TARGET VALUE PREDICTION FOR ONLINE OPTIMIZATION AT ENGINE TEST BEDS
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Abstract: The settling times of target functions play an important role in the domain of online optimization at the engine test bed. Inert target functions generally induce long measuring times which lead to increased costs. In this article, we analyze how previous knowledge about the physical behavior of target functions can be used to early predict the final steady state value to reduce measuring times.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, model based algorithms have gained significance in the domain of online optimization of combustion engines (Isermann, 2003). In this area, known optimization systems like, for example, Cameo (Gschweitl et al., 2001) and Vega (Bredenbeck, 1999) are in use, but the algorithm mbminimize presented in (Knödler et al., 2003) (Knödler, 2004) (Poland et al., 2003) also has found its place in real applications.

An important and time consuming part of online optimization is the extraction of measuring data at the engine test bed. Inert target functions, like e.g. the exhaust gas temperature, need a long time until the final steady state value of the target function – also called target value – is reached for a certain combination of input parameters. In addition, the detection of the final value is complicated by noise. On the other hand, the behavior of transient oscillation is often known, or can be derived from physical rules in order to early predict the target value. This procedure is investigated in the given contribution, first in simulation and then on real engine data. Preceding analysis like (Flohr, 2005) (Schropp, 2006) show that the behavior of target functions in this application domain can often be described by simple mathematical functions. A target value prediction during the online optimization based on a small amount of data therefore has the potential to reduce the effort of measuring. The idea of prediction is not new, of course. There is recent work like (Castillo and Melin, 2002) (Han et al., 2004) (Teo et al., 2001) (Wang and Fu, 2005) which deals with this topic using approximators such as neural networks, genetic algorithms, or support vector machines for predictions based on time series.

2 TARGET VALUE PREDICTION

In this section, the algorithm of target value prediction is presented on idealized, artificially composed measuring data. In addition, the algorithm is tested with regard to robustness against noise.

2.1 The Principle of Target Value Prediction

The progression of target functions is often inversely exponential. A typical example is the temperature. At the engine test bed, the exhaust gas temperature is a quantity, which reacts slowly to adjustments of the input parameters in comparison with other quantities of the engine. It is thereby an ideal candidate for the following analyses for two reasons: On the one hand, it is easy to get a large amount of measuring data during the time of transient oscillation due to the inertia of the target function. On the other hand, the possible
profit of time gained by using target value prediction is especially large.

Figure 1 shows artificially generated, idealized measuring data of a target function with such a behavior, displayed by the black circles. The system is steady at the beginning and reacts with a delay to the adjustments of the input values. The recorded data is used as basis for online calculations by the target value prediction. With a function approximation algorithm based on least squares optimization, the behavior of the target function is emulated, and a target value is predicted. So, if the data is given as \( \{x_i, \tilde{f}(x_i)\} \) with \( \tilde{f} \) being the unknown target function, the objective is to find parameter values \( \tilde{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3) \) that approximate the error

\[
E = \sum_i (v_1 e^{v_2 x_i} + v_3 - \tilde{f}(x_i))^2 \rightarrow \min \quad (1)
\]

best. The result for the idealized data is also shown in figure 1. If the data is so ideal and free of noise like this, an early determination of the target value is simple. A greater challenge is given by the addition of noise, which is shown in the next section.

An important aspect of the prediction lies in the correct detection of the moment when the target function reacts to changes of the input. This point in time is usually unknown in a real application, and the response time often varies. In our applications, this moment is determined by a significant change in the target values over a longer span of time. Therefore, it is fundamental for our algorithm to have a continuous and detailed record of the target function. Given the data \( \{x_i, \tilde{f}(x_i)\} \), we first filter our plateaus by replacing every set

\[
\{x_{i-n}, \ldots, x_i\} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : \tilde{f}(x_{i-j}) = \tilde{f}(x_i)
\]

with its final data point \( x_i \), discarding the rest, then we choose the smallest \( x_i \) from the set

\[
\{ x_i \mid |\tilde{f}(x_{i-\delta}) - \tilde{f}(x_i)| > \lambda \left( \max_i \tilde{f}(x_i) - \min_i \tilde{f}(x_i) \right) \}
\]

\( \delta \) and \( \lambda \) are empirically specified parameters.

