event Processing**

4
5 **Corresponding Author:** James O'Donnell - jtodonnell@lbl.gov
6 Phone: +1-510-486-4146, Fax +1 510-486-4089
7 Building Technologies Group; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
8 1 Cyclotron Road, MS 90R3111
9 Berkeley, CA 94720

10
11 **Author:** Edward Corry - edwardcorry@nuigalway.ie
12 Phone +353 65 68 23721
13 Informatics Research Unit for Sustainable Engineering,
14 National University of Ireland, Galway

15
16 **Author:** Souleiman Hasan – Souleiman.hasan@deri.org
17 Phone +353 91 492973
18 Digital Enterprise Research institute, National University of Ireland, Galway.
19 IDA Business Park, Lower Dangan, Galway Ireland.

20
21 **Author:** Edward Curry - ed.curry@deri.org –
22 Phone +353 91 492973
23 Digital Enterprise Research institute, National University of Ireland, Galway.
24 IDA Business Park, Lower Dangan, Galway Ireland.

25
26 **Author:** Marcus Keane – marcus.keane@nuigalway.ie
27 Phone +353 91 492619
28 Informatics Research Unit for Sustainable Engineering
29 National University of Ireland
30 Galway, Ireland

41 Building Performance Optimization Using 42 Cross-Domain Scenario Modeling, Linked 43 Data, and Complex Event Processing

44 James O'Donnell^a, Edward Corry^b, Souleiman Hasan^c, Marcus Keane^b Edward Curry^c

45
46 Corresponding Author

47 ^aBuilding Technologies Group; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
48 1 Cyclotron Road, MS 90R3111
49 Berkeley, CA 94720, jtodonnell@lbl.gov, – Phone: +1-510-486-4146

50
51 ^bInformatics Research Unit for Sustainable Engineering,
52 National University of Ireland, Galway,
53 edwardcorry@nuigalway.ie, marcus.keane@nuigalway.ie
54 Phone 353 65 68 23721

55
56 ^cDigital Enterprise Research institute, National University of Ireland, Galway.
57 IDA Business Park, Lower Dangan, Galway Ireland.
58 Souleiman.hasan@deri.org, ed.curry@deri.org, Phone +353 91 492973,

59 Abstract

60 The scenario modeling method empowers building managers by enabling comprehensive performance analysis in
61 commercial buildings, but is currently limited to data from the building management domain. This paper proposes
62 that Linked Data and Complex Event Processing can form the basis of an interoperability approach that would help
63 to overcome technical and conceptual barriers to cross-domain scenario modeling. In doing so, this paper illustrates
64 the cross-domain potential of scenario modeling to leverage data from different information silos within
65 organizations and demonstrates how to optimize the role of a building manager in the context of his or her
66 organization. Widespread implementations of cross-domain scenario models require a solution that efficiently
67 manages cross-domain data acquisition and post processing underpinned by the principles of linked data combined
68 with complex event processing. An example implementation highlights the benefits of this new approach. Cross-
69 domain scenario models enhance the role of the building manager within an organization and increase the
70 importance of information communicated by building managers to other organizational stakeholders. In addition,
71 new information presented to stakeholders such as facilities managers and financial controllers can help to identify
72 areas of inefficiency while still maintaining building function and optimized energy consumption. Two key
73 challenges to implementing cross-domain scenario modeling are: the data integration of the different domains'
74 sources, and the need to process scenarios in real time. This paper presents an implementation approach based on
75 linked data to overcome interoperability issues, and Complex Event Processing to handle real-time scenarios.

76
77 **Keywords:** Linked data, complex event processing, performance metrics, building performance analysis

78 1 Introduction

79 Unavailable, unreliable, and inaccurate building performance information is a major cause of inefficient building
80 operation [1,2]. Information used by building managers must be reliable, but no standards are currently available for

81 the analysis and interpretation of building performance data. In addition, current methods and tools fail to account
82 for the profile of building managers, both in terms of the operational context of their role and their typical technical
83 and educational background [3]. As a result, the information communicated to building managers can result in
84 decisions that are often ad-hoc, arbitrary, and incomplete [4].

85
86 In practice, analysis methods applied to building operations vary in complexity. Performance benchmarks usually
87 originate from prescriptive code compliance, externally established energy performance guidelines, whole-building
88 energy simulation results, and rules of thumb or conventional wisdom [5,6]. Such benchmarks are typically difficult
89 to disaggregate, as they fail to contain enough metadata for a comparison with systems and components in a given
90 building.¹ Mismatches between the functionality provided by information systems and that required by designers
91 during the design stage have been recognized in the architecture, engineering, and construction (AEC) industry [9].
92 This lack of functionality is also evident in the operational phase of the building lifecycle, as building managers seek
93 to operate complex facilities in the absence of specifically tailored information flows driven by the profile of the
94 building manager [3]. For example, building managers might compare a building's annual gross energy
95 consumption with data about its previous year's performance or with normalized data from similar buildings, but
96 they may not have the data or technical resources to break down energy end use by type. Normative comparison
97 methods include those from the Netherlands Normalization Institute (NEN 2916), ENERGY STAR, and CIBSE
98 Guide F: *Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, [10–12], as well as the more advanced U.S. General Services
99 Administration (GSA) *Building Performance Assessment Toolkit*, providing objective performance indicators that
100 are communicable between different project stakeholders [13].

