

A Web of Things Architecture for Digital Twin Creation and Model-Based Reinforcement Control

Luca Bedogni

Department of Physics, Mathematics and Informatics
University of Modena and Reggio Emilia
Via G. Campi 213/B, 41125 Modena, Italy
luca.bedogni@unimore.it

Federico Chiariotti

Department of Information Engineering
University of Padova
Via G. Gradenigo 6/B, 35131 Padova, Italy
chiariot@dei.unipd.it

Abstract—Internet of Things (IoT) devices are available in a multitude of scenarios, and provide constant, contextual data which can be leveraged to automatically reconfigure and optimize smart environments. To realize this vision, Artificial Intelligence (AI) and deep learning techniques are usually employed, however they need large quantity of data which is often not feasible in IoT scenarios. Digital Twins (DTs) have recently emerged as an effective way to replicate physical entities in the digital domain, to allow for simulation and testing of models and services. In this paper, we present a novel architecture based on the emerging Web of Things (WoT) standard, which provides a DT of a smart environment and applies Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) techniques on real time data. We implement our system in a real deployment, and test it along with a legacy system. Our findings show that the benefits of having a digital twin, specifically for DRL models, allow for faster convergence and finer tuning.

Index Terms—Web of Things, Digital Twin, Reinforcement Learning, Model-based Learning

I. INTRODUCTION

The Internet of Things (IoT) has transformed many aspects of daily lives, as modern, intelligent devices are now available in a plethora of different use cases. This vast amount of information, together with the capability of IoT devices to interact with the real world, opens up several possibilities for the automatic reconfiguration and control of systems based on Artificial Intelligence (AI) and deep learning techniques, without human intervention in the loop [1].

The Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) revolution, which started in 2015 with the first functioning Deep Q-Network (DQN) model [2], has led to a flourishing of proposed solutions in various fields, including the IoT. In the years since, DRL models have proven their value in a number of applications, from complex board games to cellular network optimization. However, some inherent challenges still limit their use in practical scenarios [3]: while these models can often overcome traditional approaches after convergence, the training phase requires some exploration of the state and action spaces, leading to suboptimal outcomes during training.

This training phase might be extremely long in some applications, as training even a modestly sized DQN often requires

millions of steps. Moreover, several models may be a viable solution for the same task, hence understanding the one which fits the best is not trivial. This can effectively prevent the use of DRL in many domestic and industrial IoT applications [4], whose control loops are relatively slow, as the training would require weeks or even months of highly suboptimal control. On the other hand, purely passive training (i.e., training the model on experience samples that were obtained while using a policy not controlled by the learning agent) has known convergence issues [5]: if a traditional control policy is used during training, avoiding highly damaging outcomes, the DQN might never learn a good policy.

A solution to this issue is given by *model-based* DRL [6]: in this paradigm, domain knowledge about the task of the learning agent is used to create a model of the environment, which can be used as a simulation environment for offline virtual training. The agent is then free to make mistakes and learn from experience, without actually causing any damage in the real world, and the model can be sped up to make the duration of the training process independent from the timing of the task, as the only limit to the virtual environment is the available processing speed. Naturally, the model itself is not reality, and the agent might need an online training phase in the real world after reaching convergence in the simulated environment, but the difficulty of transfer learning from the virtual environment to the real one is much lower than learning the policy from scratch, and more importantly, extremely damaging actions are already associated to very low values, and a directed exploration policy will never select them, achieving a much smaller optimality gap during the online training phase.

Enabling simulation of counterfactual scenarios and different control policies is one of the key aims of another paradigm that is rapidly attracting interest in the engineering community, the *Digital Twin (DT)* [7]. DTs include sensory, simulation, and management aspects of objects and processes, effectively bridging the physical and digital worlds [8]: a twin can be used to monitor the state of its physical counterpart, by connecting it directly to sensors, or to simulate the effects of choices and actions, using it as a dynamic model disconnected from physical reality. In fact, a DT can provide the virtual environment for model-based DRL, acting as a sandbox to train the

This work was partly supported by the Italian Ministry of University and Research under the PNRR “SoE Young Researchers” grant for project REDIAL.

learning agent in without affecting the real environment. At the same time, the twin can be refined with updated data from the real sensors, more accurately matching the physical system it represents; the DRL agent can then be easily retrained on the improved sensor data, incorporating the new model with the experience on the actual physical system.