During the online operation, the target value prediction is updated constantly with additionally recorded data. The algorithm is suited for online use, because the calculation of the target value only requires a few milliseconds. Depending on the noise, the predicted target value often changes when new measuring data is added, and the prediction improves in quality with an increased amount of data. The quality of the target value prediction is compared to the standard method, which is still in use at the test beds at present. The standard method assumes that the target function is tuned after a fixed amount of waiting time, specified in advance. Then, an averaged measuring value is used as final target value. In our simulation the waiting time, also referred to as stationary time, is set to the point in time when the target function has reached 95\% of its final value. At this point, a measuring time of half the stationary time’s duration is used. This is in accordance to the situation at the engine test bed.

2.2 The Impact of Noise

To test the robustness of the algorithm against noise, the following tests were done. For different noise levels 1000 test runs were evaluated each. Normal distributed noise was used with a standard deviation specified in relation to the range of the target values. The results are the averaged saving of time in comparison to the standard method with a fixed stationary time, as well as the relative error reduction \( \epsilon \), calculated as the fraction of error \( \epsilon_{\text{ref}} \) of the standard method by which the prediction error \( \epsilon_{\text{pred}} \) is lower, and vice versa:

\[
\epsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{\epsilon_{\text{ref}} - \epsilon_{\text{pred}}}{\epsilon_{\text{ref}}} & \text{if } \epsilon_{\text{pred}} < \epsilon_{\text{ref}} \\ \frac{\epsilon_{\text{ref}} - \epsilon_{\text{pred}}}{\epsilon_{\text{pred}}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)
\]

The higher the values are, the better target value prediction worked. The prediction success displays how often the prediction error was smaller than the error of the standard method. The results are presented in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise level</th>
<th>Saving of time</th>
<th>Error reduction</th>
<th>Prediction success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By means of these results, it was possible to confirm the assumption that the function approximation
method of the target value prediction is able to determine the final value more precisely than a simple averaging after a fixed stationary time. With increased noise, which significantly falsifies the measuring data especially in the early phase of transient oscillation, the difference lessens because an early prediction is not possible anymore in this case.

At a high noise level, which may commonly occur in real applications, an early prediction is still possible, but the success is lacking. In the next section, we show how this trade-off can be used to reduce the overall measuring time of an optimization problem without downgrading the final results.

Figure 2 shows sample data sets with different noise levels.

\[
\text{Target Function} = v_1 \cdot e^{v_2 \cdot x_1} + v_3 \cdot e^{v_4 \cdot x_1} + v_5
\]

Figure 2: Sample data with different noise levels.

2.3 Addressing More Than Simple E-functions

The simple E-function is only one of different possibilities to describe the behavior of target functions. In our real application, for example, we found that a twofold E-function \( v_1 \cdot e^{v_2 \cdot x_1} + v_3 \cdot e^{v_4 \cdot x_1} + v_5 \) was better suited to describe the progression of the measuring data. This and other unexpected behavior in the data may be explained by the measuring technology, the interplay of which still needs more investigations. In this contribution, we want to mention two examples, which occur commonly at the engine test bed.

Figure 3 shows an example of real engine data with an overshooting behavior. An early target value prediction will therefore fail to describe the progression correctly. For an optimization problem with several measuring points, the decision whether to abort the measuring process due to an early target value prediction can be made depending on the significance of the expected target value. For example, if the current target value is already under a certain threshold of importance and the predicted value has even less impact on the optimization result, a possible overshooting can be neglected.

Figures 3 shows an example of real engine data with overshooting behavior.

Sometimes, a drift in the target values can be detected. This behavior can be identified with target value predictions, too. If several predictions are recorded over a longer period of time, it becomes evident that a small linear time is included in the underlying target function \( v_1 \cdot e^{v_2 \cdot x_1} + v_3 \cdot x_1 + v_5 \). In general, however, the influence of drift at one single measuring point is too small to have a significant impact on the final steady state value. Since the detection of drift behavior is complicated by noise and requires a longer period of measuring time, we neglect the possible occurrence of drift in general. This corresponds to the standard measuring method, which determines the final result as an averaged measuring value.

3 RESULTS IN REAL APPLICATIONS

This section consists of several applications from the domains of both simulation and the engine test bed, in which target value prediction improves the final results.

