

INTEGRATING THE EXPECTED FUTURE: SCHEDULE BASED ENERGY FORECASTING

Raffael Theiler, Olga Fink

ENAC IIC IMOS

École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL)

Lausanne, CH-1015, Lausanne

{raffael.theiler, olga.fink}@epfl.ch

ABSTRACT

Power grid operators depend on accurate and reliable energy forecasts, aiming to minimize cases of extreme errors, as these outliers are particularly challenging to manage during operation. Incorporating planning information – such as known data about users’ future behavior or scheduled events – has the potential to significantly enhance the accuracy and specificity of forecasts. Although there have been attempts to integrate such expected future behavior, these efforts consistently rely on conventional regression models to process this information. These models often lack the flexibility and capability to effectively incorporate both dynamic, forward-looking contextual inputs and historical data. To address this challenge, we conceptualize this combined forecasting and regression challenge as a sequence-to-sequence modeling problem and demonstrate, with three distinct models, that our contextually enhanced transformer models excel in this task. By leveraging schedule-based contextual information from the Swiss railway traction network, our proposed method significantly improved the average forecasting accuracy of nationwide railway energy consumption. Specifically, enhancing the transformer models with contextual information resulted in an average reduction of mean absolute error by 40.6% , whereas other state-of-the-art methods did not demonstrate any significant improvement.

1 CONTEXT & SCALE

Despite extensive research efforts to forecast energy usage in electrical grids, operators still encounter significant outliers when faced with unexpected scenarios, with relative errors occasionally exceeding 50%, posing considerable operational challenges. Our research reveals that a critical limitation of current forecasting approaches is their over-reliance on trends and periodic patterns from past observations. We challenge this conventional focus on historical data as the primary source for energy forecasts and advocate for integrating contextual information about the expected future, such as anticipated user behavior and scheduled events. By incorporating this expected future information, we significantly improve the accuracy and specificity of load forecasts. This approach proves crucial for improving forecasting capabilities, and this methodology can be broadly applied to other domains where similar planning information is available.

2 INTRODUCTION

Electrical energy distinguishes itself from other traded commodities because its transmission follows the power flow equations Kundur (2012); Pagnier & Chertkov (2021). These equations require that the amount of energy consumed (demand) must always match the amount of energy produced (supply) to maintain the stability of the power grid Ullah et al. (2021). In compliance with these laws, grid operators collaborate closely with energy traders to ensure frequency synchronization and voltage stabilization, preventing damage to infrastructure and grid-connected assets Klyuev et al. (2022). A key challenge is therefore to strike a balance between fluctuating production, and demand within

the operational range of the grid Zheng et al. (2017), especially from renewable energy sources. To ensure a balance between production and demand, and to maintain cost-efficient and robust operation of the power grid, operators depend on precise load forecasting. This precision is crucial for navigating the complexities of *wholesale electricity and power market* Lago et al. (2021). Furthermore, accurate energy forecasting improves the overall efficiency of managing electricity generation and anticipated consumption while reducing production costs Klyuev et al. (2022).

Forecasting models typically aim to capture temporal correlations by learning the trends and periodicity of time series data Li et al. (2023). However, the complex interactions between energy supplier, load management, trading operations and consumers are not sufficiently represented by the limited number of aggregated time series available for electrical load forecasting Zheng et al. (2017). To address this, researchers have enhanced load forecasting models by incorporating additional contextual information, such as environmental data Hong et al. (2020). In the renewables sector, for instance, power grid operators integrate meteorological data to improve forecasting accuracy Markovics & Mayer (2022). For wind power forecasting, data on wind speed and direction at different altitudes, temperature, atmospheric pressure, and humidity are typically used as contextual information López & Arboleya (2022). In contrast, photovoltaic power forecasting relies on information regarding cloud coverage and imaging from cameras and satellites Si et al. (2021); Markovics & Mayer (2022). Although extensive datasets have been employed in these and other scenarios to improve predictions of available energy supply, integrating information about the anticipated consumer behaviour to forecast the balance points of supply and demand has been neglected. Incorporating planning information on expected consumer activities or scheduled events, such as a large gatherings or the commencement of new industrial operations, could significantly enhance the accuracy of load forecasts. This approach would enable utility companies to better anticipate demand spikes, leading to more efficient energy distribution and improved grid reliability.