In this work, we describe a general-purpose Web of Things (WoT) architecture that can seamlessly support the creation and twinning of DTs and the model-based training of DRL agents in a virtual environment composed by one or more DTs. The architecture can interface directly with sensors and actuators through WoT standard protocols, as well as providing a middleware layer that can integrate legacy systems and proprietary IoT frameworks, such as most domotic systems, into the architecture. We also provide a Smart Home use case, in which DRL is used to control the heating system of a room, considering the number of people occupying it as well as associated energy efficiency. The DT and DRL agent are connected to a real deployment, using data from the installed sensors and providing notifications to the user with advice on thermostat settings. As more data becomes available over time, the DT for each room is automatically updated, exploiting more complex models when their training becomes possible, and the deployed DRL agent is retrained using the new models, providing a self-improving temperature control with a seamless occupant experience.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: first, we provide a review of the relevant literature in Sec. II. We then describe our architecture and the model-based DRL training procedure in Sec. III, and we present our domotic use case in Sec. IV. Finally, Sec. V concludes the paper and presents some possible avenues of future work.

II. RELATED WORK

The IoT has revolutionized many aspects of daily lives, becoming pervasive and present in several different scenarios. To fully leverage the IoT's potential, Deep Learning or Machine Learning techniques are often employed to extract patterns from the vast amount of data that sensors and other IoT devices produce. The IoT presents many challenges, one of which is certainly the possibility for them to cooperate even if made by different vendors and adopting different communication protocols [1]. This is one of the reasons behind the increasing interest over the WoT standard, which provides a homogeneous representation of devices and of operations which can be performed on them [9], [10], while also offering Quality of Service (QoS) levels depending on the application requirements, and security mechanisms to protect the data and the devices.

However, even being able to seamlessly interconnect devices does not fully unleash the possibilities offered by the IoT. What is still missing is the possibility for devices to automatically understand what services can spark from the devices and the data which is available in their networks. In other words, what is missing is the interpretation of the data, which goes beyond pure classification [11], to go towards automatic

service composition built by the device from the data itself [12]. There have been many contributions in this domain, most of which focused on a specific aspect of the issue, such as how to discover devices using the same protocol and exchanging similar information [13], and how to leverage ontologies to provide semantics to the data, hence to be able to provide a shared sense to it [14] [15].

There are fewer works which address the autonomous creation of services from the devices, and more generally how different devices can form novel services without human intervention [16]. Apart from understanding the nature of the data, devices also need to be able to perform different actions on the network to change its behavior and recognize what actions may bring the system toward a better state [17]. In other words, the network has to automatically understand what is the causality of actions on specific variables of interest, which requires to perform several experiments and possibly have a long history of data, which is not always feasible in an IoT scenario. There have been some advances in this domain [18], but there are still no organic solutions that can also deal with all the challenges that deployment in real scenarios brings [16], [19].

During the past decade, another revolution in computing and AI took place, in parallel to the development of IoT systems: reinforcement learning, whose practical applications had been mostly limited to board games and parametric optimization of hand-designed algorithms, was successfully integrated with deep neural networks [2], taking a significant leap in terms of performance and capabilities. Over the past few years, DRL has become a staple solution in many fields, including robotics, automated factory management, and communication networks. However, DRL solutions for real systems have two significant problems, which stem from the model-free nature of the learning procedure: firstly, they require a long training process, which must include samples of highly suboptimal actions in order to fully explore the solution space, and secondly, counterfactuals and alternative options are hard to evaluate [20].

Domotics, and the control of slow processes such as building heating and climate control, are an application field that is particularly vulnerable to long training times [4]: while training a DRL agent in faster environments, with sub-second time steps, can take a few hours, training time for agents on processes whose actions are separated by minutes or hours can be measured in months. Furthermore, the robustness of the learned solution needs to be verified thoroughly, as the consequences of failures may range from annoying to dire.

In these cases, virtual pre-training before deployment is a common technique [21]. Complex simulators or simple black-box models can provide a safe environment for the DRL agent to make mistakes [22], transferring the acquired knowledge to the real world. However, most works using virtual environments for training designed them *ad hoc* [23], requiring extensive human intervention, and the quality of the simulation environment is crucial for effective transfer learning [24].




Fig. 1: Web of Things architecture.

Causal reasoning and the creation of models of the environment, either in advance or during training and operation, are ways to mitigate these issues: modeling the effects of actions, and whether the available actions affect control performance [25], can significantly improve DRL training. The concept of a DT, which uses real data from the environment to build a model, can be extremely useful: by gradually improving the environment model, and retraining the DRL agent if needed, the DT paradigm can aid the virtual environment design process [26], providing the basic building blocks for automated data-driven training [27].

This work combines ideas from the DT and WoT literature in a single architecture, which can easily integrate multiple DTs from different types of sensors and automatically retrain a DRL agent for complex control task in a virtual environment generated by a selection of DTs.