101
102 However, these methods can fail when they involve building-to-building comparison. For example, if all the
103 compared buildings operate inefficiently, or the comprehensive, unique nature of the building, such as highly
104 specialized low energy heating and cooling systems, is not taken into account by the measurement method. In
105 buildings that use a calibrated whole-building energy simulation model, measured performance is extremely difficult
106 to compare with predicted performance, due to difficulties in creating like-for-like comparisons, especially at
107 different levels of granularity [14–16].

108
109 Structured methods applied by experts have resulted in energy conservation measures that have, on average, saved
110 over 20% of total energy costs and over 30% of heating and cooling costs, in more than 100 studied U.S. buildings
111 [17]. Experts brought in to “fix” building systems provide one possible solution to identifying causes of inefficient
112 operation in the building stock [18,19]; although, when the magnitude of the global building stock is considered, the
113 time, skills, and resources of experts needed to attend to inefficient operation suggest that an expert-led solution is
114 impractical.

115
116 O'Donnell [20] established that a global solution must primarily involve the stakeholder responsible for commercial
117 building energy management. A properly enabled building manager should be able to achieve savings similar to
118 those of an expert consultant. O'Donnell defined a tailored technique called *scenario modeling* that accounts for the
119 knowledge, skills, and experience of building managers, together with the available building data, and this technique
120 can be used by a building manager to drive the optimization process.


121 **1.1 Scenario Modeling**

122 Scenario modeling enables the explicit and unambiguous coupling of building functions with other pivotal aspects of
123 building operation (Figure 1), in a method that specifically considers the education and technical expertise of
124 building managers, for example, to evaluate the impacts of operational strategy on a building's carbon dioxide (CO₂)

¹ Data models such as Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) or SimModel offer potential solutions in this area [7,8].

125 emissions. The technique removes the need for subjective interpretation of limited data or expert intervention with
126 respect to holistic performance analysis. Building managers can minimize the time spent aggregating performance
127 data and instead focus on optimization strategies. The scenario modeling method uses an easily navigable, holistic,
128 and reproducible checking mechanism that compares actual performance with predicted performance and completes
129 the “plan-do-check-act” cycle for building managers. The underpinning logic captures, transforms, and
130 communicates the complex interdependencies of environmental and energy management in buildings but presents
131 this information in a format appropriate for building managers [21].

132
133 Using this method, building managers have more reliable information that can be communicated to other
134 stakeholders at the tactical and strategic levels of organizations [22], enabling more informed energy-related
135 decisions by upper management, who require a return on investment for any new method or technology.
136



137
138 Figure 1: Holistic building performance analysis, as evaluated by building managers, relies on an understanding of
139 five key performance aspects and their interdependencies. These performance aspects form the basis of scenario
140 modeling. .
141

142 A building-wide implementation of scenario modeling [23] requires a software framework that is capable of
143 representing the explicit class structure of the scenario modeling technique, illustrated in Figure 2a and accompanied
144 by an example Scenario Model implementation in Figure 2b, and transforming the underpinning data through
145 defined algorithms, to derive meaningful operational information. Available data contained in other organizational
146 silos would further enhance the scope of scenario models. Linking building information silos has long proved to be a
147 complicated exercise, and a mechanism that can effectively link these data sources is required. We explore the
148 linked data concept as a solution to this problem.
149




Figure 2: A) Class diagram representation of the scenario modeling method that enables holistic, yet flexible, performance analysis by building managers and B) an illustration of the class diagram in practice, a Scenario Model that evaluates comfort against energy consumption

There is a strong motivation for cross-domain data sharing of building data, and the benefits of performance data, presented at a granular level, have long been recognized (Section 2). We now offer a technical implementation that leverages the principles of linked data and complex event processing, to provide a decision support system for building managers. A demonstration of the proposed implementation focuses on an owner-occupied office building in Ireland that has limited measurement points (Section 2.1, 2.2).

2 Cross-Domain Scenario Modeling

Scenario modeling presents customized information for end users, but like all data processing techniques, this method relies on the availability of relevant data. In practice the vast majority of performance analysis is based on measured data, but benchmarks may also be derived from predictive models. Data other than that found in Building Management Systems (BMS) and utility information is seldom, if ever, used [24]. Sources such as whole building energy simulation models generate enormous volumes of data at differing levels of granularity, but post processing is lacking, especially the comparison of simulation outputs with measured data in buildings [3,25,26]. Utility pricing information often does not leave the financial domain of an organization, although access to such information may lead to an adjustment in operating strategy by building managers.

