



## Local4Global

SYSTEM-OF-SYSTEMS THAT ACT LOCALLY FOR  
OPTIMIZING GLOBALLY

611538, FP7-ICT-2013.3.4

### Deliverable D 6.1.1:


### Evaluation Plan (1st version)

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Deliverable Version: | D 6.1.1, v.1.0  |
| Document Identifier: | local4global wp6_d6.1.1_rwth_trv_tum_v1.0   |
| Preparation Date:    | June 10, 2014   |
| Document Status:     | Final   |
| Author(s):           | Thomas Schild (RWTH), Roozbeh Sangi (RWTH), Roland Ettinger (TRV), Michael Krause (TUM) |
| Dissemination Level: | PU - Public   |

### Project funded by the European Community in the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme



EU FP7 - SMALL/MEDIUM-SCALE FOCUSED  
RESEARCH PROJECT (STREP), FP7-ICT-2013.3.4:  
ADVANCED COMPUTING, EMBEDDED AND CONTROL  
SYSTEMS  
D) FROM ANALYZING TO CONTROLLING BEHAVIOUR  
OF SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS (SOS)



## Deliverable SUMMARY SHEET

| Deliverable Details          |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Type of Document:</b>     | Deliverable   |
| <b>Document Reference #:</b> | D 6.1.1   |
| <b>Title:</b>                | Evaluation Plan (1st version)   |
| <b>Version Number:</b>       | 1.0   |
| <b>Preparation Date:</b>     | June 10, 2014   |
| <b>Delivery Date:</b>        | June 30, 2014   |
| <b>Author(s):</b>            | Thomas Schild (RWTH), Roozbeh Sangi (RWTH), Roland Ettinger (TRV), Michael Krause (TUM) |
| <b>Document Identifier:</b>  | local4global wp6_d6.1.1_rwth_trv_tum_v1.0   |
| <b>Document Status:</b>      | Final   |
| <b>Dissemination Level:</b>  | PU - Public   |

| Project Details                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Project Acronym:</b>        | Local4Global  |
| <b>Project Title:</b>          | SYSTEM-OF-SYSTEMS THAT ACT LOCALLY FOR OPTIMIZING GLOBALLY  |
| <b>Project Number:</b>         | 611538  |
| <b>Call Identifier:</b>        | FP7-ICT-2013.3.4  |
| <b>Call Theme:</b>             | ADVANCED COMPUTING, EMBEDDED AND CONTROL SYSTEMS  |
| <b>Project Coordinator:</b>    | CERTH – Centre for Research and Technology – Hellas<br>CERTH – Centre for Research and Technology – Hellas;<br>ETHZ – Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich;<br>RWTH – RWTH Aachen University;<br>IK4 – IK4 TEKNIKER;<br>TRV – TRANSVER GmbH;<br>TUC – Technical University of Crete; |
| <b>Participating Partners:</b> | TUM – Technische Universität Muenchen;  |
| <b>Instrument:</b>             | STREP   |
| <b>Contract Start Date:</b>    | October 1, 2013   |
| <b>Duration:</b>               | 36 Months   |

### Deliverable D 6.1.1: Short Description

The Evaluation Plan will prescribe the general evaluation approach, the assessment objectives, the indicators to be used, the methods and timing of measurement and the measurement conditions, and statistical issues such as sample sizes. Establishing this Evaluation Plan is an iterative process based on a first draft version as basis for further discussion within the project and with the project officer. After that the final version will be consolidated, complimented by questionnaire details for the evaluation of the user acceptance.

**Keywords:** evaluation, assessment, system of systems, use case, traffic, building, control, automation, monitoring, key performance indicator, junction control, building management system, optimization, data base, transfer, questionnaires, user acceptance, methodology, methods

### Deliverable D 6.1.1: Revision History

| Version: | Date:      | Status: | Comments   |
|----------|------------|---------|--|
| 0.1      | 23/05/2014 | Draft   | First complete draft version for internal revision               |
| 0.2      | 23/05/2014 | Draft   | Contributions by TRANSVER  |
| 0.3      | 23/05/2014 | Draft   | Contributions by TUM   |
| 0.4      | 23/05/2014 | Draft   | Final draft, ready for internal revision by the project partners |
| 1.0      | 10/06/2014 | Final   | Contributions by project partners                                |

### Copyright notices

© 2014 Local4Global Consortium Partners. All rights reserved. Local4Global is an FP7 Project supported by the European Commission under contract #611538. For more information on the project, its partners, and contributors please see <http://local4global-fp7.eu>. You are permitted to copy and distribute verbatim copies of this document, containing this copyright notice, but modifying this document is not allowed. All contents are reserved by default and may not be disclosed to third parties without the written consent of the Local4Global partners, except as mandated by the European Commission contract, for reviewing and dissemination purposes. All trademarks and other rights on third party products mentioned in this document are acknowledged and owned by the respective holders. The information contained in this document represents the views of Local4Global members as of the date they are published. The Local4Global consortium does not guarantee that any information contained herein is error-free, or up to date, nor makes warranties, express, implied, or statutory, by publishing this document.

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary .....                                    | 1  |
| 1 Introduction .....                                       | 2  |
| 2 General Evaluation Approach.....                         | 4  |
| 2.1 Comparability .....                                    | 4  |
| 2.2 Transferability to generic TSoS .....                  | 4  |
| 3 General Evaluation Methodology.....                      | 5  |
| 3.1 Assessment Objectives .....                            | 5  |
| 3.2 Assessment Methodology .....                           | 6  |
| 3.2.1 GKPIs .....  | 6  |
| 3.2.2 Determination of GKPI .....                          | 8  |
| 3.3 Evaluation Methodology.....                            | 8  |
| 3.3.1 Determination of KPI .....                           | 8  |
| 3.3.2 Measured data .....                                  | 8  |
| 3.3.3 Simulations .....                                    | 9  |
| 3.3.4 Questionnaires.....                                  | 9  |
| 4 Traffic Use Case .....                                   | 10 |
| 4.1 The Use case .....                                     | 10 |
| 4.1.1 System Description .....                             | 10 |
| 4.1.2 L4G Traffic Use Case .....                           | 10 |
| 4.1.3 Base Case Control.....                               | 11 |
| 4.1.4 Test Case Control.....                               | 11 |
| 4.1.5 Assessment Objectives .....                          | 12 |
| 4.2 Evaluation Methodology.....                            | 12 |
| 4.2.1 Methodological Approach .....                        | 12 |
| 4.2.2 Measures and KPIs.....                               | 15 |
| 4.2.3 Methods .....  | 16 |
| 4.2.4 Uncertainties and artificial circumstances .....     | 23 |
| 4.2.5 Data Base .....                                      | 23 |
| 4.2.6 KPI 1: Performance Index.....                        | 23 |
| 4.2.7 KPI 2: Level of Service.....                         | 24 |
| 4.2.8 KPI 3: Average Network Mean Speed .....              | 25 |
| 4.2.9 KPI 4: Cost-Benefit Ratio.....                       | 25 |
| 4.2.10 KPI 5: Subjective Usability / User Experience ..... | 26 |
| 4.2.11 KPI 6: Driving Behavior / Compliance .....          | 26 |
| 4.3 Transfer to General KPI.....                           | 26 |
| 5 Building Use Case (RWTH).....                            | 28 |
| 5.1 The building test site.....                            | 28 |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 5.2   | L4G building TSoS.....                                     | 30 |
| 5.2.1 | <i>General building TSoS structure</i> .....               | 30 |
| 5.2.2 | <i>L4G building TSoS structure</i> .....                   | 31 |
| 5.2.3 | <i>Delimitation to BMS</i> .....                           | 32 |
| 5.2.4 | <i>Delimitation to CSS</i> .....                           | 32 |
| 5.3   | Data management .....                                      | 33 |
| 5.3.1 | <i>Data base structure</i> .....                           | 33 |
| 5.3.2 | <i>Designation principles</i> .....                        | 33 |
| 5.3.3 | <i>Types of data points</i> .....                          | 33 |
| 5.3.4 | <i>Data verification</i> .....                             | 34 |
| 5.4   | Evaluation Methodology.....                                | 34 |
| 5.4.1 | <i>KPI</i> .....   | 34 |
| 5.4.2 | <i>Questionnaires</i> .....                                | 34 |
| 5.4.3 | <i>Limit value monitoring</i> .....                        | 35 |
| 5.4.4 | <i>Evaluation strategy - MCIS</i> .....                    | 35 |
| 5.4.5 | <i>Uncertainties</i> .....                                 | 35 |
| 5.5   | KPI evaluation .....                                       | 35 |
| 5.5.1 | <i>Net Energy Consumed (NEC)</i> .....                     | 36 |
| 5.5.2 | <i>Net Energy Savings (NES)</i> .....                      | 37 |
| 5.5.3 | <i>Non-Renewable Energy Consumed (NREC)</i> .....          | 37 |
| 5.5.4 | <i>Non-Renewable Energy Savings (NRES)</i> .....           | 39 |
| 5.5.5 | <i>Primary Energy Consumed (PEC)</i> .....                 | 39 |
| 5.5.6 | <i>Primary Energy Savings (PES)</i> .....                  | 40 |
| 5.5.7 | <i>Further KPI</i> .....                                   | 40 |
| 5.6   | Evaluation of behavior under artificial circumstances..... | 41 |
| 5.6.1 | <i>Artificial malfunctions</i> .....                       | 41 |
| 5.6.2 | <i>Artificial incidents</i> .....                          | 41 |
| 5.7   | Evaluation of users' acceptance .....                      | 41 |
| 5.8   | Transfer to General KPI.....                               | 42 |
| 6     | Outlook .....  | 43 |
| 7     | References .....   | 44 |

## List of Figures

|   |    |
|---|----|
| FIGURE 1: ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL KPI FOR GENERIC TSOS .....  | 6  |
| FIGURE 2: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR USE CASE TSOS .....  | 8  |
| FIGURE 3: TEST BED MUNICH FOR TRAFFIC TSOS USE CASE .....   | 10 |
| FIGURE 4: TIME-SPACE DIAGRAM OF A COORDINATED TIMING PLAN (FHWA 2008) .....                                 | 11 |
| FIGURE 5: ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA .....  | 12 |
| FIGURE 6: V-SHAPE CYCLE FOR TSOS TRAFFIC USE CASE EVALUATION .....  | 14 |
| FIGURE 7: DeLONE AND McLEAN INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUCCESS MODEL (DeLONE AND McLEAN 2003)<br>.....             | 15 |
| FIGURE 8: EVALUATION METHODS, MEASURES AND KPIS .....   | 16 |
| FIGURE 9: CAR FOLLOWING LOGIC BY WIEDEMANN (PTV AG 2011) .....  | 17 |
| FIGURE 10: MICROSIMULATION MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION PROCESS IN LOCAL4GLOBAL .                      | 18 |
| FIGURE 11: VISSIM NETWORK MODEL. MAP: LANDESAMT FÜR VERMESSUNG UND GEOINFORMATION<br>BAYERN, 1053/08 .....  | 19 |
| FIGURE 12: DETAILED MODELING OF INTERSECTION LAYOUTS FROM SIEMENS AG, 2011 .....                            | 19 |
| FIGURE 13: ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND CONTENTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES .....                                       | 22 |
| FIGURE 14: VIEW OF THE E.ON ERC MAIN BUILDING IN AACHEN, GERMANY .....                                      | 28 |
| FIGURE 15: ENERGY SUPPLY CONCEPT .....  | 30 |
| FIGURE 16: FIRST-LEVEL MAP REPRESENTATION OF A GENERIC BUILDING TSOS WITH VIEW ON THE SUPPLY<br>SYSTEM..... | 31 |
| FIGURE 17: FIRST-LEVEL MAP REPRESENTATION OF THE L4G BUILDING USE CASE'S TSOS .....                         | 31 |
| FIGURE 18: SCHEMES OF GENERIC DEMAND SYSTEMS .....  | 36 |
| FIGURE 19: SCHEME OF GENERIC CONVERSION SYSTEMS .....   | 38 |