III. ARCHITECTURE

In this section, we describe the building blocks of our framework. We leverage the WoT model, which enables a standardized interface and communication process for smart devices belonging to a network. We focus our efforts on a Smart Home scenario, but our architecture can be easily extended and adapted to other environments as well.

In Sec. III-A, we describe our framework, which is based on a WoT network through which devices are able to communicate. The training procedure for model-based DRL agents is then described in Sec. III-B, including the twinning of the digital twin model to the selected sensory set and the training of the agent in the virtual environment provided by the twin. We then describe the inclusion of legacy components in Sec. III-C, to extend our vision and encompass other devices which may be available through other networks or systems.

A. WoT Network

Our architecture extends the simpler version presented in [12] and mainly builds on the WoT paradigm, which enables devices to provide their representation in terms of a Thing Description (TD), which advertises their own capabilities to other devices willing to interact with them. Fig. 1 highlights the different components which build our architecture and their interactions.

On the lower left corner of the figure, we see sensors and actuators, which are built following the WoT standard: they

provide a minimalist HTTP server which serves the requests, and also provide their TD whenever their root URL is visited.

Upon joining the network, devices are also requested to join a Thing Description Directory (TDD), which stores all the TDs from devices in the network. Using a TDD has numerous advantages, such as the possibility to perform queries on it to retrieve specific groups of devices, or to gather all devices providing the same kind of data and so on. Moreover, it allows to keep track of all the devices which are available in our system. The TDD also provides an interface to notify other software components of devices joining the network. To this interface we subscribe two other components, which are the Middleware and the Engine.

The Middleware is in charge of recognizing devices joining the network and instantiate an appropriate model for interpreting the values by performing two main operations:

- It monitors the TDD for devices which have joined the network, analyzes their TD and instantiates an appropriate model which can handle such type of data. Moreover, it can also instantiate an appropriate DT which can handle that device.
- It connects to legacy systems which may be already present in the smart environment, and provides a WoT interface to them. These newly created WoT devices will then be registered to the TDD, so that other devices in the system can leverage their data and can possibly interact with them.

Overall, the Middleware is in charge of maintaining updated the modules and DT components according to the devices active in the system. Therefore, it also periodically checks whether registered devices are still alive and removes the models or DTs whenever such devices left the network.


Finally, the Engine is in charge of optimizing the system by considering at all the Things registered in the TDD and their capabilities, as well as monitoring the agent rewards.

B. Model-Based Training

The proposed architecture includes a two-step procedure for training model-based DRL agents, as shown in Fig. 2: the basic concept is to exploit the Digital Twin paradigm to provide a virtual environment that is safe for an agent to explore, without any impacts on the actual physical system.

- 1) *Digital Twin training and data gathering*: Firstly, the system needs to gather sensory observation and create a digital twin of the observed environment. In our architecture, the TDD may include different sensors and actuators, belonging to different logical and physical environments and tasks: for example, two temperature sensors might be in different parts of a building or plant, and two sensors in the same room might have different logical functions, which make them functionally independent (e.g., light and temperature sensors). The system administrator then needs to select the set of sensors to gather in a single DT by querying the TDD. Once the model is instantiated, the Middleware

1. Digital Twin training and data gathering



2. Virtual model-based DRL training




Fig. 2: Diagram of the two stages of a model-based DRL training in the WoT platform.

layer automatically subscribes it to the sensors fitting the specified TD, starting the twinning process. The platform is entirely agnostic to the training method used for the model, which could use either statistical or learning-based methods: since the architecture operates over standardized queries and responses, the DTs can be implemented as a black box, even using different programming languages. During this stage, the actuators in the environment must be operated using a legacy policy, which may be defined by an algorithm or directly by the user, as shown in Fig. 2.

- 2) *Virtual model-based DRL training*: After the DTs have reached the required accuracy, a DRL agent can be trained in a virtual environment without affecting the real system. The twins can be used in a predictive fashion, applying the results of the agent's choices and simulating the real system. The virtual environment may include more than one twin, representing different subsystems that are affected by the agent's actions and concur in determining the system reward. Naturally, the choice of which DTs must be included, as well as which actuators can be controlled by the DRL agent, is made by the system administrator.

From a DRL point of view, the model-based training is robust, as long as the DTs represent the effects of actions accurately. In any case, a short online training phase in the real environment is still possible, with a small cost in terms of system efficiency. During this phase, a directed exploration algorithm will still avoid any catastrophic failure modes, as the Agent will have learned that they lead to significant penalties in the virtual environment. On the other hand, from the WoT perspective, the Middleware just needs to connect the Agent to the proper components: during the virtual training, observations of the environment are provided by the DTs, while during real operation, observations from the sensors are pushed directly to the Agent. In the same way, its commands

are only directed to the DTs during the virtual training, but are routed to the real Actuators in the operational phase.