One of the key restrictions to the use of such data is that many of these external data sources use heterogeneous data definitions that may require technical expertise and significant time resources to parse into a performance framework. For example, comma separated value (.csv) files are often used to store common performance information such as time-series data, and the format of these data can take many different forms. Other data, such as weather or financial data, may also be retained in formats that are not immediately accessible, requiring manual intervention on the part of the building manager. Data may also be retained in functions of the organization, and a cross-domain data sharing framework may not exist.




Figure 3: Typical weekly temperature and CO₂ pattern, highlighting incorrect use of the ventilation system.

178
179
180

181 Within organizations, many untapped sources of data exist that could be of enormous value to building managers,
 182 including occupancy counts, human resource data, room scheduling data, cleaning crew information, and design
 183 data that have not been updated over the building life cycle. For example, actual occupancy values may vary from
 184 those intended at design. An example from the National University of Ireland, Galway (NUIG) campus highlights
 185 the issue at hand (Figure 3). The air handling unit for a large lecture theater schedules the system to be available
 186 from 08:30 to 11:00 and 15:00 to 16:00 from Monday to Friday and assumes that the zone is not occupied when the
 187 system is off. Based on this information alone, a building manager performing a rudimentary trend analysis of zone
 188 conditions would not be concerned by a slight rise in temperature during unoccupied periods, but an expert may
 189 question these data. The CO₂ readings clearly indicate activity in the room. In the absence of the HVAC system, the
 190 CO₂ levels rise to almost 2,000 parts per million (ppm), almost twice the traditionally held figure of 1,000–1,200
 191 ppm taken to indicate a deterioration in air quality [27]. In this case, a separate room scheduling system, maintained
 192 by the admissions office, contains a different occupancy schedule for the zone in question, and this clearly indicates

193 that the room is heavily used when the HVAC system is turned off (

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
08:00-09:00					
09:00-10:00	237		237	200	237
10:00-11:00		237	237	237	200
11:00-12:00	237	180	180	145	237
12:00-13:00	237	200	237	200	149
13:00-14:00			145		
14:00-15:00	221	237	145		140
15:00-16:00	221		120	160	140
16:00-17:00	149		250	160	
17:00-18:00	200			160	

194 Figure 4). As in this case, the majority of building managers in commercial buildings do not have access to data
 195 other than that sent from the BMS.
 196
 197

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
08:00-09:00					
09:00-10:00	237		237	200	237
10:00-11:00		237	237	237	200
11:00-12:00	237	180	180	145	237
12:00-13:00	237	200	237	200	149
13:00-14:00			145		
14:00-15:00	221	237	145		140
15:00-16:00	221		120	160	140
16:00-17:00	149		250	160	
17:00-18:00	200			160	

198 Figure 4: Projected Occupancy Pattern for Lecture Hall 01 from the room scheduling system. This pattern does not
 199 match the supervisory operation schedule in the Building Management System.
 200
 201

202 In the context of organizational integration, a link between a room scheduling database and the operation of the
203 HVAC system would provide significant organizational benefit. This example highlights the potential for
204 interlinking different silos of information within an organization and creating an interpretive, richer scenario model
205 for building managers and other organizational stakeholders. A robust, flexible solution must therefore consider a
206 number of technical requirements that include: acquisition of large volumes of data stored in heterogeneous formats,
207 processing of these data, and making all of the data available for pertinent stakeholders.

208 **2.1 Use Case for Cross-Domain-Based Scenario Modeling**

209 Scenario modeling using linked data and complex event processing ensures that data can be queried in a variety of
210 previously unavailable ways. By doing so, building managers can leverage significant benefits in terms of
211 operational understanding and building controls. The efficacy of the proposed approach depends on the range of data
212 sources available in a particular building. We now demonstrate the concept as applied to the Digital Enterprise
213 Research Institute (DERI) building, a utilitarian office block with stand-alone heating and ventilation units servicing
214 the office spaces. The facility has a limited number of metered data streams. It serves exclusively as an office
215 building, with a mix of open plan spaces, offices, and meeting rooms spread over three floors around a central core.
216 The occupant profile suggests a 9 to 5 pattern of occupancy for the most part, with occupants based at personal
217 computers throughout the day.
218

219 This case study describes the implementation of scenario modeling on the DERI building, located in Galway,
220 Ireland, and reflects a potential use case for many organizations: the financial controllers at DERI are concerned by
221 the rise in energy costs and are considering a pro rata billing system, based on the volume of energy consumed by
222 each research group. Before such a system is implemented, the financial controllers wish to understand the current
223 breakdown of energy consumption and assign the task to the building manager. There are 14 distinct sections in the
224 building, but members of any group can sit in more than one section. Not all sections are equal in terms of energy
225 consumption, so proportioning bulk energy is inappropriate.
226