3.1 Model-based Optimization

In the applications of this section, we used a model-based approach for the optimization of the input parameters of a target function that was defined over a given input space. The models of the target function were generated by a committee of neural networks.
and LLR models, the output of the later being a linear combination of non-linear basic functions. Neural networks have been long established in model-based optimization, as illustrated in (Hafner, 2002) (Hafner et al., 2000) (Schüler et al., 2000), for example. The strengths of neural networks for our use lies in the ability to produce a good overall approximation of the target function based on few data points without prior knowledge. The LLR models, on the other hand, are designed to specifically describe local behavior in the input space in detail.

Based on such a model, we calculate a QBC criterion (query by committee), of which figure 4 provides an example over an one-dimensional input space. The QBC criterion supplies the largest values to the points where the committee’s individual models diverge the most. The information of already known measuring points is included to avoid repeated measuring at the same input values. The expression “query” here denotes the decision-making process to determine the next measuring point with the aid of the currently available model. This method will be used in the following subsection.

### 3.2 Optimization in a Simulation Environment

As a first application, we used our algorithm in a simulation environment, which was designed for the optimization of an engine model. Measuring points were chosen in a two-dimensional search space by a D-optimal DoE-method (Röpke, 2005) (Weber et al., 2005). The goal was to find the local minima and to model the regions around them with the least error possible. We used the Branin function as the target function and simulated it to be inert, according to what was described in the section before. Note, that the test set consisted of test points near the local minima only, in order to display the optimization goal. Figure 5 shows the setup of the experiments. Our algorithm was tested against the standard method with fixed stationary and measuring time.

There are two conditions, after which the prediction based algorithm completes the measuring process at a specific measuring point and evaluates the gathered measuring data via prediction: In the standard case, analogous to the section before, the measuring process is finished when the predicted value is stable over a certain period of time. This is calculated with the term

\[
|\text{mean}(p(t-\delta), \ldots, p(t-1)) - p(t)| < \alpha \\
\wedge \text{std}(p(t-\delta), \ldots, p(t-1)) < \alpha
\]

using the predicted values \(p(t)\) after normalization. The parameters \(\delta = 30\) (seconds) and \(\alpha = 0.01\) are empirically determined based on real engine data.

In addition, however, there is a possibility to abort the measuring when the expected target value is too high to be a local minimum. In this case, the value predicted at that moment is used as an estimated target value, even if it is to be expected that the error at this point is quite large. The intention of this method is to save measuring time at unimportant measuring points to gain a first rough engine model and use the saved time to explore the regions of minima in detail. Figure 6 shows two cases where the measuring process was completed due to early predictions. In the first case, the measuring was complete since the predicted values leveled off at the point in time marked by the dotted line. The second case shows an example where the expected value was considered irrelevant for the minimization problem. The measuring process was aborted in this case.
expected optimum will not be aborted, and measure-
ings near local minima based on the current, incom-
plete model will also not be aborted. The thresholds
for these options are set by the user based on rough
previous knowledge at this time, but they are not sen-
sitive. These rules grant an additional certainty that
no information will be lost unnecessarily.

Figure 7 shows the progression of the test error
during the optimization over time, as an average over
72 test runs. After 74.4% of the time that the standard
method needed in total, the target value prediction al-
gorithm evaluated the initial set of measuring points.
At that point, our algorithm created a function model
with a test error of 41.6, while the model of the stan-
dard method still had a test error of 502.6. The reason
for this huge difference lies in the fact that the stan-
dard method did not yet deal with several measuring
points, so the error near those is still very large, of
course. The final test error of the standard method
was 31.4.

In addition to the initial set of measuring points,
the prediction based algorithm used the saved time
to measure additional data points. To generate these
points, the current model of the target function was
used to locate the regions near local minima, as ex-
plained in the subsection before. Based on QBC cri-
teron, the additional measuring points were chosen
by a line search algorithm. With the additional data
points, the final test error could be reduced to 17.7
with a 43.6% improvement in comparison with the
standard method.

In this scenario, our algorithm was able to produce
a rough interim result in a shorter time. On the other
hand, using the complete amount of time available,
our algorithm was able to improve the final results in
comparison with the standard method.