C. Legacy Components

In order to integrate our architecture into an existing system, the Middleware also includes the possibility to interact with legacy systems already available in the smart environment. To accomplish this, it is also possible to design specific components directly in the Middleware to interconnect to other systems exposing data or services.

A note on this is that those specific components, developed to connect to legacy systems, have to be also deployed as a Thing themselves. This allows for them to be registered in the TDD upon connecting to the legacy system, so that other devices can leverage the data exposed by them, or connect to the offered services. Clearly, the precise definition of one or more legacy components has to be made according to the scenario and to already existing deployments, as it enables our system to integrate and cooperate with the others.

IV. USE CASE: HEATING SYSTEM DRL CONTROL

In this section we describe a prototype implementation of our system, and we detail how we implemented all the software components described in Section III. We consider a smart home scenario, in which different sensors can provide environmental data in order to schedule activities and optimize the planning. We focus our efforts on deploying our system aside a legacy system which manages different sensors and actuators around a house, which are not compliant to the WoT standard. This scenario can be found in many modern homes, which leverage data from off-the-shelf devices which also provide proprietary software solutions to manage them. We base our analysis on the climate operations of the house, which means that our aim is to optimize the temperature of different rooms accounting for the room occupancy and for the inside and outside temperature. Specifically, we deploy our system in a real house deployment with 2 floors, three rooms




Fig. 3: Temperature dataset used for our experiments.

and four inhabitants which provide heterogeneity in objectives and room occupancy, which are:

- A living room open space, which also includes the kitchen;
- A bathroom;
- A master bedroom shared by two people.

The living room is generally occupied during the morning, at lunchtime and during the evenings, but it may also get sporadic occupation throughout the entire day in case people work from home or at lunch and dinner times. A bathroom typically has a flat occupancy during the day, meaning that people can use it at different times without a specific routine. On the other hand, the bedroom instead has zero occupancy during the day, and full occupancy during the night, although bedtime and wake ups can have relatively small variations on different days of the week. We will detail the parameters we took into account below.

In Figure 3, we also show the temperature dataset we have collected over 40 days. This data has been obtained through the legacy system sensors which were already deployed in the house in November-December 2022. The black line represents the outdoor temperature and shows a significant drop, from roughly 12°C to around 5°C . The other three lines show the temperature inside the three rooms considered as part of this study. While the absolute values differ, their trends are similar and also reflect the current configuration of the already existing heating system. The heating in the three rooms is controlled by a classical thermostat system, in which the inhabitants set the desired temperature in different part of the day and the heating system is switched on to match that temperature. The schedule varies greatly for the three rooms: the master bedroom is only heated at night, the living room only during the day, while the bathroom is heated in the morning and in the evening. Nevertheless, they show a similar trend as heat spreads through the whole house.

A. Implementation

The house was already running a legacy system provided by Home Assistant¹, which is a personal smart home hub providing integration with several off-the-shelf devices. Home

Assistant allows users to interconnect components offered by different vendors, and provides a standardized domain and naming schemes to obtain data and perform actions. We describe at first the implementation of the Legacy component connecting the middleware to Home Assistant, and we then highlight how it is integrated into our architecture.

Home Assistant provides data with different APIs. For our purpose, we performed the integration through the data exposed in InfluxDB, a popular time-series database which is integrated within Home Assistant and which stores data from the devices managed by Home Assistant. Since our aim is to be WoT compliant to make devices able to register in the TDD, we developed a software component as a Thing, which performs the following:

- It connects to InfluxDB and reads all the devices providing a variable of interest. In our case, since we are focusing on optimizing the temperature, the corresponding domain is `climate`, which is the group of devices in Home Assistant which can provide temperature, humidity and also perform operations such as switching on a cooling or heating system.
- For each discovered device, it provides a specific GET operation advertised in its thing description. For each of these methods in the TD, whenever they are requested it will translate the query to an appropriate InfluxDB query to retrieve the data and eventually provide it to the client requesting it.

This software component is then registered in the TDD, so that other devices have seamless access to its data without requiring specific knowledge on the technical details of the connection.