227 Traditionally, in order to complete such a task, the building manager would track down the utility bills for a
228 12-month period and divide total figures by the number of groups within the organization. However this approach
229 would not proportion the energy consumption fairly. To complete the given task, the building manager would have
230 to locate the required information through file searches, phone calls, and meetings. He may have access to energy
231 consumption values based on 14 predefined zones in the building (Table 1) but would not have space allocation
232 details as defined in Table 2. Combining the information provided by these two tables could be a tedious process
233 that includes data-parsing and data-processing activities. As the data required to carry out the analysis are spread
234 across a number of domains, it becomes very difficult and time consuming to capture and interpret the data.
235

236 Table 1: Breakdown of the available electrical meters at the DERI building, as available from the traditional
237 Building Energy Performance (BEP) silo. Note one meter per zone and a total building meter.
238

PointName	Measured Object Type	Measured Object Name	PointType
DERI_GF_SW	Space	Ground Floor South Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_GF_WW	Space	Ground Floor West Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_GF_NW	Space	Ground Floor North Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_FF_SW	Space	First Floor South Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_FF_WW	Space	First Floor West Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_FF_NW	Space	First Floor North Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_SF_SW	Space	Second Floor South Wing	Electricity Use

DERI_SF_WW	Space	Second Floor West Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_SF_NW	Space	Second Floor North Wing	Electricity Use
DERI_DC	Space	Data Centre	Electricity Use
DERI_Atrium	Space	Atrium	Electricity Use
DERI_Building	Space	DERI Building (Full Building)	Electricity Use
DERI_Cafe	Space	DERI Café	Electricity Use

239

240

Table 2: A subset of zone allocation information based on the human resources data silo.

ID#	Floor	Zone	Name	Research Group
308a	2	South	Researcher 1	Group 1
310	2	West	Researcher 2	Group 1
311	2	West	Researcher 3	Group 2
313	2	North	Researcher 4	Group 2
314	2	North	Researcher 5	Group 3

241

242

In Section 2.2, we illustrate how linked data techniques might be used to interrogate diverse data sources, allowing data analysis to be performed easily.

243

244

245

2.2 Implementation of Scenario Modeling Using Linked Data and Complex Event Processing at DERI

246

247

DERI has implemented a linked data infrastructure which connects different silos of information through common contexts. This infrastructure has been extended to consider energy usage in the building. Figure 5 illustrates how the various data silos may be combined. For example, the zone context is common to three silos, and the person context is common to two silos (Figure 5). Different association relations are notable for the person context in each silo.

248

249

250

251

With regard to the human resources silo, a person is an occupant of a group and a member of a group, while in the inventory silo, a person has a laptop. The “same as” relationship links the person context in both silos. This “same as” mechanism ensures that the end user has the ability to query data from all linked silos.

252

253

254





Figure 5: A linked data perspective that illustrates three distinct silos of information and how these silos link together.


255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260

In this case, the end user is the building manager, and we propose that the building manager would use a single scenario model which represents total building energy consumption but focuses on an analysis of Research Group 1



262
 263 Figure 6). In doing so, it uses two performance aspects: energy consumption and legislation. This approach ensures
 264 that the energy consumption analysis also considers the legislative costs associated with CO₂ emissions. This
 265 particular scenario leverages whole building energy consumption as captured by electricity meters [28] and accounts
 266 for the zone-level electricity measurements depicted in Table 1. The scenario model explicitly captures the
 267 following information:

- 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
- Total building energy consumption
 - Energy consumption for Research Group 1
 - Cost of utilities for Research Group 1
 - Associated CO₂ emissions for Research Group 1



275
276
277
278

Figure 6: Scenario model using linked data and complex event processing defines energy consumption per research group and CO₂ emissions per research group.

279 **Nomenclature**

Elec _{pz}	Electricity consumption per zone	(kWh)
N _E	Number of employees in the zone	(People)
N _{EG1}	Number of Group 1 employees in the zone	(People)
N _{TEG1}	Total number of employees from Group 1	(People)
G _T	Total gas consumption for the building	(People)
G _R	Gas unit rate	(€/m ³)
G _{EF}	Gas emissions factor	(People)
E _{EF}	Electricity emissions factor	(People)
E _R	Electricity unit rate	(€/kWh)

280
281
282


The combination of the scenario modeling technique with different silos of information, connected through a linked data approach, dramatically assists the building manager with performance analysis activities. The system

283 implemented at DERI enables real-time access to the required information and displays relevant information to the
 284 building manager.


285
 286 clearly illustrates how the DERI energy consumption disaggregates by organizational group. To maintain
 287 consistency with the scenario definition,

288 also includes a comparison of measured and predicted energy consumption, cost, and CO₂ emissions. In this case,
 289 the benchmark figures represent historically normalized data, as a whole building energy simulation model has not
 290 been developed for this building.


291



292
 293 Figure 7: Dashboard image comparing total building energy consumption against a benchmark and as broken down
 294 by research group.