## List of Tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| TABLE 1: MAIN PROJECT OBJECTIVES (DOW, ANNEX I, TABLE 1).....    | 5  |
| TABLE 2: MAIN ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES (DOW, ANNEX I, TABLE 3)..... | 6  |
| TABLE 3: LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS (FGSV 2001) .....          | 25 |
| TABLE 4: GKPI-KPI TRANSFER RELATION .....                        | 27 |
| TABLE 5: L4G BUILDING USE CASE OVERVIEW.....                     | 32 |
| TABLE 6: PRIMARY ENERGY FACTORS (DIN V 18599-1 2007).....        | 39 |
| TABLE 7: GKPI-KPI TRANSFER RELATION .....                        | 42 |

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| ANMS     | Average Network Mean Speed                |
| BMS      | Building Management System                |
| BUC      | Building Use Case                         |
| CBA      | Cost-Benefit-Analysis                     |
| CBR      | Cost-Benefit-Ratio                        |
| CCA      | Concrete Core Activation                  |
| CSS      | Central Supply Systems                    |
| FCD      | Floating Car Data                         |
| FOT      | Field Operational Test                    |
| FVU      | Façade Ventilation Unit                   |
| GKPI     | General Key Performance Indicators        |
| HCM      | Highway Capacity Manual                   |
| HGV      | Heavy Goods Vehicle                       |
| HMI      | Human Machine Interface                   |
| IS       | Interconnecting Wall Sensor               |
| KPI      | Key Performance Indicators                |
| L4G      | Local4Global project                      |
| LOS      | Level of Service                          |
| MCIS     | Monitoring Control and Information System |
| NDS      | Naturalistic Driving Study                |
| NEC      | Net Energy Consumption                    |
| NES      | Net Energy Savings                        |
| NREC     | Non-renewable Energy Consumption          |
| NRES     | Non-renewable Energy Savings              |
| PC       | Personal Computer                         |
| PC (BUC) | People Counter                            |
| PEC      | Primary Energy Consumption                |
| PES      | Primary Energy Savings                    |
| PI       | Performance Index                         |
| PS       | Presence Sensor                           |
| RMSPE    | Root Mean Square Percent Error            |
| SoS      | System of Systems                         |
| SUS      | System Usability Scale                    |
| TD       | Temperature Demand                        |
| TrUC     | Traffic Use Case                          |



---

|      |                                 |
|------|---------------------------------|
| TSoS | Technological System of Systems |
| VFC  | Variable Flow Control           |
| WS   | Window Sensor                   |
| WTP  | Willingness to Pay              |

---

## **Executive Summary**

The Local<sup>4</sup>Global project is meant to develop an ambitious and new methodology that facilitates to control a generic TSoS. Therefore, a plug-and-play and ready-to-use system will be the final product of the project. These goals require an exhaustive evaluation within the development process to advance a focused and goal-oriented progress.

The evaluation of the methodology's impact bases on two use case TSoS in different technical areas, a traffic TSoS and a building TSoS. The methodology will be tested in real TSoS that facilitate to implement and to monitor the system's operations in the required quality to be able to analyze and evaluate the achievement of the project's goals. A successful testing of the Local<sup>4</sup>Global methodology would open a valuable and advantageous perspective for further research activities in the appropriate research areas, thus an extensive and detail evaluation renders a wide-ranging exploitation possible.

Hence, the evaluation plan on hand faces the challenge to prepare a detailed and expressive evaluation of an inchoate methodology that is still in development, solely based on the test bed environment that already exists, but is not yet considered as a TSoS, and a generally capable software architecture. The mean of choice is an extensive data gathering and monitoring that provides the foundation of the evaluation on the level of the particular TSoS as well as on the level of generic TSoS.

For both use case TSoS, detached evaluation plans are developed, which meet the use case specific basic conditions and issues, facilitate to determine meaningful KPIs that are suitable for comparison. The general evaluation plan consists of the transfer principles, how the use case specific KPIs will be transferred and conclusions will be made for generic TSoS. In addition to the analysis based on measurements and derived figures, a pre-analysis will take place to investigate and gather indications if and how the methodology will be applicable to the real TSoS. Therewith, an instance of quality management is implemented as well as a first base for evaluation.

The document on hand embodies the 1<sup>st</sup> version of the evaluation plan. It is meant to facilitate a synchronous development of all related disciplines that take part in the project. This is an essential requirement for the capability to achieve the project's goals. Based on the first series of deliverables, that is the result of a close and steady collaboration of the project's partners, further progress will be discussed and advanced because of the pervasive and comprehensive information. The evaluation plan's final version will contain further perceptions and details and will present the methods for the evaluation of the final Local<sup>4</sup>Global methodology's impact on TSoS.

# 1 Introduction

The Local4Global project (L4G) aims to develop a new groundbreaking, generic and fully-functional methodology for controlling and optimizing TSoS<sup>1</sup> at the global level, based on local information. Therefore, a control algorithm will be used that is suitable to control generic TSoS without the need for the use of elaborate and effort consuming modelling, analysis and control design tools.

This algorithm/system will be evaluated based on use cases of different technological disciplines to be able to evaluate the potential impact for generic TSoS. Within the traffic use case, the L4G System will be introduced to a rural traffic network in combination with the control of cooperative vehicles. Within the building use case, the L4G algorithm will be implemented to control heating and cooling devices in a building. To do these implementations, the first step is the preparation of plans for the implementation and evaluation phases. The former has been accomplished in deliverables 5.1.1 respectively 5.2.1, and the latter is made in this documentation.

The evaluation plan prescribes the general evaluation approach, the assessment objectives, the indicators to be used, the methods and timing of measurement and the measurement conditions, and statistical issues such as sample sizes. The core of the evaluation plan is an ‘Indicator Table’ for each use case, which contains for each indicator

- ✓ The name and number of the indicator (e.g. Average Daily Travel Times, Average Daily Fuel or Energy Consumption, Average Daily Fanger Factor<sup>2</sup>, Optimality Accuracy, Time Required to Complete the Computations, Time Required to Re-configure, etc);
- ✓ The maximum and minimum allowable values of the indicator;
- ✓ The European standards related to the particular indicator (if any);
- ✓ The data required to measure the indicator;
- ✓ The data sources (e.g. which sensors and devices to be used, the particular time-intervals to be used within the evaluation, etc) and
- ✓ The methods of data analysis (formulas, statistics tests).

Establishing this evaluation plan is an iterative process, which is obtained through communication, discussion and agreement among the L4G project partners point by point about what is feasible, what is not possible and what alternative solutions are available.

This document aims to outline a framework for evaluation of the Local for Global optimization algorithms within both, the building use case and traffic use case. The overall structure of the report contains five chapters.

The first chapter presents the general evaluation approach and addresses the objectives of work and also the required instruments like the above-mentioned “Indicator Tables”. The evaluation methodology is described in chapter two, where general key performance factors for evaluation are also defined. Chapters three and four deal with the evaluation procedure of the traffic and the building use cases, respectively. A brief description of the systems, how to obtain the required parameters for calculation of key performance factors and how to evaluate the gained results are discussed in these chapters. Additionally, preparation of the use case independent

---

<sup>1</sup> A Technological System of Systems (TSoS) is an orchestration of human designed systems that built a system of systems (SoS) regarding the way they work and the behavior, characteristics and interaction

<sup>2</sup> Fanger Factor is an indicator for thermal comfort

evaluation is presented in chapters three and four. Finally, comparison of general key performance factors, assessment of the L4G impact and conclusions with a view to generic TSoS are made in chapter five. In addition to evaluation purposes, the results of the developed evaluation plan are applied in the next step of the project, in order to determine additional sensors and monitoring devices that have to be installed at each of the two use cases.

## 2 General Evaluation Approach

The project aims to develop an algorithm/methodology that will be applicable to generic TSoS as a fully-functional and ready-to-use system, delivered in the form of an embedded, web-based plug-and-play system. Both use cases are meant to test this methodology and to evaluate its impact by implementing it in real-life TSoS. Based on the results and the experience of these tests, conclusions will be made for the deployment on generic TSoS.

Therefore, the evaluation task faces the following challenges:

- Incorporation the project's assessment objectives and general KPIs (GKPIs)
- Finding comparable KPIs for each use case that relate to the GKPIs
- Preparation of the evaluation procedures to determine all KPIs
- Preparation of the questionnaires that provide the evaluation of users' acceptance
- Preparation the overall evaluation
- Preparation of the assessment of the L4G's impact on generic TSoS by transferring the evaluation results from both use cases

The general evaluation plan addresses all these challenges and describes the approaches that will be used for evaluation. Chapter 3 gives an overview on the general evaluation methodology, which contains the assessment approach regarding the transferability to generic TSoS and the evaluation methodology that will be used in both use cases structurally. The use case specific evaluation plans are described in chapters 4 and 5, where the specific assessment objectives and methodology, evaluation methodology and the preconditions and circumstances are discussed. Additionally, the instruments will be presented in these two chapters as well as a brief description of the particular use case. In chapter 6, conclusions will be made regarding the future evaluation purpose.

### 2.1 Comparability

The evaluation of two use cases in different research areas requires a well-aligned evaluation of both use cases, if the outcome of both evaluations has to be comparable regarding the overall assessment objectives. For sure, each subject area contains its own perspective on the control purpose that underlies L4G and, therefore, each particular TSoS requires specific evaluation methods and target figures, while a joint subset of these figures has to be evaluable.

Despite the use case specific peculiarities, the required comparability will be established by focusing on the project's assessment objectives and the related KPIs. The introduced common KPIs will be used as far as possible to enlarge the evaluation's findings.

### 2.2 Transferability to generic TSoS

The comparable KPIs will be transferred to the GKPIs as a foundation to assess the L4G's impact on generic TSoS. Finding conclusions for a totality based on a sample size of two use cases is hard to achieve, but the use cases gives a first orientation and indication for the impact of L4G. Therefore, the KPIs' average values will be used with a spread in size of the deviations as well as the questionnaires' outcome, discussed concerning the tendency of the users' acceptance.

### 3 General Evaluation Methodology

#### 3.1 Assessment Objectives

In DoW (1.1.5) the measurable objectives in form of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are defined that will lead through the evaluation task. They are related to one or more of the main project objectives that are given in Table 1 in short terms.

**Table 1: Main project objectives (DoW, Annex I, Table 1)**

| Index | Description  |
|-------|--|
| O1    | The TSoS constituent systems are operating as fully autonomous units that react and interact depending only on their local environment in order to optimize the TSoS emerging performance at the global level.   |
| O2    | There will be no need for an elaborate and tedious effort to deploy the L4G system or to redesign/re-configure in cases of changes. The L4G system provides a plug-and-play control mechanism that embed learning, evolving and self-organizing capabilities |
| O3    | There will be no need for an elaborate, “expensive” infrastructure.  |
| O4    | The L4G methodology will be applicable to generic TSoS.  |

These objectives focus on the System-of-Systems (SoS) character that is the foundation for the L4G development and substantiates the ambitious challenge to aim on generic TSoS control.

Both use case TSoS are of SoS character as discussed in D2.3 (Ettinger, Krause and Schild, et al. 2014) and suitable to test the L4G methodology. For both use cases, measurable KPIs are defined that embody the core elements of the evaluation beside the questionnaire’s outcome.

Table 2 gives an overview and a brief description of the main assessment objectives, the target improvements, and the relation to the above-mentioned main project objectives. Both use cases are suitable to evaluate the achievement of the project target as far as a real TSoS is involved. The assessment of O4 is part of the verification process and described in the implementation plans of both use cases (Ettinger und Krause 2014) (Schild and Sangi 2014).