With the digitalization of numerous industrial sectors and the widespread adoption of the Internet of Things (IoT) for both industrial and consumer applications Teng et al. (2021), demand-side planning information is becoming increasingly accessible. This data on the individual consumer behaviour can be leveraged to improve the accuracy of forecasts by providing more precise insights into consumer patterns. Integrating known information about users' future behavior or scheduled events can significantly improve forecasting performance. We refer to such information as the "*expected future*" Abbott (2005), which can include production plans, vacation schedules, or time tables. This data is assumed to represent recurring patterns that lie within the usual operating regime - describing scenarios and situations that are regularly reoccurring and the impact of which has been captured by past observations - and are therefore highly likely to occur as planned or foreseen. This is particularly true for large and complex systems with centralized control, where tight organisation and planning are fundamentally required for robust operation, such as large manufacturing facilities or railway operations Meissner et al. (2017); Lusby et al. (2018). Including the *expected future* in forecasting models represents a significant opportunity to improve the robustness and the quality of forecasts. This approach has been tested on a small scale for managing biogas energy demand in previous research Dittmer et al. (2021). However, integrating consumer planning information into forecasting models remains an under-explored resource for improving the prediction of challenging customer load profiles. This is primarily due to the distributed nature of the problem, lack of centralized control, and privacy concerns Asghar et al. (2017). However, large industrial electricity consumers, such as those in the railway sector Zhang et al. (2020); Haehn et al. (2020); Heil et al. (2020), and the steel industry Karelähti et al. (2011), often meticulously plan their operations in advance. This meticulous planning facilitates the acquisition of precise operational data, thereby enhancing the accuracy and reliability of load forecasts.

3 EFFICIENT INTEGRATION OF THE EXPECTED FUTURE IN FORECASTING

A model that effectively integrates historical data with the *expected future* must be capable of simultaneously forecasting based on past data and regressing from anticipated future conditions. To date, only a few algorithms approach forecasting as a dual task, combining both forecasting and regression. This dual approach is essential for capturing the complex dynamics of both historical trends and future anticipated information. Typically, forecasting models rely on historical data patterns and often lack the flexibility or capability to integrate dynamic, forward-looking inputs effectively. While conventional regression models and statistical analysis methods can model the relationship

between covariates and the target effectively Klyuev et al. (2022), they often fail to adequately account for historical dependencies. Conversely, recent state-of-the-art multiple-input multiple-output linear models, such as Decomposition Linear (DLinear, Zeng et al. (2022)), and conventional autoregressive models like LSTMs, do not explicitly address the regression task Zheng et al. (2017). In addition, recent time-series transformer models, such as Crossformer Zhang & Yan (2022) and iTransformer Liu et al. (2023), focus on broad applicability but do not emphasize the integration of detailed exogenous multivariate time series representing the *expected future* Ahmed et al. (2023). Although the concept of *expected future inputs* was first introduced in transformers by Lim et al. (2021), these newer models have yet to fully exploit this approach to enhance forecasting accuracy through the integration of anticipated future conditions.

Numerous transformer architectures have been proposed to enhance state-of-the-art performance in various time-series analysis tasks Wen et al. (2023). Particularly, specialized studies have made significant advancements in energy forecasting scenarios using time-series transformers Ran et al. (2023); Zhao et al. (2021); L'Heureux et al. (2022). In our work, we further develop time-series transformers by incorporating elements from regression transformers. Previous research on regression transformers has shown that a range of regression problems can be approached as conditional sequence learning tasks. Notable examples include symbolic regression Kamienny et al. (2022), linear regression Pathak et al. (2023), and applications in computational chemistry Irwin et al. (2022) Born & Manica (2023). Building on the concept that sequence modeling principles are applicable to time series analysis Nie et al. (2022), we propose a novel and effective approach to enhance encoder-decoder-based transformer models. Our strategy involves integrating covariates from the *expected future* by modifying the embedding layer of the transformer's decoder. In this innovative approach, the decoder functions as the regressor, selectively attending to sequence data from the *expected future*, while the encoder learns representations of past data. We enhance both components by introducing an additional trainable embedding at each time step to capture the *expected future*. Departing from traditional transformer architecture, our model employs non-causal attention, enabling it to leverage the embedded information across all time steps for more effective forecasting. This dual formulation as a regression and forecasting task not only improves generalization capabilities beyond standard forecasting methods but also reduces overfitting in smaller datasets – a notable challenge with conventional transformers. By reframing the forecasting problem in this dual manner, our approach reduces the dependency on long input sequences for context interpretation, effectively addressing a common limitation of transformer models, which struggle with handling long input contexts Ahamed & Cheng (2024).