295
 296 Figure 8 complements analysis at the building level by analyzing how members of Research Group 1, who sit at
 297 fixed locations, consume energy throughout the building—information that is difficult to determine using traditional
 298 processes and resources. The software implementation supports a breakdown of energy consumption for all research
 299 groups within the DERI organization. With this information at hand, the building manager can communicate
 300 transparently with upper management and fulfill his assigned duties.
 301



302 Figure 8: Dashboard image displaying the energy consumption of Research Group 1, broken down by zone.
 303 This effective proof-of-concept demonstration must consider a number of technical challenges before it can be
 304 applied at a large scale.
 305

306 2.3 Technical Challenges

307 To meet the high-level challenges discussed in Section 2.2, the proposed solution needs to meet the following
 308 technical requirements:
 309

- 310 • **Multi-domain Information:** In large-scale environments, it becomes difficult to agree on the same concepts
 311 for the same things, due to federated responsibility of event and data publication. The system will need to
 312 support heterogeneous use of vocabulary to describe events and associated data. For example, an energy sensor
 313 may use the term “usage” while another one might use the term “consumption” to describe the same activity of
 314 consuming energy.
- 315 • **Inclusion of Real-time Sensor Data:** To support decisions with minimum delay, the system has to handle real-
 316 time observations that come from physical and virtual sensors, and to be able to process such streaming data
 317 efficiently in order to draw higher-level and aggregated information from it. Inclusion of external data sources,
 318 weather data, and utility price data may result in data quality issues, such as accuracy and uniformity, that need
 319 taken into account.

320 3 Implementation

3.1 Technology Background

3.1.1 Linked Data

Semantic Web technologies and standards play an important role in simplifying access to existing and future data and enabling large quantities of data to be shared on the Web. The Resource Description Framework (RDF) standard provides a common interoperable format and model for data linking and sharing on the Web. Linked Data is a best-practice approach used to expose, share, and connect data on the Web based upon W3C standards. In contrast to documents, Linked Data is not aimed at human consumption, it is processed and queried by computers, similar to relational data stored in conventional databases. Linked data technology uses web standards (e.g., the Resource Description Framework (RDF) [29]) in conjunction with the four following basic principles for exposing, sharing, and connecting data:

- **Use a standardized way to identify objects:** The use of Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) [30] (similar to a URL) to identify things such as a person, a place, a product, an organization, or an event—or even concepts such as risk exposure or net profit—simplifies data reuse and integration.
- **Use a standardized way to get data about objects:** URIs are used to retrieve data about objects using standard web protocols. For a person, this could be his or her organization and job classification; for an event, this may be its location, time, and attendance; for a product, this may be its specification, availability, price, or some other feature.
- **Use a standardized way to represent data:** When someone looks up a URI to retrieve data, provide it using standardized formats, ideally in Semantic Web standards RDF and SPARQL [31].
- **Use a standardized way to interlink information:** Retrieved data may link to other data sources, thus creating a data network (e.g., data about a product may link to all components it is made of, which may link to all suppliers).

Linked data technology can be accommodated with minimal disruption to existing information infrastructure, as a complementary technology for data sharing, and should not be seen as a replacement for current IT infrastructure (e.g., relational databases, data warehouses). The objective is to expose the data within existing systems, but only link the data when its needs to be shared.


3.1.2 Complex Event Processing

To process information flows, systems that are dedicated to high rate information flow processing are used. Data Stream Management Systems (DSMS) and Complex Event Processing (CEP) systems are two that have been adopted by commercial systems over the last few years [32]. In Complex Event Processing [33], the situations of interest are expressed in the form of event patterns and stored in the CEP engine. New information items can participate in the evaluation of the pattern if they are relevant. When a pattern is matched, a new higher-level event is generated and can participate in further processing, or could be forwarded to an event consumer like a dashboard or a business process management tool.

The bridge between Complex Event Processing and Linked Data is achieved with the use of Semantic Sensor networks (SSN). SSN were proposed [34] to optimize the benefits of current standards in the field of sensor networks [35]. The SSN ontology [34] has been designed to represent common concepts in a sensing environment. It handles metadata information such as sensor types and platforms, as well as classes, to describe real-time sensor observations. The use of sensor networks that respect linked data principles [36] when publishing data forms a solid basis for a real-time energy platform.

3.2 Linked Dataspace for Energy Intelligence

365 This paper proposes that Linked Data and Complex Event Processing can be the basis for an interoperability
 366 approach that would help to overcome technical and conceptual barriers to cross-domain scenario modeling. The
 367 approach has been implemented using the Linked dataspace for Energy Intelligence developed at DERI. Figure 9
 368 shows the proposed placement of the Linked dataspace for Energy Intelligence (LEI) [37,38]. LEI serves as a
 369 platform that applications can be built upon. The approach can support interoperability with linked data providing
 370 common syntactic and access protocols.