**Table 2: Main assessment objectives (DoW, Annex I, Table 3)**


| Index  | Description   | Target Improvement | Main Objective |
|--------|---|--------------------|----------------|
| GKPI 1 | <i>Traffic Use Case:</i><br>Difference in terms of daily average network speed  | 30 %               | O1, O2, O3     |
|        | <i>Building Use Case:</i><br>Difference in terms of daily average energy consumption from non-renewable sources while maintaining users' comfort (Fanger Factor) at an acceptable level |                    |                |
| GKPI 2 | Equal to GKPI 1, but when major (artificial) incidents are present  | 30 %               | O1, O2, O3     |
| GKPI 3 | Users' satisfaction metric to be calculated through questionnaires  | 80 %               | O1, O2, O3     |

### 3.2 Assessment Methodology

In this section, the methodologies for assessing each particular use case and the transfer to GKPIs are described. Herein, KPIs represent the evaluation's outcome of measurable figures, delimited to the results of the questionnaires that deliver statistical figures.

#### 3.2.1 GKPIs

Regarding the duality of the evaluation, the GKPIs have to be determined by the equivalent KPIs within each use case. As mentioned in section 2.2, the average values of these figures will be determined with a spread in size of the deviations as far as deeper statistical analysis is not reasonable.



**Figure 1: Assessment of general KPI for generic TSoS**

The definition of the evaluation procedure is given with the following formulas:

$$GKPI_n = \%GKPI_n \pm \%gkpi_n \quad (3.1)$$

where:

$\%GKPI$  = percentage of improvement of GKPI due to the L4G methodology

$\%gkpi$  = spread of percentage of improvement above both use cases

$$\%GKPI_n = \frac{\%KPI_{n,TrUC}^{eq} + \%KPI_{n,BUC}^{eq}}{2}$$

where:

$\%(G)KPI$  = improvement of KPI due to the L4G methodology (3.2)

$TrUC$  = traffic use case

$BUC$  = building use case

$eq$  = use-case-equivalent to GKPI

$n$  = identifier of figure

The spread is equal to the difference between the GKPI and the KPI of one use case.

$$\%gkpi_n = \%GKPI_n - \min(\%KPI_{n,TrUC}^{eq}; \%KPI_{n,BUC}^{eq})$$

where:

$\%gkpi$  = spread of percentage of improvement

$\%GKPI$  = percentage of improvement for the general KPI due to the L4G methodology (3.3)

$\%KPI^{eq}$  = percentage of KPI, equivalent to GKPI

$n$  = identifier of figure

$TrUC$  = Traffic Use Case

$BUC$  = Building Use Case

Therefore, each KPI will be calculated twice, for the system with the current control algorithm (base case) and for the L4G controlled system (test case), to calculate the percentage of improvement.



$$\%KPI_n = \frac{KPI_{n,base} - KPI_{n,test}}{KPI_{n,base}} \cdot 100$$

where:

- $\%KPI$  = percentage of improvement for the KPI due to the L4G methodology (3.4)  
*base* = determined for base case  
*test* = determined for test case  
*n* = identifier of figure

### 3.2.2 Determination of GKPI

GKPI 1 and 2 are based on measurable values, aggregated to the use case specific KPIs and transferred to the GKPIs per use case. Measurements for the values required for KPIs determination will be implemented in the use case TSoS. While the tests are running, these measurements are logged in a data storage and available for evaluation. Using evaluation procedures (e.g. programmed as script or visualized by some exploitation options), the use case specific KPIs will be determined and as far as possible aggregated to the GKPIs equivalent KPIs, that will be transferred to GKPIs and allow assessment and making conclusions for generic TSoS.



**Figure 2: Evaluation methodology for use case TSoS**

## 3.3 Evaluation Methodology

In this section, the general evaluation process is described from the point of data gathering to the final use case specific KPIs. Also interrelations to the implementation strategy are presented, which increase understanding, experience and knowledge about the L4G methodology and its operational behavior.

### 3.3.1 Determination of KPI

A brief description of the meaning and the formula for KPI determination is given in the use case specific sections. Based on the formula, the needed values for KPI determination is identifiable. These obtained values have to be stored in the data storage to be available for evaluation procedures. The evaluation procedures contain the definitions, methods and mathematical relations as described in this deliverable (see sections 4.2 and 5.4.1).

### 3.3.2 Measured data

The data for KPI determination will be gathered automatically in a data base that facilitates a detailed evaluation as far as required. The before-mentioned simulation data and the measurements that will be done whilst the algorithm is in operation, embody the base of all determinations.

The data acquisition and storage is system specific and will be described in the future chapters in the particular use case context.

### **3.3.3 Simulations**

A pre-analysis will be done before the L4G algorithm is implemented within the real TSoS to prevent incidents because of failures or malfunctions of the algorithm in connection to the TSoS. For both use cases, a base simulation already exists and will be modified as far as needed to get a notion of the SoS' behavior under the L4G control.

The simulation will be simplified and does not raise the claim to be complete in relation to the real TSoS, but it will produce an indication whether the algorithm will operate successfully and what kind of problems can be expected. The results of the simulations will be compared to the later operations, thus the evaluation will be based on all available information about the methodology.

### **3.3.4 Questionnaires**

The evaluation of the users' acceptance is part of the main assessment objectives. Therefore, questionnaires are required that facilitate statistical analysis to achieve representative and comparable figures based on subjective perceptions. Beside the base issues of the questionnaire's construction, sample sizing and evaluation, the choice of a suitable medium is a challenge regarding the reachability and the willingness to participate of the users' structure.

The questionnaires will be constructed as short as possible to obtain the highest ratio of participants and as focused as possible to achieve a maximum of significance. Both use cases will take previous disseminations of similar questionnaires as well as latest perceptions and latest lessons learned into account.

The questionnaires will be evaluated statistically focusing on the users' acceptance. Therefore, methods of descriptive statistics are suitable. Further details will be given in the use case specific sections.

## 4 Traffic Use Case

### 4.1 The Use case

#### 4.1.1 System Description

Aiming to introduce the Local4Global System into practice in the frame of the Traffic TSoS Use Case, a test bed in the north of Munich, Germany was defined to test and evaluate the outcomes of the project. The test bed is a road section of the federal road B 13 between the highway junction Unterschleißheim in the north and the junction of the federal roads B 13 and B 471 in the south (cf. Figure 3). This road section with a length of more than five kilometers allows testing new control approaches and technologies in a rural environment with comparably long distances between intersections and high-speed sections. The speed limit varies along one driving direction between 70 km/h and 100 km/h. Between the traffic signals at Landshuter Strasse (Junction #2) and Inhauser Moos (Junction #1) the maximum allowed speed is 60 km/h. The whole section has two lanes per driving direction and seven signalized intersections.



- #1: Inhauser Moos
- #2: Landshuter Strasse
- #3: Weihenstephaner Strasse
- #4: Münchner Ring
- #5: Kreuzhof
- #6: Franz-Lehner-Straße
- #7: B 471

**Figure 3: Test Bed Munich for Traffic TSoS Use Case**


Due to relative high traffic loads on the one hand and comparably highly developed hardware infrastructure on the other hand, the section has a strong potential for improvement in terms of traffic control. The seven signalized junctions of the road stretch are equipped with induction loops to detect the traffic flow in junction areas. At all junctions, traffic signal controllers of the traffic signal manufacturer Siemens of the latest generation are in operation. The controllers are able to receive and store data from roadside detectors. Furthermore, traffic controllers are able to archive signalization data. Detection and signalization data can be transmitted via mobile network to a central traffic computer for further processing.

#### 4.1.2 LAG Traffic Use Case

The Local4Global system aims to be a generic plug-and-play evolutionary optimization software package to improve the performance of generic TSoS globally on the basis of local information. The product's performance is tested and evaluated by means of two specific use cases. With respect to the project's Traffic Use Case, the product aims to autonomously optimize the current signal traffic control concept as described in the following section.

#### 4.1.3 Base Case Control

Currently, traffic signal systems in the test bed operate coordinated. The well-timed coordinated system is under operation during off-peak period on weekdays between 9.30am and 2.30pm. The concept of coordination permits continuous movement along an arterial and supports the formation of platoons leading significantly to an improvement of traffic flow along with the reduction of travel times, stops and delay. Figure 4 illustrates the result of coordination showing trajectories of moving vehicles in two directions through a system of coordinated traffic signals using a graphical representation known as a time-space diagram (FHWA 2008).



**Figure 4: Time-Space Diagram of a Coordinated Timing Plan (FHWA 2008)**

Coordination can either be of fixed time or traffic actuated nature. In both cases the cycle lengths of all signal plans at all signalized intersection as being part of the coordinated road stretch have to be equal. Besides requiring a background cycle length for synchronization purposes, coordination of traffic signals leads to further constraints: one signal phase has to be defined as a coordination phase. This phase always receives a minimum amount of assigned green time. Although it is possible to have a portion of the coordinated phase be actuated, i.e. traffic-responsive, the designated coordination phase requires a non-actuated interval that is guaranteed every cycle for the purpose of coordination (FHWA 2008). In other words, traffic dependency needs to be realized within a framework. Concerning base case control in the test bed, a traffic-actuated coordination being bound to a rather tight framework is under operation, i.e. the framework allows only small traffic-actuated deviations at some intersections.


#### 4.1.4 Test Case Control

After implementation in the Traffic Use Case, the Local4Global system aims to optimize the current traffic signal control in the test bed as described in the previous sections. The implementation of the Local4Global product in the Traffic Use Case incorporates two major applications. First, cooperative vehicles in the test bed shall receive signal timing information while approaching signalized intersections. A smartphone-based application will derive and display appropriate speed recommendations, aiming to avoid stops at signalized intersections. Secondly, the Local4Global system will autonomously optimize signal control on the basis of

test bed data. With respect to the technical conditions of the test bed, the Local4Global system can be provided with signalization and detection data as well as GPS trajectories from cooperative vehicles for optimization purposes. Summing up, the Local4Global systems' functionalities aim to improve performance, safety and environmental capability while being highly effective concerning costs and operation defined as capability objectives in Deliverable D2.3 (Ettinger, Krause and Schild, et al. 2014).

#### 4.1.5 Assessment Objectives

Capability objectives describe benefits that should result from the functionalities provided by the system. From the perspective of evaluation, capability objectives lead to assessment objectives defining the qualitative reference goals if aspired targets are met. Assessment objectives used for evaluation can be structured and grouped with respect to different features. Within the TSoS Traffic Use Case in Local4Global, four main assessment objectives are chosen to structure the criteria: efficiency, profitability, human factors and functionality. Each group contains one or several criteria (cf. Figure 5).



**Figure 5: Assessment objectives and criteria**

## 4.2 Evaluation Methodology

### 4.2.1 Methodological Approach


The method of evaluation chosen for the assessment of the TSoS Traffic Use Case is basically combining aspects of three widely applied approaches. The evaluation methodology follows the *Guidebook for Assessment of Transport Telematics Applications: Updated Version* (Zhang, et al. 1998), the V-Model from software engineering projects and integrates ideas from the Information Systems Success Model by DeLone and McLean (2003).

The definition of evaluation steps, grouping of assessment objectives, impact assessment by means of evaluation measures as well as the choice of assessment methods is based on the quite generic guideline from Zhang et al. (1998) developed within the European project CONVERGE. The approach distinguishes between the following major steps concerning the evaluation procedure:

1. **Determination of user needs:** the determination of user needs, capability objectives and system requirements is subject of Deliverable 2. (Ettinger, Krause and Schild, et al. 2014).

2. **Description of applications:** the Local4Global product aims to be a web-based plug-and-play system, evolutionary and self-organizing, optimizing the global performance of the Traffic TSoS based on local information. The system is the basis for the traffic-related applications being developed within the project i.e. advanced traffic control optimization on the one hand and smartphone application displaying speed recommendations on the other hand.
3. **Definition of assessment objectives:** the capability objectives as listed in Deliverable D2.3 (Ettinger, Krause and Schild, et al. 2014) lead to assessment objectives named and grouped in section 4.1.5.
4. **Pre-assessment of expected impacts:** Local4Global intends to globally improve the performance of TSoS. With respect to the Traffic Use Case, the main objective of Local4Global is to improve efficiency in traffic control described by a variety of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) like Level of Service (LOS), network mean speed or Traffic Performance Index (TPI). The assessment objectives according to the DoW are listed in section 3.1 of this document. According to this, Local4Global aims to e.g. improve the daily average network speed by 30 %.
5. **Assessment methodology:** The assessment methodology developed for Local4Global as documented in this section is grounded on assessment objectives and the available data to quantify the system's benefits or detriments in the line with the objectives by means of KPIs. In this context, a KPI is a quantitative or qualitative indicator, derived from one or several measures, agreed on beforehand, expressed as a percentage, index, rate or other value, which is monitored at regular or irregular intervals and can be compared to one or more criteria (FOT-NET 2011).