The developed software component also provides bidirectional communication, meaning that it can also feedback to Home Assistant. This is realized by exposing a PUT method in the TD of the software, which allows clients to send data to the Thing, which then routes it back to Home Assistant. To realize this part, without loss of generality we have adopted the MQTT² protocol, by publishing data on the Home Assistant MQTT broker. Clearly, other protocols can be adopted depending on the scenario and on the specific needs. We show an example of this behavior in Fig. 4: Fig. 4a shows the MQTT subscribe (RL-TEMP) node inside Node-RED running in Home Assistant. Figure 4b shows instead the Home Assistant dashboard, with the three heating systems managed by our models and with their current statuses.

B. Digital Twin Evaluation

In this section, we show the performance evaluation of our model in a real deployment, leveraging a Thermal Twin (TT) which twins the temperature dynamics accounting for outside and inside temperatures, and a Room Twin (RT) which instead accounts for the rooms occupancy.

The TT was adapted from grey box RC-equivalent models in the relevant literature [28]. We considered two measured

¹<https://www.home-assistant.io/>

²MQTT originally stood for Message Queuing Telemetry Transport, but the acronym has officially not stood for anything since 2013.





Fig. 4: Integration of the legacy component output inside the Home Assistant instance.




Fig. 5: MSE for the three considered rooms as a function of the amount of available data.

parameters, the room's internal temperature T_i and the ambient temperature outside the building T_a , which are available from the smart home sensors, along with a set of hidden variables which can help in tracking the thermal evolution of a room. The $T_i T_e$ model includes the temperature of the envelope (i.e., the building's external walls), and the $T_i T_h$ model includes the temperature of the heating system. The $T_i T_e T_h$ model includes both, and the $T_i T_e T_h R_{ia}$ includes a variable thermal resistance between the air in the room and the exterior of the building. Naturally, more complex models are more accurate, but require more data to avoid overfitting.

Fig. 5 shows the Mean Square Error (MSE) of the internal temperature predicted by the TT for the three rooms we have




Fig. 6: Best models for the TT as a function of the amount of training data.

considered in our study. As expected, the MSE generally decreases as the available data become richer, but the three rooms all have different trends: while 7 days of data are enough to train the DT of the living room, the master bedroom needs significantly more data and has a far higher error. This can be explained by the fact that the master bedroom is the room which is least occupied during the day: the model is then able to learn about the heating system dynamics only during the night, and the nighttime temperature is kept at a low value of 16°C . This does not allow it to obtain a sufficiently wide variety of samples to learn from; therefore, the model does not learn as fast as in the other rooms, which show a similar behavior. Nevertheless, all three rooms show large improvements when trained with a longer dataset: the average error for the master bedroom decreases from more than 1.8°C with only 1 day of training to less than 1.2°C when trained with a month of data, with roughly a 30% reduction in the total error. A similar comment can be also made for the other two rooms, where at the beginning of the training the error is around 1.2°C and it is reduced to roughly 0.7°C . We can also consider which model performs best in each room for different amounts of training data: the best model for each considered case is shown in Fig. 6, which confirms our analysis. More complex models are usually better with more data, and the evolution of the best model selection follows this trend, with some oscillations.

There are three main takeaways from this analysis: (i), personalized models have to be created and trained for each room, even in the same house, as the heating and temperature dynamics vary greatly between rooms, depending on their size, isolation, exposure to sunlight, and heating units; (ii), the larger the training set, the better the results, as it is possible to observe a wider variety of samples; (iii), a DT can effectively help to understand when a model is ready to be deployed, since it can be trained on a portion of data and tested with fresh data, and then used whenever the error falls under a scenario-




Fig. 7: Heatmap of the probability for each room to be occupied over time in the synthetic RT model.

specific threshold, and iv , the DT can include different types of models with different levels of complexity, which can be hot-swapped as new data become available and richer models can be trained effectively. For a wider review of RC-equivalent model parameters and training, we refer the reader to [28].

On the other hand, the smart home deployment did not provide room-level occupant data, so we assumed a simple Markovian model. For each room, we considered a maximum number of occupants N_{\max} , each of whom behaves independently. The occupant is in state 1 if they are inside the room, and the evolution of their state is driven by the matrix $\mathbf{P}(d, h)$, which is a function of the day of the week and of the current time. Fig. 7 shows the average probability of each room being occupied over the whole week: the bedroom is occupied during the night, with a slightly shifted timeframe in the weekend, while the bathroom and living room are usually occupied during the day and evening, with different transition probabilities. Naturally, the actual probability of a room being occupied at a given time will depend on the state, but we can see that the bedroom is more predictable, while, as expected, the bathroom has a much more random pattern throughout the day. The assumed probability for someone to be in the bathroom is low but constant throughout the day, while the occupants remain in the living room for longer times during the morning and evening, resulting in a higher probability of the room being occupied. The three rooms also have different numbers of occupants: we assume that the whole family of 4 may be present in the living room, while only 2 people use the master bedroom, and only one person at a time can be in the bathroom (in this case, one person leaving the bathroom and another entering would count as one person remaining in the room).