371
 372 Figure 9: Linked dataspace for Energy Intelligence (LEI) enables cross silo data access for a diverse range of uses.
 373

374 The main components of the architecture are:

- 375 • **Adapters:** At the bottom of the architecture are the existing operational legacy information systems. Adapters
 376 perform the “RDFization” process, which transforms multiple formats and legacy data and lifts it to the
 377 dataspace.
- 378 • **Linked Data:** The result of the linked data wrappers is a cloud of interlinked resources that reflect virtual or
 379 actual entities with links to relevant knowledge and contextual information from across all the information
 380 systems that have exposed linked data. Each entity within the cloud has a dereferenceable URI that returns data
 381 in a machine-readable format, describing the resource identified.
- 382 • **Support Services:** Dataspace support services are designed to simplify the consumption of the linked data
 383 cloud by encapsulating common services for reuse. Some example support services used in this work are:

- 384 ○ *Entity Management Service*, to improve data quality and inter-linkage between entity data scattered
 385 among legacy systems. The EMS can leverage automatic data integration algorithms that are
 386 supported by humans for collaborative data management [39].
- 387 ○ A *Complex Event Processing* engine [40], to assess situations of interest that are encoded as event/action
 388 rules. Real-time information from sensors networks are also supported via the Semantic Sensor
 389 Network Ontology.
- 390 ○ *Data Catalogue and Provenance service* [41], to query the catalogue about data sources with specific
 391 attributes such as freshness and publisher, and track the data back to their origin.
- 392 ○ *Search and Query services* [42], to allow users to interact with the dataspace using structured or natural
 393 language interfaces.
- 394 • **Applications:** At the top of the architecture are the consuming applications such as decision support
 395 applications and dashboards. Scenario models are defined at this level to gain a deeper understanding of the
 396 energy consumption behaviors in the building.

397 **3.2.1 CEP Rules for Cross-Domain Scenario Modeling**

398 The following code snippet implements the key concepts of the zone energy-sharing scenario model detailed in
 399 Figure 6. Together, the snippets represent a sample of the engineering implementation for the scenario model
 400 defined in Section 2.2. The first snippet details the event that is created when a new energy meter reading is
 401 received.

402 Implementation of “Zone Energy Sharing” Event for processing energy meter values

```

  403 INSERT INTO ZoneEnergySharingEvent
  404 SELECT
  405     EnergyConsumptionEvent.ZoneURI,
  406     GetZoneEnergySharing(EnergyConsumptionEvent.ZoneURI,
  407                          EnergyConsumptionEvent.Consumption)
  408 FROM
  409     EnergyConsumptionEvent
  
```

404 The second snippet details the implementation of the energy allocation formulae defined in Figure 6 that apportions
 405 the energy usage for a zone to the groups that occupy that zone.

406 Function to apportion the energy consumption of a zone to individual groups

```

  407 HashMap<URI, Double> GetZoneEnergySharing(ZoneURI, Consumption) {
  408     //For each GroupURI that has presence in ZoneURI
  409     //Add to the result map a pair of GroupURI and
  410     // Consumption*(proportion of GroupURI presence in ZoneURI)
  411     //Return the result map
  412
  413     HashMap<URI, Zone> Zones=State.getZones();
  414     Zone zone=Zones.get(ZoneURI);
  415     HashMap<URI, Double> resultMap=new HashMap<URI, Double>();
  416
  417     foreach(URI groupURI : zone.getOccupantsCount().getKeySet()){
  418         if(zone.getOccupantsCount().get(groupURI)>0) {
  419             Double groupConsumption =
  
```

```
Consumption*zone.getOccupantsCount().get(groupURI)/zone.getOccupantsTotalCount();
        resultMap.put(groupURI, groupConsumption);
    }
}
}
```

409

4 Conclusion and Future Work

410

This paper illustrated the value of transferring data between different parts of organizations for use in holistic environmental and energy management activities. The combination of scenario modeling, linked data, and complex event processing significantly enhances the information available to building managers, especially when the information communicated is in a format specifically designed for building managers. With access to additional information that can in turn be processed by predefined algorithms, this solution removes the need for subjective or expert intervention with respect to holistic performance analysis. The technique minimizes the time spent by building managers on performance analysis and building performance optimization. In fact, building managers, empowered by additional cost and operational information, can communicate savings to other organizational stakeholders with greater certainty, and this elevates the role of building manager in the context of organizational objectives, especially if organizations practice continuous improvement as defined by the best practice “plan-do-check-act” cycle, the key component of ISO 50001 [43].

421

422

Future building managers should have access to all possible data that they require from an organization. It is imperative that these data are processed and communicated in a format suitable for building managers. Such data and processing include simulation-based modeling and control, expert algorithms for Fault Detection and Diagnosis (FDD), or functionality to leverage other types of simulation, such as Daylighting or Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD). In order to include new data silos in the interoperable linked data environment, unique adapters are required for each silo. Bidirectional benefit is a key driver for the development of such adapters. For example, the HR domain could leverage occupancy data from the demonstration in Section 2.2.