Besides incorporating the major steps towards evaluation from the CONVERGE methodology, the approach chosen in Local4Global is based on procedures of the V-Model – widely used in software development. As illustrated in Figure 6, the V-Model describes the road map from the idea of the Local4Global system via requirements analysis, design specification and software development towards testing, implementation, verification, validation and operation. These steps are described by the design cycle. The evaluation steps are represented by the assessment cycle. Starting from the idea, especially identified requirements and derived specifications define the goals for evaluation.



**Figure 6: V-shape cycle for TSoS Traffic Use Case Evaluation**

As illustrated above, assessment objectives are of technical nature (functionality), cover impact assessment (system performance, efficiency), target human factors (safety, user acceptance) as well as monetary aspects (profitability). Assessment objectives are described by KPIs determined by means of various evaluation methods: Within Local4Global, a simulation study, field tests as well as a Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) are considered to be appropriate evaluation methods. Field test data as well as simulation output provide the basis for a traffic analysis. Benefits derived from the traffic analysis as well as identified costs provide input for the CBA. Human factors are determined via experiments and questionnaires to cover both aspects like usability, acceptance and safety as well as availability and quality of functionalities.

The approach to determine the latter aspects is borrowed from DeLone & McLean (2003) but is significantly adapted and shortened. The approach grounds individual impact of a system on the two aspects of system quality and information quality (cf. Figure 7). Although the organizational impact will be excluded in the questionnaire due to the properties of Local4Global being a research project, the individual impact for users of a technical system like the Local4Global product somehow define the organizational impact as users and their usage of the system influence the system's global performance. In this context, the approach matches the Local4Global idea of optimizing constituent systems on the basis of local information in order to achieve a global optimum. Addressees of questionnaires for determining the individual impacts regarding system and information quality are users of the Local4Global application, i.e. primarily test subjects using and assessing the smartphone application during the test period.




**Figure 7: DeLone and McLean Information Systems Success Model (DeLone and McLean 2003)**

#### **4.2.2 Measures and KPIs**

As described above, KPIs are used to describe assessment objectives quantitatively or at least qualitatively. The indicators are derived from measures basically grounded on available information. From this point of view, available information defines measures whereas measures define evaluation methods enabling impact assessment resulting in KPIs for evaluation purposes. The relationship of chosen methods, measures and KPIs is illustrated in Figure 8. Evaluation methods are in detail described in the subsequent section and KPIs are defined starting in section 4.2.6.





**Figure 8: Evaluation Methods, Measures and KPIs**


### 4.2.3 Methods

#### 4.2.3.1 Simulation Study

Before starting the testing period of the Local4Global control system in the test field, the system performance will be evaluated by means of a microscopic traffic simulation. The simulation environment offers the possibility to assess the functionality, operational safety and performance of the Local4Global control approach without being bound to any technical, administrative or legal restraints. A positive assessment of the control approach in the simulation environment may also serve as system verification and provide a basis for argumentation towards the introduction of the system into practice.

##### 4.2.3.1.1 Traffic Simulation Model

The microsimulation study will be carried out in the simulation environment VISSIM. VISSIM is a microscopic, time step and behavior-based traffic flow simulation model for visualization, analysis and optimization of traffic-related scenarios developed by PTV Group, Germany. VISSIM uses the psycho-physical driver behavior model developed by WIEDEMANN (PTV AG 2011). WIEDEMANN basically distinguishes between four different situations to simulate a vehicle's driving behavior as illustrated in Figure 9: free driving (i.e. no reaction), approaching (i.e. reaction), following (i.e. unconscious reaction) and deceleration.




**Figure 9: Car Following Logic by WIEDEMANN (PTV AG 2011)**

“The basic concept of this model is that the driver of a faster moving vehicle starts to decelerate as he reaches his individual perception threshold to a slower moving vehicle. Since he cannot exactly determine the speed of that vehicle, his speed will fall below that vehicle’s speed until he starts to slightly accelerate again after reaching another perception threshold. This results in an iterative process of acceleration and deceleration.” (PTV AG 2011) Consequently, in particular parameters like desired speeds and deceleration as well as acceleration parameters in VISSIM all described by distributions are the main variables for modelling the movements of vehicles in the simulation environment. These parameters affect significantly capacities, level of service and travel speeds. The desired speed represents the speed a driver is willing to choose for traveling if not hindered by other vehicles or network elements like traffic signal systems, stop signs or speed limits. In general, the desired speed is geared to the speed limit. In VISSIM, each vehicle gets initially assigned a quantile for speed, acceleration and deceleration distributions when entering the network.

#### 4.2.3.1.2 Microsimulation Study Organization

The process of carrying out a microsimulation study in Local4Global follows the *Guidelines for Applying Traffic Simulation Modeling Software* (FHWA 2004) and accordingly the German equivalent (FGSV 2006). Under these guidelines, the overall process can be subdivided in the steps preparation, base model development, calibration, simulation experiment and documentation. The slightly adapted approach for Local4Global is illustrated in Figure 10.



**Figure 10: Microsimulation Model Development and Application Process in Local4Global**

#### 4.2.3.1.3 Starting Position in Local4Global

The microsimulation study in Local4Global is grounded on an available simulation model set up in VISSIM. The test bed is modelled on the basis of official maps from the *Landesamt für Vermessung und Geoinformation* (Bayern Bavarian Agency for Surveying and Geoinformation) (cf. Figure 11). Each intersection is modelled in detail on the basis of signal layout plans as illustrated in Figure 12 for intersection #1 (Inhauser Moos).



**Figure 12: Detailed Modeling of Intersection Layouts from Siemens AG, 2011**

**Figure 11: VISSIM network model.  
Map: Landesamt für Vermessung und Geoinformation Bayern, 1053/08**

The available model is calibrated on the basis of traffic volumes and turning movements from traffic counts carried out during off-peak periods (weekdays, 9.30 am to 2.30 pm). Distributions for desired speeds, accelerations and deceleration are calibrated on the basis of travel times and detected speeds from test drive data (GPS trajectories). Furthermore, the behavior of influenced drivers or rather cooperative vehicles is calibrated and implemented. Considering this background, the microsimulation study in Local4Global could start directly with the simulation experiment.

#### 4.2.3.1.4 Further steps in Local4Global

Further traffic counts and calibration activities will need to be carried out if the Local4Global system shall operate on a 24/7 basis, especially to adequately model the peak hour traffic conditions. An available macroscopic traffic model of the region could also deliver further information on demand and loads. The behavior of influenced drivers might have to be recalibrated depending on the exact functionalities provided by the Local4Global system. After re-calibration activities, the following steps will need to be carried out paving the way towards simulation experiment, determination of KPIs and evaluation:

1. **Implementation** of Local4Global traffic control methods in VISSIM. The software's Python Application Programming Interface (API) allows the implementation of advanced traffic control methods like the Local4Global control algorithms.
2. **Validation** of available model with special respect to traffic volumes and behavior of influenced/informed drivers of cooperative vehicles taking into account specific aspects of Local4Global applications.

#### 4.2.3.1.5 Field Tests

Field tests are carried out to collect data providing the input for the evaluation of the performance of the Local4Global system in the test bed. Two types of field tests are planned to be carried out. One-vehicle test drives are performed in order to determine objectively the quality of traffic control on the basis of acknowledged key figures. A fleet test aims to introduce the Local4Global system to a wide range of users using intensively Local4Global applications on a voluntary basis willing to contribute to the evaluation of the system.

#### 4.2.3.1.6 One-Vehicle Test Drives

The objective of one-vehicle test drives is to collect data for the quality assessment of traffic control at intersections and sections. GPS data from test drives is used e.g. to determine the quality level (LOS) of the Local4Global system compared to the traditional coordinated traffic control being currently under operation. Average waiting times are the measure to determine LOS for uncoordinated intersection branches.

The execution of one vehicle test drives for data collection follows the principles of Module N2 of the German Guideline for Quality Management for Traffic Signal Control (Friedrich, et al. 2008). Test vehicles cruising in the test bed are equipped with GPS data loggers and collect information on current position, heading and time stamp once a second. The travel speed is derived from distances between positioning points and time intervals between logs. In order to be able to obtain an objective view on traffic quality, drivers of test vehicles carrying out test drives are asked to adapt their speed to the traffic flow and "swim" in platoons.

#### 4.2.3.1.7 Fleet test

The intended fleet test is classified as an experimental field test. Experimental field tests are characterized by an enhanced external validity (Bortz und Döring 2006). Thus, the results can be generalized to other conditions. Field test have naturally a high ecological validity, because they are carried out in the "real-world" and not in a simulation or laboratory. On the other hand, the influence to control interfering variables (e.g. weather conditions or interaction between cars) is often reduced or even not possible. Sometimes, test subjects are preselected or filtered in pre-tests, according to the subject of the experiment. (e.g., the test population should resemble a

worst case scenario), but most often the test subjects are chosen to compose a typical user group of a product (e.g. conform to a given distribution of age).

Two terms that are closely connected to field tests in the automobile sector are: Field Operational Tests (FOT) and Naturalistic Driving Studies (NDS).

**Field Operational Test:** “A study undertaken to evaluate a function or functions under normal operating conditions in environments typically encountered by the host vehicle(s) using quasi-experimental methods.” (FOT-NET 2011)

**Naturalistic Driving Study:** “Naturalistic Driving observation refers to studies undertaken using unobtrusive observation when driving in a natural setting.” (<http://wiki.fot-net.eu>)

Thus, NDS does not fit to characterize the fleet test because the information by the traffic light information system on the smartphone are intended to change the “natural setting”.

The fleet test is best characterized by the term FOT. Nevertheless, FOTs are often connected to products or technologies that are already available or close to market entrance. The purpose of the project is to test a System-of-System approach in two use cases (building and traffic). Thus, even the term FOT does not fully fit.

The test subjects will not be intentionally preselected. There is a kind of filtering due to the facts that the application will be implemented for Android (biggest market share) and the focus is on light vehicle drivers. Another big constraint is, that a valuable test subject should use the road (best on a regular basis), when the system is operating.

The upper limit for test subjects is estimated during the project by a load test on the server architecture, which provides the traffic light information to the smartphones and gather the data from the floating vehicles. Thus, it can be judged how many users can be managed at the same time by the servers.

In four former experiments, e.g. the analysis of reduced speeding behavior with and without the system (Krause, Yilmaz und Bengler, Comparison of Real and Simulated Driving for a Static Driving Simulator 2014) with the traffic lights assistant on this road section, the sample size was typically around 20 resulting in significant outcomes. Thus, N=20 will be assumed as lower limit for human factors in this project.

There is also a differentiation of the sample size and user group fluctuation for different purposes. For FCD collection and as input for the optimization algorithms in general, it would be desirable to have a constant group as large as possible. To judge about human factors like usability and acceptance, even one-time-users and drop-outs (and their reasons) can be of more interest than continuous users.

The Human Machine Interface (HMI) was extensively tested in the KOLIBRI project<sup>3</sup> in driving simulator and field trials, e.g. regarding visual (Krause, Knott und Bengler 2013) and cognitive demands and showed suitability while driving on this track. The HMI is used as before. If (small) changes are necessary due to project requirements, an expert judgment will be made with respect to driver distraction issues. However, this project includes no further objective driver distraction assessment e.g. with eye-tracking.