4 FORECASTING DYNAMICS IN RAILWAY TRACTION NETWORK

To showcase the significant impact of integrating historical data with the *expected future*, we evaluate the performance of our proposed framework on a case study on day-ahead load forecasts for the Swiss national railway traction network (RTN). The objective of this study is to forecast the next day's grid load on the RTN to support day-ahead planning for production and trading in energy markets. The RTN represents a complex and expansive infrastructure that operates according to well-defined, recurring operational patterns meticulously planned through precise timetables. In addition to integrating passenger transportation timetables, RTN also manages detailed freight train schedules. Both are essential for planning the following day's energy consumption. Consequently, grid load forecasting is influenced not only by trends and periodicity but also by *future contextual information*. In the RTN, several variables influencing grid load are directly derived from centralized planning. These include energy efficiency improvements, railway rolling stock allocation (encompassing both long-term strategic planning and short-term scheduling of specific rail vehicles for particular journeys or services), and planned long-term construction projects Bosch (2017). However, more complex factors that affect the forecast, such as weather-dependent operational patterns and passenger-induced effects, can only be implicitly captured by data-driven learning.

By effectively leveraging the certainty of future plans in combination with other influencing factors that can be extracted from the data, our contextually enhanced transformer model significantly improves forecasting accuracy. This approach not only improves prediction accuracy by integrating well-defined future events and trends but also reduces the speculative nature of traditional trend-based forecasts. Consequently, it increases the overall robustness and reliability of our predictions. In addition to improved average accuracy, our proposed approach significantly reduces both the fre-

quency and magnitude of large outliers by leveraging contextual information. These outliers are typically a major concern for RTN operators as they can lead to substantial financial losses due to the necessity of last-minute emergency purchases in the intra-day trading market. Moreover, energy availability in this market is not guaranteed, as power plants may operate at or near capacity, making it difficult to accommodate sudden or extreme fluctuations.

Furthermore, this case study contributes to the ongoing discussion in the field of deep-learning based forecasting, specifically addressing recent debates on the effectiveness of transformers for time-series forecasting. Recent studies have indicated that linear models, such as DLinear or Time-series Dense Encoder (TiDE, Das et al. (2023)) often outperform transformers in many scenarios. However, while TiDE and DLinear perform well in straightforward forecasting tasks, our research reveals that their advantage diminishes in scenarios that heavily depend on rich future contextual information. Our case study shows that in such contexts, the enhanced capability of our proposed transformer model to integrate and leverage detailed future covariates effectively mitigates the performance edge of these linear models. Moreover, our transformer models maintain competitive performance with state-of-the-art results on standard time-series benchmark datasets such as ETTh1 and ETTh2, which do not incorporate expected future contextual information. This demonstrates their strong generalization capabilities and affirms their viability and effectiveness in the domain of time-series forecasting.

The case study for this research consists of two multi-year datasets, *Railway* (2018-2023) and *Railway-agg* (2020-2023, both captured at hourly resolution. These datasets contain grid load along with relevant covariates aimed at enhancing forecasting accuracy Bosch (2017). The recorded covariates include temperature recordings, gross tonne-kilometers moved (which combines tonnage and mileage), and train counts, all derived from the timetable of the Swiss national railway traction network. These are used to forecast the next day’s nationwide railway energy consumption at hourly basis. The data will be made publicly available following the acceptance of this paper.