429

430

Once established, Linked Data systems are easily scalable for campuses and portfolios of buildings, but should not be limited to assisting only the building manager. Further work could focus on stakeholder integration, where other stakeholders, particularly designers, commissioners, and financial controllers would benefit significantly from cross-silo data access. In conclusion, the scenario modeling technique is not limited to the energy domain, but is an extensible method of evaluating building related data. As more data streams become available in different building domains, the technique can be extended to incorporate these. The linked data approach is built on the premise of connecting diverse data streams. As these streams become more widespread in the building area, the possibilities for building wide and urban scale data platforms driving myriad applications becomes possible.

437

438

5 Acknowledgements

439

This work was supported by the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Office of Building Technology, Building Technologies Program of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

441

442

This work has been funded by the Irish Research Council.

443

This work has been funded by Science Foundation Ireland under Grant No. SFI/08/CE/I1380 (Lion-2).

444

6 References

445
446 [1] P. Torcellini, S. Pless, M. Deru, B. Griffith, N. Long, R. Judkoff, Lessons Learned from Case Studies of Six High-
447 Performance Buildings, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO, USA, 2006.
448 [2] I.P.M. & V.P.C. DOE, International Performance Measurement & Verification Protocol. Concepts and Options for
449 Determining Energy and Water Savings, United States Department of Energy, 2002.
450 [3] J. O'Donnell, Specification of Optimum Holistic Building Environmental and Energy Performance Information to
451 Support Informed Decision Making, Ph.D Thesis, University College Cork, 2009.
452 [4] C. Neumann, D. Jacob, Results of the project Building EQ. Tools and methods for linking EPBD and continuous
453 commissioning, Fraunhofer ISE, 2010.
454 [5] J. Granderson, M.A. Piette, B. Rosenblum, L. Hu, Energy Information Handbook: Applications for Energy Efficient
455 Buildings, (2012).
456 [6] E. Morrissey, Building Effectiveness Communication Ratios (BECs): An Integrated "Life-Cycle" Methodology for
457 Mitigating Energy-use in Buildings, PhD Thesis, University College Cork, 2006.
458 [7] buildingSMART, Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) Homepage, (2012).
459 [8] J.T. O'Donnell, R. See, C. Rose, T. Maile, V. Bazjanac, P. Haves, SimModel: A domain data model for whole building
460 energy simulation, in: IBPSA Building Simulation 2011. Sydney, Australia, IBPSA, Sydney, Australia, 2011.
461 [9] P. Pauwels, Reconsidering information system support for architectural design thinking., Ph.D. Thesis, Department of
462 Architecture and Urban Planning, Ghent University., 2012.
463 [10] NEN, NEN 2916: Energy Performance of Non-residential Buildings Determination Method., Dutch Normalization
464 Institute (NEN), Standardization Institute, Delft, 1999.
465 [11] CIBSE, CIBSE Guide F: Energy efficiency in buildings, CIBSE, 2004.
466 [12] ENERGY STAR, Normalize Data, (2012).
467 [13] G. Augenbroe, C.-S. Park, Quantification Methods of Technical Building Performance, Building Research & Information.
468 33 (2) (2005) 159–172.
469 [14] P. Raftery, M. Keane, A. Costa, Calibrating whole building energy models: Detailed case study using hourly measured
470 data, Energy and Buildings. 43 (2011) 3666–3679.
471 [15] P. Raftery, M. Keane, J. O'Donnell, Calibrating whole building energy models: An evidence-based methodology, Energy
472 and Buildings. 43 (2011) 2356–2364.
473 [16] A. Costa, M.M. Keane, P. Raftery, J. O'Donnell, Key factors methodology—A novel support to the decision making
474 process of the building energy manager in defining optimal operation strategies, Energy and Buildings. 49 (2012) 158–
475 163.
476 [17] M. Liu, D.E. Claridge, W.D. Turner, Continuous CommissioningSM of Building Energy Systems, J. Sol. Energy Eng.
477 125 (2003) 275–281.
478 [18] O. Baumann, Enhanced Building Operation Using 'Operation Diagnostics' -A Case Study, in: International Conference
479 for Enhanced Building Operations, October 11-13, 2005 Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 2005.
480 [19] O. Baumann, Operation Diagnostics-Use of Operation Patterns to Verify and Optimize Building and System Operation,
481 in: International Conference for Enhanced Building Operations, Paris, France, 2004.
482 [20] J. O'Donnell, M. Keane, E. Morrissey, V. Bazjanac, Scenario Modelling: A Holistic Environmental and Energy
483 Management Method for Building Operation Optimization, Energy and Buildings. Submitted (2012).
484 [21] G.J. Langley, R. Moen, K.M. Nolan, T.W. Nolan, C.L. Norman, L.P. Provost, The Improvement Guide: A Practical
485 Approach to Enhancing Organizational Performance, 2nd ed., Jossey-Bass, 2009.
486 [22] D. Pati, C.-S. Park, G. Augenbroe, Roles of quantified expressions of building performance assessment in facility
487 procurement and management, Building and Environment. 44 (2009) 773–784.
488 [23] M. Keane, A. Costa, J. O'Donnell, K. Menzel, U. Gokce, E. Jafer, et al., BUILDWISE: BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE
489 FUTURE. Wireless Sensor Networks for Energy and Environment Management in Buildings. Final Report, Informatics
490 Research Unit for Sustainable Engineering, University College Cork, <http://zuse.ucc.ie/buildwise/>, 2010.
491 [24] M.A. Piette, S.K. Kinney, P. Haves, Analysis of an information monitoring and diagnostic system to improve building
492 operations, Energy and Buildings. 33 (8) (2001) 783–791.
493 [25] T. Maile, V. Bazjanac, M. Fischer, A method to compare simulated and measured data to assess building energy
494 performance, Building and Environment. 56 (2012) 241–251.
495 [26] T. Maile, Comparing Measured and Simulated Building Energy Performance Data, Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University,
496 2010.
497 [27] ASHRAE, ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2010 Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, ASHRAE, 1791 Tullie
498 Circle NE, Atlanta, GA 30329, 2010.
499 [28] E. Curry, J. O'Donnell, E. Corry, S. Hassan, S. O'Riain, M. Keane, Using Multi-Domain Data to Optimize Building
500 Operational Performance: A Linked Data Approach to Interoperability, Advanced Engineering Informatics. Special
501 Edition (n.d.).
502 [29] Resource description framework (RDF) model and syntax, (1999).
503 [30] T. Berners-Lee, R. Fielding, L. Masinter, Uniform resource identifiers (URI): generic syntax, (1998).
504 [31] E. Prud'Hommeaux, A. Seaborne, SPARQL query language for RDF, W3C Working Draft. 4 (2008).
505 [32] G. Cugola, A. Margara, Processing flows of information: From data stream to complex event processing, ACM Comput.
506 Surv. 44 (2012) 15:1–15:62.