The test subjects need to follow a registration procedure subscribing with their email address to use the system. This assures that even one-time users can be asked for their opinion. The used questionnaires preferably incorporate the System Usability Scale (SUS), (Brooke 1996) and the AttrakDiff2 (Hassenzahl 2003). These were used several times in the KOLIBRI project. Thus, comparison would be enabled.

---


<sup>3</sup> KOLIBRI: Cooperative Traffic Control Outside Urban Areas, Research project funded by the Bavarian research foundation, 2011-2013



For methodological reasons it would be an advantage to get the baseline driving behavior of a test subject on the track, without the traffic light information on the smartphone. Therefore, the app will include a function to track the driving, without showing any traffic light information. Solid continuous users, will be contacted and asked, if they could enable the option for their next ride.

Inspired by the of the approach from DeLone & McLean (2003) aiming to describe the success of a system by analyzing system quality and information quality, a simplified determination of the fulfillment of assessment objectives in terms of functionalities from a user’s point of view is planned to be carried out. Participants in the fleet tests will be addressees of questionnaires being asked to assess aspects of system quality like availability of functionalities, usability, stability, Willingness To Pay (WTP) for the app etc. as well as aspects of information quality like accuracy, reliability and timeliness by means of checklists and ordinal scale. The latter aspects can also be quantified and compared to objective metrics by calculating e.g. the difference between predicted and actual signal timing described e.g. via Root Mean Square Percent Error (RMSPE).

Figure 13 illustrates relevant aspects covered by questionnaires in terms of system quality, information quality and attractiveness in the view of assessment objectives linked to suitable assessment methods.



**Figure 13: Assessment Objectives and Contents of Questionnaires**

#### 4.2.3.2 Profitability analysis

The profitability of the Local4Global system is going to be assessed by means of a Cost-Benefit-Analysis (CBA). The CBA represents an economical assessment method intending to maximize social welfare. In this context, the methodology is often used to evaluate an entire strategy with respect to the impacts of investments on the benefits of the group on whose behalf the analysis is carried out. It is the main objective of a CBA to identify configurations which can improve the level of overall welfare (Commission of the European Communities 1991).

The analysis covers different kinds of impacts and different groups affected, but tries to combine all of these impacts into a single measure. The interest groups generally affected by projects are producers, consumers and third parties. The costs of producers (i.e. companies or public administrations) may be directly measured in monetary units. For consumers and third party groups the project’s outcomes may either result in a financial advantage or disadvantage depending on whether travel costs increase or decrease. It is common however to value the project impact on the quality of life that is mainly affected by it.

A cost-benefit calculation technique often used is the "Benefit-Cost Ratio". The comparison of use case related costs and benefits as far as they can be determined lead to a KPI describing the system’s economic performance.

#### 4.2.4 *Uncertainties and artificial circumstances*

Uncertainties and artificial circumstances are mainly related to field tests. They are subject of the risk assessment and contingency plan documented in Deliverable D5.1.1 (Ettinger und Krause 2014).

#### 4.2.5 *Data Base*

The traffic control methods implemented in the test bed during the KOLIBRI project define the reference cases for the evaluation of the Local4Global system. The availability of wide data material from the KOLIBRI project enables the comparison of impacts of the Local4Global System's control strategies to the results of the uncoordinated, fixed time coordinated and traffic actuated control evaluated within KOLIBRI. Available material consists of

- findings of a traffic analysis carried out in the frame of the project KOLIBRI (2011-2013) based on one-vehicle drives quantifying measures like travel times, waiting times, number of stops at intersections, quality of traffic flow in different control setups (uncoordinated, fixed time coordination, traffic actuated coordination).
  - user questionnaires from KOLIBRI project (2011-2013)
    - SUS scores from five experiments
    - AttrakDiff2 values from four experiments
    - individual willingness to pay for the app, from an online survey and from two field trials
  - driving data from usability tests within KOLIBRI project (2011-2013)
    - from three driving simulator experiments
    - from four real road experiments
- (Typically around N=20 participants)

The KOLIBRI experiments with test subjects on the real road were mainly carried out during fixed time coordination periods. The last subject test of KOLIBRI was managed during a traffic actuated coordinated period and also included an experimental aspect with (intended) malfunction of the traffic lights information system on the smartphone. The results of this experiment are planned to be further assessed and published.

#### 4.2.6 *KPI 1: Performance Index*

The Performance Index expresses the overall traffic quality in a road network based on measures like stops at traffic signals or waiting times. For evaluation purposes the criteria are not regarded as isolated parameters. They are weighted and included in a so-called Performance Index (PI) e.g. according to Brilon et al. (2007) based on the findings of Robertson (1969) in the context of the traffic control tool TRANSYT. The PI represents the weighted average number of stops and waiting time and is calculated according to the equations below.

$$PI = \left( G_W \cdot \sum_i \sum_z (W_{i,z} \cdot g_i \cdot g_z) + G_H \cdot \sum_i \sum_z (H_{i,z} \cdot g_i \cdot g_z) \right) \quad (4.1)$$

$$PI_R = \frac{PI}{\sum_i \sum_z (Q_{i,z} \cdot g_z)} \quad (4.2)$$

where:

$PI$  = performance index

$PI_R$  = relative performance index

$G_W$  = weight of waiting times

$W_{i,z}$  = sum of waiting times per hour for vehicles of type  $z$  on intersection branch  $i$

$g_i$  = weight of route  $i$



- $g_z$  = weight for vehicles of type  $z$   
 $G_H$  = weight for number of stops  
 $H_{i,z}$  = sum of number of stops per hour for vehicles of type  $z$  on intersection branch  $i$   
 $Q_{i,z}$  = traffic volumes of vehicles of type  $z$  on intersection branch  $i$   
 $i$  = route index  
 $z$  = vehicle index

The parameters "number of stops" and "waiting time" can be determined by means of test drives or microscopic traffic simulation. The determination of weights follows published examples or predefined numbers based on local conditions (Brilon, Wietholt and Wu 2007). The factor  $g_i$  can be used to put more weight on the main direction if needed. It can also be assumed that relative to the energy consume, a stop represents a waiting time of 60 seconds. A lower PI stands for higher traffic quality. The value of the PI has no significance by its own and is only relevant for comparison reasons. For evaluation purposes, the last calculation step is normalizing the performance index due to the traffic volumes.

#### 4.2.7 KPI 2: Level of Service

The KPI of Level of service (LOS) is used to analyze roads by categorizing traffic quality. It is a qualitative measure describing the operational conditions for a traffic stream. The assessment is based on service measures such as travel time, waiting time, travel speed or coordination measure. The differentiation into six different service levels is both used in the American standard *Highway Capacity Manual HCM* (FHWA 2000) and in the German equivalent *Handbuch für die Bemessung von Straßenverkehrsanlagen HBS* (FGSV 2001). The categories are defined by letters from A to F. Each letter stands for a state of flow. The definitions are based on the *Highway Capacity Manual*.

**LOS A** describes free flow operations. The vehicles are unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream.

**LOS B** describes a reasonably free flow. The ability to maneuver within traffic stream is slightly restricted.

**LOS C** describes a stable flow of traffic and stable operations. The ability to maneuver and change lanes is more restricted than at LOS B, which may contribute to lower average travel speeds.

**LOS D** is approaching unstable flow. The freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is noticeably limited and even minor incidents can create queuing.

**LOS E** is the highest operational density level. It describes operation at capacity. The ability to maneuver at this Level is minimal due to closely spaced vehicles and lack of space for the traffic stream to absorb disruptions. Any incident can create a serious breakdown.

**LOS F** describes a breakdown in vehicular flow. Queues are forming and the maneuverability within the traffic stream is down to zero.

The German standard HBS distinguishes between two cases for the quality assessment of signal traffic control: coordinated traffic signal control and uncoordinated traffic signal control.

In order to evaluate a road section with coordinated traffic, it is necessary to establish the coordination measure  $k$ . The value of  $k$  is expressed in percent and represents the rate of signal pass through, i.e. passing a traffic light without stopping. A higher value stands for a better coordination and higher traffic quality.

$$k_i = \frac{D_i}{(N_k - 1) \cdot n} \cdot 100 \quad (4.3)$$

$$k = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{2} \quad (4.4)$$

mit:

$k_i$  = coordination measure traffic direction  $i$  [%]

$k$  = coordination measure for the road section [%]

$D_i$  = number of signal pass through at signalized intersection for each traffic direction  $i$  [-]  
(except starting intersection)

$N_K$  = number of signalized intersections for the road section [-]

$n$  = number of test drives [-]

For uncoordinated traffic control the relevant characteristic is the average waiting time. It represents the average time in seconds to wait for a signal to turn green on a road section. Table 3 summarizes the LOS definitions in the context of coordinated and uncoordinated traffic signal control.

| LOS      | coordination measure [%] | allowed average waiting time [s] | description according to HCM (FHWA 2008) |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>A</b> | $\geq 95$                | $\leq 20$                        | free flow                                |
| <b>B</b> | $\geq 85$                | $\leq 35$                        | reasonably free flow                     |
| <b>C</b> | $\geq 75$                | $\leq 50$                        | stable flow                              |
| <b>D</b> | $\geq 65$                | $\leq 70$                        | approaching unstable flow                |
| <b>E</b> | $\geq 50$                | $\leq 100$                       | unstable flow                            |
| <b>F</b> | $< 50$                   | $> 100$                          | breakdown flow                           |

**Table 3: Level of Service Definitions (FGSV 2001)**

#### 4.2.8 KPI 3: Average Network Mean Speed

The Average Network Mean Speed (ANMS) is a suitable indicator for determining the performance of a traffic control system. A quality assessment on the basis of the ANMS can be carried e.g. by comparing two systems, provided that sufficient data is available for both setups when comparing e.g. the Local4Global system to the baseline control from the KOLIBRI project. Furthermore, the KPI is suitable for measuring the system's performance over time. This approach is in particular suitable if the evolutionary capabilities of a system shall be assessed as in the case of the Local4Global product. For a net-wide analysis, the microscopic traffic simulation is considered to be an appropriate tool as it allows the integration of all vehicles in the modelled network.

#### 4.2.9 KPI 4: Cost-Benefit Ratio

The CBA's KPI considered beneficial for the TSoS Traffic Use Case is the widely applied *Benefit-Cost Ratio*. For public investments, the ratio between costs and benefits typically needs to be  $> 1$ . In this particular case, it shows the value of traffic-related benefits over costs. Mainly the following indicators for costs and benefits are considered:

Indicators for costs:

- **Investment costs** for Local4Global system (infrastructure and equipment) e.g. installation costs for server infrastructure, detection equipment, devices, traffic control facilities (traffic controllers, communication facilities)
- **Maintenance costs** for Local4Global system (running costs) for data transmission and communication, data processing and storing, operation of traffic computer and/or computing centers

Indicators for benefits are e.g. reductions in:

- **Travel times** incl. monetary assessment e.g. on the basis of the German guideline “*Empfehlungen für Wirtschaftlichkeitsuntersuchungen an Straßen*” (FGSV 1997) indicating time cost rates for passenger cars and HGV
- **Fuel consumption** including monetary valuation on the basis of fuel prices
- **Externalities** indicating benefits resulting from a reduction of emissions from road traffic due to e.g. avoiding stops at signalized intersections.

#### **4.2.10 KPI 5: Subjective Usability / User Experience**

For the subjective ratings, the two standardized questionnaires

- **System Usability Scale (SUS)**, overall usability rating and
- **AttrakDiff2** user-experience

along with project specific questions (e.g. willingness to pay) are used.

The results are related with literature values and scores from KOLIBRI project. Also, changes of the SUS and AttrakDiff2 over time (repeated use) are of special interest.