5 LOAD FORECASTING RESULTS

We evaluate our proposed methodology across four forecasting tasks utilizing multivariate time-series datasets, both with and without future contextual information. Specifically, the *Railway* and *Railway-agg* datasets include extensive *future contextual information* (FCI) derived from scheduling and operational planning. In contrast, we also assess performance using two long-range time-series forecasting benchmarks, ETTh1 and ETTh2, which do not contain FCI. Moreover, to demonstrate the flexibility and architecture-independence of our contextually enhanced transformer approach, we apply it across three distinct encoder-decoder transformer architectures: the contextually enhanced Crossformer (CF), the time-series transformer with Informer embedding (TST); and the enhanced Spacetimeformer (STF). For each transformer architecture, we compare our contextually enhanced variants against their standard, unaltered variants to establish baseline performance. Additionally, we evaluate the efficacy of recent state-of-the-art (SOTA) multi-step linear models, DLinear, and its extension TiDE. We also include traditional machine learning models as additional baselines to enhance our evaluation. These models include BiLSTM, a conventional linear regression method (EUB), and the gradient-boosting frameworks CatBoost and XGBoost. Incorporating these models offers a wide range of comparative insights, enabling a more thorough evaluation of our methodology. Additionally, we explore the inverted Transformer (iTransformer) strategy on the STF, as proposed in Liu et al. (2023).

The effectiveness of future contextual information: Incorporating FCI into different transformer architectures significantly improves their performance. On average, integrating FCI reduces the MAE by **40.6%** and decreases the standard deviation across trainings by **83.2%**. In contrast, the performance of TiDE and DLinear models remains unaffected by the addition of FCI. Notably, despite utilizing TiDE’s widely emphasized feature encoder for dynamic covariates from past and future contexts, no improvement in forecasting accuracy was observed (Figure 2). The impact of FCI is further evidenced in specific models:

- The Crossformer model sees a **50.0 %** reduction in MAE.
- The Spacetimeformer achieves a **26.6 %** decrease.
- The Time-series Transformer experiences a **40.3 %** reduction.




Figure 1: Illustration of the proposed load forecasting framework using the *Railway* dataset. Panel **a** displays the “*expected future*”, including timetables, schedules and gross ton-kilometers (GTKM) estimates derived from the operational planning of the railway operator. This information is provided for the next day across all of Switzerland in the *Railway-agg* dataset and on a regional level (e.g. East) in the *Railway* dataset. Traditionally, methods such as pure timeseries forecasting **a.1** and regression models **a.2** were employed for load forecasting. Our proposed approach introduces the use of transformer architecture to learn a unified representation of the *time series regression* task (**c**). To efficiently integrate both past and future information for this task, we propose dividing the input data at the current time point t (the present) (**b**). We then apply distinct embedding strategies for past data (**b.1**) and *future contextual information* (**b.2**).

These improvements highlight the substantial advantage of integrating *expected future* contexts into the forecasting process, as further detailed in Table 3.

Day-ahead load forecasting in railway traction networks: The *Railway* datasets provide comprehensive contextual information crucial for forecasting loads in railway transport. This information includes operational planning data such as estimated gross-ton kilometres, timetable information for both freight and passenger transport, and weather data, as illustrated in Figure 1. We categorize our analysis into two setups based on data from two distinct operational planning models. The *Railway-agg* dataset aggregates national-level data, while the *Railway* dataset offers a more granular perspective with detailed data from four separate geographic regions. Both datasets are utilized to forecast the total grid load. We refer to the respective test sets as “*Test-Small-Agg*” and “*Test-Large*”. Since the *Railway* test set (“*Test-Large*”) encompasses the time period of the smaller *Railway-agg* test set, we additionally evaluate the performance of models trained on *Railway* on the *Railway-agg* testing set (Test-Small) for a direct comparison. Our analyses across all evaluated datasets clearly demonstrate that our contextually enhanced transformers consistently outperform all baseline methods, including all versions of the transformers without the proposed extension. Detailed performance metrics of the forecasting models on the *Railway* and *Railway-agg* datasets are presented in Table 1.