The use of an artificial model for the room occupancy reduces its accuracy in the real deployment, but the architecture can easily accommodate new sensors and DTs, automatically retraining the DRL agent after updates to the underlying models. In fact, since a time-dependent RT would need to be trained over multiple weeks to figure out the family’s habits, starting from a relatively accurate prior would significantly reduce the DT training time.

C. Agent evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the agent, which leverages the RT and TT to forecast actions which improve the overall status of the system.

The temperature control Markov Decision Process (MDP) is relatively simple: the state of the system is represented by the states of the two twins, which include information about the thermal state of the room and heating system, as well as the date and current occupancy of the room. The possible actions available to the agent are A levels of heating system power, which are normalized from 0 (the heating system is off) to 1, corresponding to the maximum available heating power. The reward function for taking action a when there are o people in the room, resulting in an internal temperature T_i , is defined as follows:

$$R(T_i, o, a) = \mathbb{1}(T_i - T_0)\mathbb{1}(o - 1) - \alpha a - \beta \mathbb{1}(|T_i - T_0| - T_{\lim})(1 - 2\mathbb{1}(a))\text{sign}(T_i - T_0), \quad (1)$$

where T_0 and T_{\lim} are user-defined threshold temperatures, $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is the stepwise function, equal to 1 if the argument is greater than 0 and 0 otherwise, and α and β are penalty parameters representing the cost of energy and a generic penalty for . In other words, the agent receives a reward 1 if the temperature is above the comfort level T_0 , but only if there are people in the room; on the other hand, using energy to heat always has a cost. The second penalty term is used to avoid excessive temperature swings: if the room is too warm or too cold by more than T_{\lim} degrees, actions that do not lead the system back toward equilibrium (i.e., not turning on the heat if it is too cold, or turning it on when the room is already too hot) are penalized. The values we selected for the parameters are listed in Table I.

TABLE I: MDP parameters.

Parameter	Symbol	Value
Episode duration (steps)	L	1000
Step duration (minutes)	t	15
Comfort temperature	T_0	$18^\circ C$
Threshold temperature	T_{\lim}	$3^\circ C$
Energy cost	α	0.25
Swing penalty	β	0.2
Discount factor	λ	0.95




Fig. 8: DRL agent performance at convergence as a function of the number of days of available data.

We then implement a DQN model, with an architecture that depends on the DT models, and is defined in Table II, along with the main training parameters: the RT only needs $N_{RT} = 3$ parameters (the day of the week, time, and number of current occupants of the room), while the TT can have a variable N_{TT} depending on the RC-equivalent model. The T_i model only has a single parameter, while the more complex $T_i T_e T_h R_{ia}$ model has 4. The final input value is the ambient temperature T_a outside the room. The neural network uses a Softmax exploration policy, whose temperature decreases logarithmically from 1 to 10^{-6} , and the Adam optimizer, with ReLU activation.

Fig. 8 shows the performance of the DRL agent, as measured by the reward, when it is trained using a TT with a limited amount of data. In all cases, the RT is assumed to be perfect. We can immediately note that the bedroom needs at least 3 weeks of data to control the room temperature properly, while the bathroom can achieve good performance with a single week. This is consistent with the MSE performance of the models: while the bathroom dynamics are easy to learn, and the model predictions are similar to reality, the significant errors in the bedroom mean that the virtual training leads the DRL agent to the wrong policy, with catastrophic results. As the TT improves, so does the performance of the agents, gradually reaching the optimum. We also highlight that the optimal performance for a room depends on how much it is occupied: the dashed lines in the figure show the performance of an ideal system with perfect room occupancy prediction and free energy, i.e., the upper bound to real performance for each room. The upper bound is extremely hard to reach in

TABLE II: DQN architecture and training parameters.

Layer	Symbol	Parameters
Input	L_0	$N_{TT} + N_{RT} + 1$
Input	L_1	$10L_0$
Input	L_2	$5L_1$
Output	O	A
Hyperparameter	Symbol	Value
Activation function	ϕ_a	ReLU
Learning rate	ℓ	10^{-5}
Dropout probability	p_d	0.1
Epochs	E	25
Episodes per epoch	e	20




Fig. 9: Temperature evolution and control actions in the master bedroom over the course of a day.

the bigger rooms, as the real agent has to deal with winter temperatures outside, and consequently frequently uses energy to power the heating system. On the other hand, the bathroom does not directly face any walls, and maintaining a comfortable temperature is relatively easy, so it is possible to achieve an almost perfect performance.