#### **4.2.11 KPI 6: Driving Behavior / Compliance**

To evaluate and characterize the driving behavior the following metrics will be used:

- Percentage of time within the traffic light assistant speed recommendation
- Traffic light approach, if the system shows “You will arrive at red”
- Percentage of time above the speed limit
- Count of severe speed violations (e.g. > 15km/h)
- Characterization of speeding (e.g. Root Mean Square speed above speed limit)

### **4.3 Transfer to General KPI**

The Local4Global System intends to provide generic methods applicable to a variety of technical applications. Therefore, the transferability of KPIs to other use cases is interesting in terms of describing the generic outcomes of the Local4Global system. KPIs like LOS or ANMS are solely traffic related, i.e. they are established measures for assessing the quality of the Local4Global system in the context of traffic. The PI as introduced in section 4.2.6 is based on traffic related parameters like travel times and waiting times. The impacts of a traffic related application of the Local4Global System can be expressed in e.g. percentage changes of the PI. Although not mentioned in the DoW, a variation of the PI, the Cost-Benefit Ratio provides a suitable measure for comparing different use cases of the Local4Global system. When it comes to the assessment of L4G generic methods, for each GKPI (cf. section 3.2.1) equivalent figures are chosen as KPI that facilitate a direct transfer to GKPI and comparison above use case boundaries. See Table 7 for GKPI-KPI-correlation in traffic use case.

**Table 4: GKPI-KPI transfer relation**

| <b>GKPI</b> | <b>KPI</b>                          | <b>Description</b>   | <b>Target Improvement</b>            |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| GKPI 1      | ANMS                                | Difference in terms of daily, average network speed                            | 30 %<br><b>(according to DoW)</b>    |
| GKPI 2      | ANMS under artificial circumstances | In both use cases equal to GKPI 1, but when major incidents are present        | 30 %<br><b>(according to DoW)</b>    |
| GKPI 3      | SuS / AttrakDiff2                   | System usability rating and acceptance to be calculated through questionnaires | SUS >70;<br>AttrakDiff2<br>“desired” |

## 5 Building Use Case (RWTH)

### 5.1 The building test site

The Local4Global Building Use Case (BUC) is sited in Aachen, Germany. The E.ON ERC Main Building is a new building (completion in 2011) that contains innovative techniques for energy conversion and air conditioning, combined with a modern and extensive monitoring, control and interface system (MCIS, (Fütterer, Constantin and Schmidt, et al. 2013)) that provides the functionality of a scientific test bed.



**Figure 14: View of the E.ON ERC Main Building in Aachen, Germany**

Following, a brief description of the building is presented, which gives an overview on the layout, the energy supply, the distribution systems and the overall control system.

#### **Building Layout**

The building is comprised of four floors with the total net area of about 7.800 m<sup>2</sup>; the rooms are located around a spacious floor and communication zones. Offices and conference rooms have direct connection to the façade in order to have a maximum of natural lighting and convenience for the occupier. The structure of the building is as follows:

- Basement: Equipment rooms for supply systems and laboratories
- Ground floor: conference rooms, offices and library, communication spaces
- 1<sup>st</sup> floor: offices and CIP-pools, communication spaces
- 2<sup>nd</sup> floor: offices and CIP-pools, communication spaces

## **Energy Supply System**

The energy supply concept (Fütterer, Constantin and Müller 2011) contains different options of energy conversion systems to enable energy optimized operations for heat and cold supply. Here a brief description of the energy supply system is presented (see also Figure 3):


- The core element is a heat pump to convert low-temperature heat into cold and vice versa with a maximum efficiency.
- The geothermal field is a heat source for the heat pump if necessary (in winter) and a cold source for free cooling (in summer)
- In addition to the heat pump (low-temperature heat) a gas-fired CHP system is the basic supply system for high-temperature heat accompanying with two gas fired boilers as backup system.

## **Energy Distribution System**

Different distribution strategies are applied for each room type to meet the demand of the building. Each room has been equipped with ventilation systems as well as additional heating and cooling systems to control mass and energy flows in order to achieve the desired level of thermal comfort. The installed systems contain:

- Central Air Handling Units (AHU)
- Air Coolers (AC)
- Façade Ventilation Units (FVU)
- Volume Flow Controller (VFC)
- Concrete Core Activation (CCA)
- Floor Heating System (FHS)
- Heat Convectors (HC)
- Active Chilled Beams (ACB)

Figure 15 illustrates the concept of energy supply and distribution systems. Especially, the availability of different energy conversion systems allows producing heat on different levels of temperature, thus a demand-oriented production of heat is possible and the loss of both, thermal energy and exergy, is feasible to be minimized.



**Figure 15: Energy supply concept**


## 5.2 L4G building TSoS

### 5.2.1 General building TSoS structure

The sum of systems within a building and its technical equipment offers a massive amount of TSoS of different type, scale and complexity. Considering the control purpose of L4G, a generic building TSoS is derivable (see Figure 16). With respect to the function, the systems can be categorized into different layers which are interconnected physically by mass or energy flows.

The source layer contains all systems they transfer an energy (or mass) flow across the TSoS boundary, e.g. a gas-pipe, the probes of the geothermal field or a power cable. Within the conversion layer, these energy flows are converted into another form of energy (e.g. temperature or power level, chemical energy into thermal energy) that is applicable to be distributed through the building. The systems of the distribution layer transport energy through the building and supply the systems of the demand layer to enable the building's usage as intended.

The building management system (BMS) (considered as an abstracted system without physical relation to the constituent system, but with a pure informational relation for control purposes) represents the general control system that contains the control logics and programs for all the controlled systems. The interfaces to the physical systems are inputs from the sensors and outputs to the actuators.




**Figure 16: First-level map representation of a generic Building TSoS with view on the supply system**

### 5.2.2 L4G building TSoS structure

Regarding the deliberations in the related sections of D2.3 (Ettinger, Krause and Schild, et al. 2014), a highly resolvable section of the general building TSoS is used as L4G building TSoS to be applicable within the project.

Figure 17 illustrates the L4G building TSoS structure that takes different systems of the demand layer into account; demand 1 represents the type of conference room systems, demand 2 the type of office systems. Table 5 gives an overview on the whole TSoS.



**Figure 17: First-level map representation of the L4G Building Use Case's TSoS**



**Table 5: L4G Building Use Case Overview**

|                          |  |   |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| TSoS objective           | Thermal comfort; air quality; energy efficiency  |   |
| TSoS boundaries          | Conference and office spaces   |   |
| Constituent systems      | Usage: <b>conference rooms</b><br>3-7 single spaces of flexible size   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concrete Core Activation (CCA)</li> <li>• Air Cooler (AC)</li> <li>• Volume Flow Controller (VFC)</li> </ul> |
|                          |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persons</li> <li>• Shades (external)</li> <li>• Lighting</li> <li>• Equipment</li> </ul>                     |
|                          | Usage: <b>office rooms</b><br>6 single spaces in 2 space groups of different orientation (south-east and north-west)                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concrete Core Activation (CCA)</li> <li>• Façade ventilation unit (FVU)</li> </ul>                           |
|                          |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persons</li> <li>• Shades (external)</li> <li>• Lighting</li> <li>• Equipment</li> </ul>                     |
| Related external Systems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weather</li> <li>• Superior Building Management System (BMS)</li> <li>• (Central) Supply Systems (CSS)</li> </ul> |   |

### 5.2.3 Delimitation to BMS

The BMS includes all control related functions, either as centralized or as distributed control architecture. Open control loops with or without user interface and closed control loops are part of the BMS. Even the L4G algorithm will be implemented within the BMS to enable full access to the cloud services of the MCIS and to facilitate the implementation within the existing system.

Regarding the tight interrelations of a huge amount of systems within the building under investigation (which is typical for modern non-residential buildings), just a fragment of the BMS is used for control issue of the L4G building TSoS, thus the BMS as an own standing entity is not a constituent system in the L4G perspective, even though the control algorithm will be implemented in it. Considering the BMS as an abstracted system without physical relation to the constituent system allows delimiting the BMS and the TSoS.

### 5.2.4 Delimitation to CSS

The CSS unifies the surrounding systems of all layers (see Figure 16) that are not within the TSoS boundary, even though these systems are of relevance for the TSoS under investigation. The interdependencies of the physical system force to delimit a TSoS along boundaries they cross physical interconnections (e.g. a water loop or an air duct). Then, the state variables of the mediums at the resulting cut points have to be interpreted as follows:

- Incoming flows are pre-conditions for the control purpose (and for sure they inhere uncertainty)
- Outgoing flows are not relevant for the local control purpose (but of interest for the evaluation on hand)

As long as the devices within the boundary fulfill the SoS criteria [Diakaki et al., 2014], the delimitation is formal uncritical and the SoS point of view is applicable.

### **5.3 Data management**

In this section, a brief overview of the data management is given that builds a foundation for future evaluation work and facilitates the use of the evaluation methodology as described in the future section.

#### **5.3.1 Data base structure**

The E.ON ERC Main Building is equipped with a huge monitoring system that logs measured values event-based (COV) into a MySQL database. For each entry, the following set of informations is available:

- ItemID (unique number of data point)
- Item name (designation of each data point after an internal syntax)
- Item description (free text for explanation)
- Time stamp of COV event
- Value
- OPC quality code

This structure allows to monitor and to analyze trends of each sensor or actuator signal. Even a script based evaluation is possible selecting a set of items for a defined period by ODBC driven queries and calculating KPIs or other indicators. ODBC drivers are available for e.g. python or MATLAB, thus the evaluation scripts are flexible with view on the platform.

#### **5.3.2 Designation principles**

All data points implemented in the monitoring are consequently designated regarding specific principles that support identifying the data point's type, function and location. Moreover, a unique itemID facilitates inclusion in automatic procedures, e.g. evaluation scripts.

Within L4G, the existing data points have to be extended to realize the sufficient monitoring resolution for the evaluation objectives in all constituent systems under investigation. These new data points will be implemented within the monitoring system to achieve a consistent and transparent data processing.

For detailed information, see D 5.2.1 (Schild and Sangi 2014).

#### **5.3.3 Types of data points**

The evaluation bases on different types of data points that are characteristic for building technology. At the one hand, there are analogue input and output signals (e.g. 0-10 V, 4-20 mA) they represent the state variables of measured values or the control command values for actuators. These signals typically have a dynamic behavior and change more or less steadily. To generate logging indicating events, thresholds are used that have to be crossed before a new entry in the monitoring system is done. At the other hand, there are digital input and output signals (1 or 0) that represent values for logics and open control loops. These values are generally logged by change of value.

Another differentiation regards either a data point is a physical (a sensor or an actuator) or a virtual one. Physical data points are connected to the BMS by the so called I/O-modules distributed in the field devices of the BMS. Virtual data points are generated within the BMS and a result of the emergent computational character of BMS procedures. Especially for the communication purpose between controllers of any type, the virtual data points are

indispensable for a functioning control network. In general, the monitoring system makes no differences between physical and virtual data points. Only the cost intensity is much stronger for physical data points because of the field equipment, thus this differentiation has to be regarded for cost calculation purposes.

#### **5.3.4 Data verification**

A data verification system is implemented by using OPC DA as machine-to-machine communication protocol beneath the MetaSys<sup>4</sup> and the data logging system, realized as a visual basic service. This service is responsible for listening to the data points in MetaSys and writing the events into the monitoring database.

OPC contains a verification feature that assesses the quality of the machine communication and generates a quality code that is also logged into the monitoring database. The codes demark the quality as good, bad or uncertain (with numerous sub categories).

For evaluation, only data with the quality code 192 (“good”) will be used to minimize the risk of skew by communicational problems that are not reasoned by the control algorithm. Only in case of implausible results, data of other categories will be taken into account to probably clarify the problem on hand.

### **5.4 Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation of L4G algorithm has to be done from two perspectives; The improvement of tangible indicators at the one hand, which uses measurable items and is completely mathematical, and the users’ acceptance on the other hand, which depends on subjective cognition and sensitivities.

Whilst the first perspective is perfectly evaluable by using key performance indicators (KPIs) using logged state variables for determination, the second perspective is, especially in the field of building technology and room climate, a difficult endeavor. The better the control system works, the less awareness the user will spend to the system, thus the evaluation of the users’ acceptance of the control approach leads to an evaluation of the degree of dissatisfaction in general.