- 507 [33] D. Luckham, *The Power of Events: An Introduction to Complex Event Processing in Distributed Enterprise Systems*,
508 Addison-Wesley Professional, 2002.
- 509 [34] L. Lefort, C. Henson, K. Taylor, P. Barnaghi, M. Compton, O. Corcho, et al., *Semantic Sensor Network XG Final Report*,
510 W3C Incubator Group Report, 2011.
- 511 [35] C.Y. Chong, S.P. Kumar, *Sensor networks: Evolution, opportunities, and challenges*, *Proceedings of the IEEE*. 91 (2003)
512 1247–1256.
- 513 [36] T. Berners-Lee, *Linked Data- Design Issues*, 2006.
- 514 [37] E. Curry, *System of Systems Information Interoperability using a Linked Dataspace*, in: *IEEE 7th International*
515 *Conference on System of Systems Engineering (SOSE 2012)*, 2012: pp. 113–118.
- 516 [38] E. Curry, S. Hasan, S. O’Riain, *Enterprise Energy Management using a Linked dataspace for Energy Intelligence*, in: *The*
517 *Second IFIP Conference on Sustainable Internet and ICT for Sustainability (SustainIT 2012)*, 2012.
- 518 [39] U. ul Hassan, S. O’Riain, E. Curry, *Leveraging Matching Dependencies for Guided User Feedback in Linked Data*
519 *Applications*, in: *9th International Workshop on Information Integration on the Web (IIWeb2012)*, Scottsdale, Arizona,,
520 2012.
- 521 [40] S. Hasan, E. Curry, M. Banduk, S. O’Riain, *Toward Situation Awareness for the Semantic Sensor Web: Complex Event*
522 *Processing with Dynamic Linked Data Enrichment*, in: *4th International Workshop on Semantic Sensor Networks 2011*
523 *(SSN11)*, Bonn, Germany, 2011: pp. 69–81.
- 524 [41] A. Freitas, T. Knap, S. O’Riain, E. Curry, *W3P: Building an OPM based provenance model for the Web*, *Future*
525 *Generation Computer Systems*. 27 (2011) 766–774.
- 526 [42] A. Freitas, J. Oliveira, S. O’Riain, E. Curry, J. Pereira da Silva, *Querying Linked Data using Semantic Relatedness: A*
527 *Vocabulary Independent Approach*, in: R. Muñoz, A. Montoyo, E. Métais (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th International*
528 *Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Information Systems, NLDB 2011*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg,
529 Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011: pp. 40–51.
- 530 [43] ISO, *ISO 50001:2011 - Energy management systems -- Requirements with guidance for use*, International Organization
531 for Standardization, 2011.
- 532