To provide a better understanding of how the model works, we also show an example sequence of actions performed by the DRL agent over the course of a day for the master bedroom in Fig. 9. The room is only occupied at night, although during the day has a non-zero probability of having occupants. During the night (i.e., leftmost part of the plot), the agent heats up the room beyond the minimum desired temperature of 18°C , with the heating system at half power. In the morning, the probability of having at least one occupant significantly drops, hence the DRL agent stops to heat the room. Sporadic adjustments are made through the day, since the DRL agent wants to keep the room above the minimum temperature to avoid any reward losses. In the evening the DRL agent starts to heat the room again some time before the usual bedtime, raising the temperature above the minimum threshold in time for them to go to bed. Obviously, having a perfect representation of the occupancy would avoid the DRL agent to sporadically heat the room when the probability of having occupants is low. Still, Fig. 9 confirms that the system actually learns a non-obvious policy from the two digital twins, and improves the system overall.

D. Automatic Agent Definition

In the use case we defined, the DRL agent is still partially hand-designed: the selection of the DT models was performed manually, as well as the architecture and hyperparameter search for the training. However, the WoT architecture we define provides significant room for expansion and for automation, as agents, models, sensors, and actuators are all controlled by the same platform.

We can foresee a use case in which multiple twins (e.g., including multiple rooms, sensors, and activities) can be automatically mixed and matched to tasks (as represented by actuators). The full potential of the proposed architecture is

to automate DQN training as well, trying different state definitions and combinations of actions, as well as automatically optimizing hyperparameters for each agent. In this case, the only hand-designed part of the system would be the reward function, which would be ideal in a domotic scenario: the inhabitants only need to give the smart home a simple list of priorities, which they can adjust at any time, and the architecture will figure out which agents it will need to deploy, which twins they will need to accomplish their tasks, and which tasks are functionally independent and can be separated to simplify the action space.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have presented a novel framework to realize digital twins based on the Web of Thing standard. Our architecture allows to build customized digital twins for complex scenarios, leveraging data from custom made sensors or legacy ones, by integrating it with already existing platforms. Our results indicate the benefits of using DTs for model-based reinforcement control, as they allow to test different models and deploy the one which fits the scenario the best. This has been confirmed by deploying our platform on a real scenario on which a legacy system was already running, and integrating our platform with the existing one.