#### **5.4.1 KPI**

The determination of KPI is used to achieve measurability and comparability related to the specific content and to achieve transparency for determination of the GKPI (see 3.1). This content will be defined as well as the formula for determination and the conjunction of each item to a measured or fix value. For detailed information, see 5.5.

#### **5.4.2 Questionnaires**

A web-based questionnaire for thermal comfort will be used for the evaluation of users’ acceptance. The questionnaire will be built with a commercial tool that contains the automatic assessment of the received answers.

---

<sup>4</sup> The installed BMS is called MetaSys, a product of Johnson Controls Inc.

### **5.4.3 Limit value monitoring**

Regarding the use case requirements, the control algorithm has to satisfy a couple of limit values and thresholds. Violations of limits will be evaluated using the monitoring data base and assessed regarding their duration, intensity, and acceptability.

### **5.4.4 Evaluation strategy - MCIS**

The MCIS ‘listens’ to the BMS and detects all changes of values above a given threshold. All data points within the building (about 7.200) are observed and logged this way in an event-based manner. The monitoring data base is a MySQL database running on a virtual server network, thus a continuously and complete gathering of data allows on-site evaluation. For each time period, the progress of each data point is available. Using evaluation scripts, the calculation of each KPI is possible for every time period, constituent system and the whole TSoS, from the start of the test operations until the time of evaluation. So, the MCIS is the core element of the evaluation task and the foundation of the evaluation quality.

### **5.4.5 Uncertainties**

System operation in buildings always is influenced by uncertainties regarding e.g. the weather or the occupier’s behavior. The weather is monitored using the weather station of the building under investigation. Depending on the occupant’s behavior the following uncertainties are induced, that are not measurable for each particular room:

- a. Heat emission because of the amount of present persons
- b. Heat emission because of lighting
- c. Heat emission because of equipment operation
- d. Degree of insulation depending on the exterior shades position

To be able to analyze these uncertainties, power meters and people counter will be installed as far as possible, but a general issue of the constituent systems under investigation is not possible.

Furthermore, the delimitation of the CSS leads to uncertainty with view on prerequisites for the constituent systems operability, e.g. system pressures or supply temperatures. These uncertainties will be estimated using related measurements outside the TSoS.

## **5.5 KPI evaluation**

The BUC KPI has to be derived from the GKPI to facilitate the inverse procedure at a future stage, when the GKPI has to be evaluated and transferred to generic TSoS.


Both, GKPI 1 and GKPI 2 are related to systems performance, but measured under different operational conditions. GKPI 1 is the evaluation of the BUC KPI whilst the TSoS is in normal operation, GKPI 2 contains the same evaluation, but when incidents or malfunctions are present.

GKPI 3 contains an own standing evaluation that bases only on the questionnaires.

In this chapter, the BUC KPI is defined, the formula for determination is given and the connection of the items to the data points is established. The KPI 5.5.1 to 5.5.6 are related to energy efficiency, additional KPIs (e.g. 5.5.7) are even meaningful in building technology but, herein, only a brief description without presentation of the formula will take place due to focus on the relevant figures.

The formula that are given in this section, reference the states of a generic mass flow as illustrated in Figure 18. A fluid (e.g. air or water) enters a system (e.g. a heat exchanger or a space) with state 1 at the in-port, flows through the system that influences the state and leaves the system at the out-port with state 2. The state comprises the state variables of the fluid and

information about the flow conditions. Based on this scheme, the KPI will be calculable as described in the following sections.



**Figure 18: Schemes of generic demand systems**

### 5.5.1 Net Energy Consumed (NEC)

Based on the measurement on TSoS boundary, a balance of energy flows across the boundary leads to the consumption of heat, cold and electricity of the particular TSoS. Balanced over a determined period of time (hour, day, week or month) the result is the energy consumption for the particular form of energy in kWh, the evaluation of minimum and maximum delivers the power range of the particular energy flow in kW.

For determination of thermal NEC, the volume flow and the temperatures are logged as well as the duration of the instantaneous states. A heat balance leads to the formula below, wherein the algebraic sign indicates the direction of heat flow; a positive sign marks a heating process, a negative sign marks a cooling process. NEC usually is given as absolute value regardless the sign, thus an additional index is required to be able to distinguish (x=h for heating, x=c for cooling).

$$NEC_{th,x} = \sum_1^i \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \dot{Q}_{th,i} d\tau = \sum_{i=1}^i \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} \dot{Q}_{th,i} \cdot \Delta t$$

where:

$NEC_{th,x}$  = thermal net energy [kWh]

$\dot{Q}$  = thermal power [kW] (5.1)

$i$  = index of energy flow

$n$  = identifier of figure

$\Delta t$  = duration [s]

$$\dot{Q}_{th} = \dot{m} \cdot \bar{c}_p \cdot (T_1 - T_2) = \frac{\dot{V}}{\bar{\rho}} \cdot \bar{c}_p \cdot (T_1 - T_2)$$

where:

$\dot{V}$  = volume flow [ $\frac{m^3}{s}$ ] (5.2)

$\bar{\rho}$  = density, mean value between state 1 and 2 [ $\frac{kg}{m^3}$ ]

$\bar{c}_p$  = heat capacity, mean value between state 1 and 2 [ $\frac{J}{kg \cdot K}$ ]

T = temperature [K]

$$NEC_{el} = \sum_1^i \int_{t_0}^{t_1} P_{el,i} d\tau = \sum_{i=1}^i \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} P_{el,i} \cdot \Delta t$$

where:

$NEC_{el}$  = electric net energy [kWh]

$P_{el}$  = electric power [kW]

(5.3)

$i$  = index of energy flow

$n$  = identifier of figure

$\Delta t$  = duration [s]

Please note: A discretization takes place in equation 5.1, which results from the event-based data logging. As long as a value changes within a pre-defined threshold, no further entry will be done in the data base, thus the value is logged as constant over a period of time until the threshold limitation is crossed by the measured value.

### 5.5.2 Net Energy Savings (NES)

The comparison of NEC using the LAG control algorithm (“LAG”) leads to the savings of each energy flow related to the reference variety (“ref”). For further comparison, the percentage net energy savings will be determined.

$$\%NES = \frac{NES}{NEC_{th,x}^{ref}} \cdot 100 = \frac{NEC_{th,x}^{ref} - NEC_{th,x}^{LAG}}{NEC_{th,x}^{ref}} \cdot 100$$

where:

$NEC_{th,x}$  = thermal net energy [kWh]

(5.4)

$NES$  = net energy savings [kWh]


$\%NES$  = percentage of net energy savings [%]

The NES for electricity will be calculated using  $NEC_{el}$ .

### 5.5.3 Non-Renewable Energy Consumed (NREC)

The GKPI contain a differentiation between renewable and non-renewable energy consumption. Therefore, the energy conversion and the source layers have to be taken into account, thus the assessment of energy source composite, either renewable or not, will be feasible.

For evaluation, additional measurements as needed for NEC will be monitored that facilitate the broader energy balance on the conversion layer. They contain the energy meter values in input and output energy flows of each conversion system as illustrated in Figure 19, thus the ratio of renewable energy during net energy conversion is calculable. The control sum of percentage renewable energy (PR) and non-renewable energy (PNR) must be 100 %.



**Figure 19: Scheme of generic conversion systems**

Based on this data set, the ratio of non-renewable energy in the net energy flow is calculable for each particular conversion system and consequently for all distribution systems and constituent systems, regarding the distribution system structure.

The calculation of NREC bases on the NEC with an additional factor  $f_{NR}$  for ratio of non-renewable energy in net energy increment.

$$f_{NR} = \frac{\int \dot{E}_R d\tau}{\int \dot{E}_{NR} d\tau + \int \dot{E}_R d\tau} = \frac{1}{\frac{\int \dot{E}_{NR} d\tau}{\int \dot{E}_R d\tau} + 1}$$

where: (5.5)

$f_{NR}$  = factor for ratio of non-renewable energy

$\dot{E}_R$  = flow of renewable energy into the system [kWh]

$\dot{E}_{NR}$  = flow of non-renewable energy into the system [kWh]

$$NREC_{th,x} = \sum_{i=1}^i \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} f_{NR,i} \cdot \dot{Q}_{th,i} \cdot \Delta t$$

where: (5.6)

$NREC_{th,x}$  = non-renewable energy [kWh]

$$NREC_{el} = \sum_{i=1}^i \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_1} f_{NR,i} \cdot P_{el,i} \cdot \Delta t$$

where: (5.7)

$NREC_{el}$  = non-renewable energy in electric energy [kWh]

The NREC figures are of another energy layer than net energy, the so-called end energy layer. Herein, all energy forms are concluded that are not renewable and will be converted within the building's boundary (e.g. gas, electricity, oil). A summarization of the NREC of all conversion devices consequently is legal, thus an expressive figure is determinable.

$NREC = NREC_{th} + NREC_{el}$  where:

where:

$NREC$  = overall consumption of non-renewable energy [kWh] (5.8)

#### 5.5.4 Non-Renewable Energy Savings (NRES)

Regarding the before-mentioned aggregation above all energy forms, the %NRES is the equivalent KPI for GKPI 1 and, depending on the particular test run, even for GKPI 2, if determined whilst the thermal conditions in the TSoS are hold within the required thresholds.

$$\%NRES = \frac{NRES}{NREC^{ref}} \cdot 100 = \frac{NREC^{ref} - NREC^{LAG}}{NREC^{ref}} \cdot 100$$

where:

$NREC_{th,x}$  = thermal net energy [kWh] (5.9)

$NRES$  = net energy savings [kWh]

$\%NRES$  = percentage of net energy savings [%]

#### 5.5.5 Primary Energy Consumed (PEC)

The primary energy consumption and savings can be determined as an additional and advanced KPI related to energy efficiency. Primary energy is a specific but meaningful value in building technology that includes the energy demand of the supply chain before the limit at buildings boundary. To calculate the primary energy, factors for different types of fuel are statistically collected (see Table 6). The PEC bases on the NREC of the building and is linear to it.

**Table 6: Primary energy factors (DIN V 18599-1 2007)**

| Fuel                         | Factor $f_P$ |               |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
|                              | complete     | non-renewable |
| Fuel oil                     | 1,1          | 1,1           |
| Natural gas H (high caloric) | 1,1          | 1,1           |
| Natural gas L (low caloric)  | 1,1          | 1,1           |
| Coal                         | 1,1          | 1,1           |
| Lignite                      | 1,2          | 1,2           |
| Wood                         | 1,2          | 0,2           |
| Electricity (standard mix)   | 3,0          | 2,7           |
| Environmental energy         | 1,0          | 0,0           |



$$PEC = \sum_f NREC_f \cdot f_{P,f}$$

where:

$NREC$  = consumption order by fuel [kWh] (5.10)

$f_P$  = primary energy factor

$f$  = fuel index

### 5.5.6 Primary Energy Savings (PES)

The primary energy savings refer to the calculation of NES (see 5.5.2).

$$\%PES = \frac{PES}{PEC^{ref}} \cdot 100 = \frac{PEC^{ref} - PEC^{LAG}}{PEC^{ref}} \cdot 100$$

where:

$PEC$  = primary energy consumption [kWh] (5.11)

$PES$  = primary energy savings [kWh]

$\%PES$  = percentage of primary energy savings [%]

### 5.5.7 Further KPI

In addition to the before-mentioned KPIs that are of relevance to evaluate the building's energy efficiency on condition that the required threshold limits are satisfied, more KPIs are evaluable that open other perspectives on the control performance. A few examples are:

- **Exergy related KPI:** The exergy<sup>5</sup> oriented analysis (Baehr und Kabelac 2006) offers a deeper thermodynamic perspective on the TSoS operations. Based on the measurements, the exergy flows are calculable and evaluable similarly to the energy analysis.
- **Emission related KPI:** The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are a core KPI to assess the ecological quality of TSoS operations that is embed in world wired policy of climate change (UNFCCC 2014). The CO<sub>2</sub>-emissions correspond with the consumption of NREC/NRES but depends on the applied techniques and the dynamic processes within the supply system. The evaluation of this KPI is available based on the simulative pre-analysis (regarding the degree of simplification of the simulation models).
- **Thermal comfort related KPI:** In addition to the only observation of thermal comfort requirements and the related limitations, further KPI are evaluable to analyze the room climate dynamics. Visualizing the quality of control is possible by statistical analysis of the measured data (e.g. standard deviations, control errors).
- **Cost-Benefit-Ratio (CBR):** A L4G objective is developing a ready to use product that is applicable for different types of TSoS. The economic potential possibly differs from use case to use case, thus the comparison of CBR provides an indication which kind of TSoS contains the highest potential for a successful market introduction.