3.3 Target Value Prediction on Real
Engine Data

As an example with real application data, the target
value prediction algorithm was used on engine data,
which was provided by the BMW Group in Munich.
The data consists of exhaust gas measurements and de-
scribe load step responses. The range of values has
been scaled to make the relative error values compa-
rable. The results contain 126 data sets.

Dealing with real engine data poses a problem,
which makes a presentation of the results according
to simulation difficult: The real final values of the
target function are unknown. Even after measuring
for minutes, it is possible that the transient oscillation
of several target functions still have not finished. An
open-ended measuring is not viable, however. Figure
Figure 8: Examples of recorded engine data, which still have not reached their final values at the end of the recording. Plateaus in the recorded data arise because the measuring process is disabled during the time of evaluating and saving the engine data at the engine test bed. The data points after this point in time still vary, however. Therefore, additional assumptions, which are derived from the simulation, are made for the following data evaluations.

In the practice of test bed operations, target functions are assumed to have reached their final values after a certain amount of stationary time. A concluding averaged value is then accepted as target value. In the given data, the stationary time has been set to 60 seconds. Afterwards, a measuring has been performed over a timespan of 30 seconds, after which the averaged value has been calculated. This value was used for comparisons to rate the target value prediction algorithm. The results from simulation show that with an appropriate modeling of the target function progression given, the target value can be estimated more precisely by a corresponding prediction than by an averaged measuring value. For this reason we assume that, in the case of real engine data, the predicted target value, which was calculated based on all available measuring data, approximates the real final value best. The examples in figure 8 include the final predicted target value for comparison. With regard to this value, the results can be illustrated as in table 2.

Table 2: Evaluation of error levels using target value prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum error</th>
<th>Threshold success</th>
<th>Saving of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 shows an exemplary and successful target value prediction based on engine data. In this case, a similarity to the simulated E-function is identifiable. The complete engine data is drawn in black, while the green dashed line highlights what data was available to the prediction algorithm. The predicted behavior is shown in red.

3.4 Model-based Optimization of a Combustion Engine

As another application, we modeled a target function of an engine over a two-dimensional parameter space. The problem we had hereby was that there was not enough real engine data available for an additional large, independent test set. So, to evaluate the algorithms on the real application, we had to create a simulated reference. We did this by creating an engine
model with the given engine data. This served as a basis for calculations about test errors.

In analogy to the subsection before, we wanted to explore the input space by measuring certain data points. The target values were real engine data, and therefore the measuring process was inert. With the acquired data, a model was created both for our algorithm based on target value prediction as well as for the standard method using stationary and measuring times. The goal was to find the local minima with a good representation of their immediate environments. Note that we are referring to three different models now. The first one is created with steady state values and serves as reference. The other two models are calculated during the optimization process where recorded engine data on the inert target function is evaluated. Figure 10 shows the first of these models which represents the engine’s target function in steady states. Another fourth model is created by using target value prediction without the goal to minimize optimization time, but to achieve best test error values instead.

The measuring process consisted of approaching and measuring 38 data points. Using the standard method, the final mean squared error was 231.1. The algorithm using target value prediction was able to reach an error of 147.4 after 75.2% of the time which the standard method needed, an improvement of 36.8% in comparison to the standard method. Therefore, the target value prediction could be used to save time to early generate an engine model that had a lower test error based on the reference model. Furthermore, the predictions can also be done using the same amount of time which the standard method uses. In this variation the final result was 139.3, an improvement of 39.7%.

4 CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS

In this article we described the idea and methodology of target value prediction. Thereby, the fundamental assumption was that the behavior of the target function after adjusting the input parameters can be described with inversely exponential E-functions. Results from both simulation and practice show the possible success of this algorithm. We demonstrated that the strength of the target value prediction does not lie in single measurements, since there is always some sort of trade-off between saving of time and precision loss included. Given a larger scope of an entire optimization problem, however, exactly this trade-off can be used to concentrate available resources to the important parts of the problem and to save valuable time at less significant aspects.

Due to the nature of the prediction method to detect the important regions of an optimization problem, we expect the algorithm to scale well with larger problems where the areas of solutions do not scale accordingly at all. Further work will apply the proposed method to other problems in the domain of online optimization and continue to show its capacity.

REFERENCES