Future work on this topic will be focused on the extension of our framework to other sensor types in a smart home, a more in-depth analysis of the room twin, and extended results on other house types and rooms, which will better generalize our findings. Furthermore, the proposed automation of agent selection and MDP design is an interesting future direction.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Montori, L. Bedogni, M. Di Felice, and L. Bononi, "Machine-to-machine wireless communication technologies for the Internet of Things: Taxonomy, comparison and open issues," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 50, pp. 56–81, Oct. 2018.
- [2] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski et al., "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, Feb. 2015.
- [3] G. Dulac-Arnold, N. Levine, D. J. Mankowitz, J. Li, C. Paduraru, S. Gowal, and T. Hester, "Challenges of real-world reinforcement learning: definitions, benchmarks and analysis," *Machine Learning*, vol. 110, no. 9, pp. 2419–2468, Sep. 2021.
- [4] Z. Wang and T. Hong, "Reinforcement learning for building controls: The opportunities and challenges," *Applied Energy*, vol. 269, p. 115036, Jul. 2020.
- [5] G. Ostrovski, P. S. Castro, and W. Dabney, "The difficulty of passive learning in deep reinforcement learning," in *35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 34, Dec. 2021, pp. 23 283–23 295.
- [6] R. Kidambi, A. Rajeswaran, P. Netrapalli, and T. Joachims, "Morel: Model-based offline reinforcement learning," in *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 33, 2020, pp. 21 810–21 823.
- [7] S. Boschert and R. Rosen, "Digital twin—the simulation aspect," in *Mechatronic Futures*. New York City, USA: Springer Cham, Jun. 2016, pp. 59–74.
- [8] 5G Alliance for Connected Industries and Automation (5G-ACIA). (2021) Using digital twins to integrate 5G into production networks. Accessed on Dec. 5, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://5g-acia.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/5G-ACIA_Using_Digital_Twins_to_Integrate_5G_into_Production_Networks-.pdf
- [9] D. Raggett, "The Web of Things: Challenges and opportunities," *Computer*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 26–32, May 2015.
- [10] D. Zeng, S. Guo, and Z. Cheng, "The Web of Things: A survey," *Journal of Communications*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 424–438, Sep. 2011.
- [11] F. Montori, K. Liao, P. P. Jayaraman, L. Bononi, T. Sellis, and D. Georgakopoulos, "Classification and annotation of open internet of things datastreams," in *19th International Conference on Web Information Systems Engineering (WISE)*. Springer, Nov. 2018, pp. 209–224.
- [12] L. Bedogni and F. Poggi, "A Web Of Things context-aware IoT system leveraging Q-Learning," in *19th Annual Consumer Communications & Networking Conference (CCNC)*. IEEE, Jan. 2022, p. 405–410.
- [13] D. Georgakopoulos, P. P. Jayaraman, M. Zhang, and R. Ranjan, "Discovery-driven service oriented IoT architecture," in *Conference on Collaboration and Internet Computing (CIC)*. IEEE, Oct. 2015, pp. 142–149.
- [14] R. Agarwal, D. G. Fernandez, T. Elsahle, A. Gyrard, J. Lanza, L. Sanchez, N. Georgantas, and V. Issarny, "Unified IoT ontology to enable interoperability and federation of testbeds," in *3rd World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)*. IEEE, Dec. 2016, pp. 70–75.
- [15] N. Seydoux, K. Drira, N. Hernandez, and T. Monteil, "IoT-O, a core-domain IoT ontology to represent connected devices networks," in *European Knowledge Acquisition Workshop (EKAW)*. Springer, Nov. 2016, pp. 561–576.
- [16] D. Mønster, R. Fusaroli, K. Tylén, A. Roepstorff, and J. F. Sherson, "Causal inference from noisy time-series data—testing the convergent cross-mapping algorithm in the presence of noise and external influence," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 73, pp. 52–62, Aug. 2017.
- [17] B. M. Lake, T. D. Ullman, J. B. Tenenbaum, and S. J. Gershman, "Building machines that learn and think like people," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 40, p. e253, Jan. 2017.
- [18] M. Lippi, S. Mariani, and F. Zambonelli, "Developing a "sense of agency" in IoT systems: Preliminary experiments in a smart home scenario," in *International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops (PerCom Workshops)*. IEEE, Mar. 2021, pp. 44–49.
- [19] I. Agadacos, G. F. Ciocarlie, B. Copos, T. L. Lepoint, U. Lindqvist, and M. Locasto, "Butterfly effect: Causality from chaos in the IoT," in *1st International Workshop on Security and Privacy for the Internet-of-Things (IoT S&P)*. ACM, Apr. 2018, pp. 26–30.
- [20] P. Madumal, T. Miller, L. Sonenberg, and F. Vetere, "Explainable reinforcement learning through a causal lens," in *Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 3. AAAI, Apr. 2020, pp. 2493–2500.
- [21] Y. Lei, S. Zhan, E. Ono, Y. Peng, Z. Zhang, T. Hasama, and A. Chong, "A practical deep reinforcement learning framework for multivariate occupant-centric control in buildings," *Applied Energy*, vol. 324, p. 119742, Oct. 2022.
- [22] L. Di Natale, B. Svetozarevic, P. Heer, and C. Jones, "Deep reinforcement learning for room temperature control: a black-box pipeline from data to policies," vol. 2042, no. 1, p. 012004, Nov. 2021.
- [23] G. Pinto, Z. Wang, A. Roy, T. Hong, and A. Capozzoli, "Transfer learning for smart buildings: A critical review of algorithms, applications, and future perspectives," *Advances in Applied Energy*, p. 100084, Jan. 2022.
- [24] T. Schreiber, C. Netsch, M. Baranski, and D. Müller, "Monitoring data-driven reinforcement learning controller training: A comparative study of different training strategies for a real-world energy system," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 239, p. 110856, May 2021.
- [25] M. Seitzer, B. Schölkopf, and G. Martius, "Causal influence detection for improving efficiency in reinforcement learning," *35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 34, pp. 22 905–22 918, Dec. 2021.
- [26] M. Matulis and C. Harvey, "A robot arm digital twin utilising reinforcement learning," *Computers & Graphics*, vol. 95, pp. 106–114, Apr. 2021.
- [27] K. Xia, C. Sacco, M. Kirkpatrick, C. Saidy, L. Nguyen, A. Kircaliali, and R. Harik, "A digital twin to train deep reinforcement learning agent for smart manufacturing plants: Environment, interfaces and intelligence," *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, vol. 58, pp. 210–230, Jan. 2021.
- [28] J. Leprince, H. Madsen, C. Miller, J. P. Real, R. van der Vlist, K. Basu, and W. Zeiler, "Fifty shades of grey: Automated stochastic model identification of building heat dynamics," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 266, p. 112095, Jul. 2022.