---

<sup>5</sup> Exergy is defined as the part of an energy increment that is capable to perform technical work

## 5.6 Evaluation of behavior under artificial circumstances

The KPIs of building use case (see 5.5) focus on the L4G methodology's performance regarding energy efficiency under thermal comfort requirements. As far as the circumstances provide regular TSoS operations, the adaptive mechanism will lead to suitable and improving control operations, but if there are any malfunctions, incidents or defects, the control purpose will change.

To test the L4G methodology in non-regular TSoS operations, artificial circumstances will be imprinted. That is possible as well in simulative pre-analysis as in implementation phase in real building using the BMS / MCIS coupling.

### 5.6.1 Artificial malfunctions

Numerous malfunctions influence the every-day operations of a building at the test bed's size. Some are of lower interest, because they do not influence noticeable functions (e.g. high pressure losses in dirty filter systems). Others are of highest priority because they reduce the thermal comfort (e.g. no availability of chillers or heating systems) or the usability of the building in any other way (e.g. a blackout). All these possibilities embody the real operation environment and conditions of a control system.

To analyze the behavior and capability in periods when malfunctions are present, a few of them will be initialized in an artificial way. Especially malfunctions that influence the energy efficiency of the TSoS will be taken into account:

- Descending temperature in supply loops (heating and/or cooling)
- Ascending temperature in supply loops (heating and/or cooling)
- Breakdown of pumps (no pressure in water loops)
- Breakdown of the central AHU (no pressure in air ducts)
- Unexpected heating/cooling loads in a room
- Return of system after a blackout (abrupt)

### 5.6.2 Artificial incidents

Especially regarding the safety requirements, incidents can be a normal situation. After a system shutdown, the control system has to achieve the TSoS's operations return without complications. In the building on hand, a fire alarm or a component shutdown because of maintenance is available to initiate artificial return operations.

A benefit of the simulative pre-analysis is the capability to analyze the influence of uncertainties, thus e.g. the control behavior under extreme weather situations.

- Return of system after a complete or partial shut down
- Operation under extreme weather situations

## 5.7 Evaluation of users' acceptance

The evaluation of the questionnaires for users' acceptance bases on statistical analysis methods. The question to answer is the occupier's subjective perception of the room climate. Some methods are currently and previously in use in further projects at the EBC institute and the experience gathered in these questionnaires in addition to the results of published questionnaires (Hellwig 2005, Gossauer 2008) that focus on the same questions are the foundation of the development of L4G questionnaire.

The evaluation of the users' acceptance bases on the PMV-PPD-model of Fanger, that is standardized in DIN EN ISO 7730 (DIN 2006). The predicted percentage of dissatisfied (PPD) is the equivalent KPI for GKPI 3.

## 5.8 Transfer to General KPI

The evaluation purpose of L4G not only consists of the use case specific evaluation. A transfer to generic TSoS is required to assess the potential impact of the L4G methodology for generic TSoS. Therefore, for each GKPI (see 3.2.1) equivalent figures are chosen as KPI that facilitate a direct transfer to GKPI and comparison above use case boundaries. See Table 7 for GKPI-KPI-correlation in building use case.

**Table 7: GKPI-KPI transfer relation**

| <b>GKPI</b> | <b>KPI</b>                          | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Target Improvement</b> |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| GKPI 1      | NRES, CBR                           | Difference in terms of daily average energy consumption from non-renewables sources while maintaining user comfort (Fanger Factor) at an acceptable level | 30 %                      |
| GKPI 2      | NRES under artificial circumstances | In both use cases equal to GKPI 1, but when major incidents are present   | 30 %                      |
| GKPI 3      | PPD                                 | User satisfaction metric to be calculated through questionnaires  | 80 %                      |

## **6 Outlook**

The general evaluation approach, the assessment objectives, and the methods have been explained in this evaluation plan. A framework for evaluation of the Local for Global optimization algorithms into the both building and traffic TSoS use cases has been outlined. Furthermore, performance indicators have been defined for each use case separately. As outputs, comparison of general key performance factors and assessment of the L4G impact will be achieved. In addition to evaluation purposes, the results of the developed evaluation plan is applied in the next step of the project to determine additional sensors and monitoring devices have to be installed at each of the two use cases. Since the use cases under consideration are currently used by users, changes in the currently-installed control system cannot be made forthrightly. Therefore, the Local for global optimization algorithm will be evaluated through dynamic simulation in the further step of the project.

## 7 References

- Baehr, Hans Dieter, und Stephan Kabelac. *Thermodynamik. Grundlagen und technische Anwendungen*. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 2006.
- Bangor, A., T., Kortum Staff, und Miller, J P. „Determining What Individual SUS Scores Mean: Adding an Adjective Rating Scale.“ *Journal of Usability Studies* 4(3), 2009: 114–123.
- Bortz, Jürgen, und Nina Döring. *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation für Human- und Sozialwissenschaftler: Mit 156 Abbildungen und 87 Tabellen (4., überarbeitete Auflage)*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2006.
- Brilon, W., T. Wietholt, and N. Wu. *Einsatzbereiche von Grünen Wellen und verkehrsabhängigen Steuerungen einerseits und verkehrsabhängiger Steuerung andererseits sowie Ableitung der zweckmäßigen Einsatzkriterien. Berichte der Bundesanstalt für Straßenwesen. Reihe Verkehrstechnik, Heft V 163*. Bergisch Gladbach: Bundesanstalt für Straßenwesen (BASt), 2007.
- Brooke, John. „SUS: A quick and dirty usability scale.“ In *Usability Evaluation in Industry*, von B Weerdmeester, A Thomas und I.L Mclelland, 189-194. London: Taylor, 1996.
- Commission of the European Communities. *Evaluation Process for Road Transport Informatics - EVA Manual*. 1991.
- DeLone, W.H., and E.R. McLean. "The DeLone and McLean model of Information Systems Success - A Ten-Year-Update." 2003, Vol. 4, 19.
- DeLone, W.H., und E.R. McLean. „Information Systems Success: The Quest for the dependant variable.“ *Information Systems Journal*, 1992: Vol. 3, 1.
- Diakaki, Christina, et al. *Technical System of Systems Modelling and Analysis Requirements*. Deliverable 2.1, EU Local4Global FP7-ICT project #611538, 2014.
- DIN. „Ergonomics of the thermal environment - Analytical determination and interpretation of thermal comfort using calculation of the PMV and PPD indices and local thermal comfort criteria (ISO 7730:2005); German version EN ISO 7730:2005.“ *DIN EN ISO 7730:2006-05*. 2006.
- DIN V 18599-1. „Energy efficiency of buildings - Calculation of the net, final and primary energy demand for heating, cooling, ventilation, domestic water and lighting.“ *Part 1: General balancing procedures, terms and definitions, zoning and evaluation of energy sources*. Beuth Verlag GmbH, February 2007.
- Ettinger, Roland, Michael Krause, Thomas Schild, and Roozbeh Sangi. *Use Case Requirements*. Deliverable 2.3, EU Local4Global FP7-ICT project #611538, 2014.
- Ettinger, Roland, und Michael Krause. *1st Implementantion Plan: Traffic Use Case*. Deliverable 5.1.1, EU Local4Global FP7-ICT project #611538, 2014.
- FGSV. *Empfehlungen für Wirtschaftlichkeitsuntersuchungen an Straßen*. 1997.
- FGSV. "Handbuch für die Bemessung von Straßenverkehrsanlagen (HBS) - Fassung 2009." Köln, 2001.
- FGSV. „Hinweise zur mikroskopischen Verkehrsflusssimulation - Grundlagen und Anwendung.“ Köln, 2006.
- FHWA. *Highway Capacity Manual*. 2000.
- . *Traffic Analysis Toolbox Volume III: Guidelines for Applying Traffic Microsimulation Modeling Software*. 2004.
- FHWA. "Traffic Signal Timing Manual." 2008.
- FOT-NET. "FESTA Handbook Version 4." 2011.

- Friedrich, Bernhard, Stephan Hoffmann, Ralf Kutzner, und Tobias Pohlmann. *Leitfaden Qualitätsmanagement für Lichtsignalanlagen*. Bundesanstalt für Straßenwesen BAST, 2008.
- Fütterer, J., Constantin, A., et al. "A multifunctional demonstration bench for advanced control research in buildings - monitoring, control and interface system." *IEEE IECON 2013 proceedings : 39th Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*. Danvers USA, 2013. 5694-5699.
- Fütterer, Johannes, Ana Constantin, and Dirk Müller. "An energy concept for multifunctional buildings with geothermal energy and photovoltaic." *CISBAT 2011 : cleantech for sustainable buildings ; from nano to urban scale ; proceedings ; 14-16 September 2011, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland*. 2011.
- Garcia, Alvaro, and Eduardo Gilabert. *Technical System of Systems / Local4Global Embedded Software Needs*. Deliverable 2.2, EU Local4Global FP7-ICT project #611538, 2014.
- Gossauer, Elke. *Workplace Occupant Satisfaction in Office Buildings – A Field Study*. Karlsruhe, 2008.
- Hassenzahl, Mark. „The thing and I: understanding the relationship between user and product.“ In *Funology: From Usability to Enjoyment*, von M. Blythe, C. Overbeeke, A.F. Monk und P.C. Wright, 31-42. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- Hellwig, Runa Tabea. *Thermal comfort - Natural ventilation versus air-conditioning in office buildings from the occupant's point of view*. München, 2005.
- Krause, Michael, Levent Yilmaz, und Klaus Bengler. „Comparison of Real and Simulated Driving for a Static Driving Simulator.“ *AHFE 2014*. Krakau: (in press), 2014.
- Krause, Michael, und Klaus Bengler. „Subjective Ratings in an Ergonomic Engineering Process Using the Example of an In-Vehicle Information System.“ *HCI*. Las Vegas, 2013.
- . „Traffic Light Assistant – Evaluation of Information Presentation.“ *Advances in Human Factors and Ergonomics*. San Francisco: CRC, 2012. 6786–6795.
- Krause, Michael, Verena Knott, und Klaus Bengler. „Traffic Light Assistant - Can take my eyes off of you.“ *Annual Meeting HFES Europe Chapter*. Turin, 2013.
- PTV AG. *VISSIM 5.30-05 User Manual*. 2011.
- Robertson, D. *TRANSYT, Beiträge zur Theorie des Verkehrsflusses*. In: *Schriftenreihe Straßenbau und Verkehrstechnik, Heft 86, S. 134-144*. Karlsruhe, 1969.
- Schild, Thomas, and Roozbeh Sangi. *1st Implementation Plan: Building Use Case*. Deliverable 5.2.1, EU Local4Global FP7-ICT project #611538, 2014.
- „Traffic Light Assistant – Can Take My Eyes Off of You.“ *HFES Europe Chapter Annual Meeting 2013*. Turin, 2014.
- UNFCCC. *UNFCCC Website*. 2014. [http://unfccc.int/ghg\\_data/kp\\_data\\_unfccc/base\\_year\\_data/items/4354.php](http://unfccc.int/ghg_data/kp_data_unfccc/base_year_data/items/4354.php) (Zugriff am 21. May 2014).
- Zhang, X., P. Kompfner, C. White, and B. Sexton. "Guidebook for Assessment of Transport Telematics Applications Updated Version. CONVERGE Project TR1101. Deliverable D2.3.1." 1998.