The contextually enhanced STF stands out as the top-performing model across all datasets, notably achieving the lowest MAE of **8.28** MW (megawatts) and MSE of **112.26** MW² on the “*Test-Large*” subset, which presents the most challenging prediction task. In contrast, the performance of multi-




Figure 2: Normalized MAE in megawatts with and without the addition of FCI on the *Railway* dataset for models with comparable performance on ETTh1 and ETTh2 (Table 2). We list all transformer models and multi-step linear models (MSL) included in our evaluations.

step linear models such as DLinear and TiDE lags behind, with MAEs of **11.46** MW and **11.50** MW, respectively. This is significantly inferior to the average MAE of **8.42** MW achieved by transformer models, highlighting that while transformers can effectively leverage contextual information to enhance predictions, linear models may not benefit as significantly from such data. Furthermore, contextually enhanced transformer models demonstrate superior performance compared to both CatBoost and XGBoost. Additionally, our approach not only outperforms FCI-enhanced bidirectional LSTM but also exceeds the capabilities of the existing conventional linear regression model (EUB) used by the data provider, as well as the iTransformer strategy. This comprehensive superiority across various models and datasets underscores the advanced capability of the proposed transformer architectures to effectively handle relevant contextual information for forecasting tasks.

Performance Analysis by Weekday: Further analysis by weekday is necessary as distinct load patterns emerge on different weekdays due to varying transportation demands and operational dynamics, which differ from weekend patterns, as detailed in Appendix A. Our findings indicate that while TiDE’s performance remains unchanged with the inclusion of FCI, all transformer models exhibit consistent improvements across every day of the week, as depicted in Figure 4. This visually underscores the beneficial impact of FCI. Notably, in the TiDE model, FCI is processed simultaneously with past contextual information, which may dilute its effectiveness (refer to Table 3 for details). The uniform improvement across all weekdays in transformer models highlights the robustness and generalizability of FCI’s positive effects, demonstrating its substantial value in enhancing forecasting accuracy in complex scenarios.

Is load forecasting in railway traction networks a regression or forecasting problem? Our hypothesis suggests that forecasting in scenarios where rich future contextual information is available can be effectively approached through two primary methods: historical data analysis and regression techniques that integrate anticipated future contexts. To further examine the impact of contextual information, we have conducted several ablation studies on the STF, the top-performing transformer model in our previous experiments (as shown in Table 3). In our initial ablation study, we demonstrate that significant improvements in forecasting accuracy can be achieved by incorporating both past time series data (w/o Enc TS) and contextual information. Specifically, adding Future Contextual Information (FCI) to the decoder results in a **26.6 %** reduction in mean MAE on Test-Large, while integrating past time series data into the encoder leads to a **29.0 %** reduction. Interestingly, the addition of past contextual information alone yields only a minor improvement of **3.2 %** in mean MAE. This suggests that much of the value of contextual information may already be captured

within the past time series itself. These findings highlight the dual nature of the load forecasting problem, presenting challenges typical of both regression and forecasting tasks. In our ablation study, further analysis of the relevance of past contextual information reveal that transformer models do not benefit from longer contextual inputs on the *Railway* dataset. Increasing the context length from one day to eight days ($w = 192$), thereby providing the relationships from the previous day and the target load profile for the previous week as input to the model, surprisingly degrades forecasting performance by **33.1 %**. In contrast, multi-step linear models TiDE and DLinear require a considerably longer context sequence of one month ($w = 672$) for effective forecasting, as shown in Table 3. This underscores the dependency of linear models on past trends and periodicity. However, the performance of these models still lags behind that of transformers, highlighting the critical need for efficient integration of FCI.


Analyzing Forecasting Outliers in Energy Production: In energy production, where supply must precisely match demand at every moment, managing large forecasting outliers presents significant challenges for power grid operators. To address this issue, we have conducted a comprehensive evaluation of our proposed contextually enhanced transformer models, focusing particularly on their ability to handle significant outliers that pose a risk to grid stability during operation and are difficult to compensate for. Our analysis reveals that while transformer model generally perform acceptably on average, they tend to produce a higher number of predictions classified as outliers without the integration of FCI. Without FCI, we observe an average of **0.98 %** significant outliers exceeding a 30% MAPE for the transformer models. This is reduced to **0.07 %** outliers when FCI is included. Upon integrating FCI, all contextually enriched transformer models significantly outperform the linear regression model EUB (**0.37 %**) in managing outliers. This analysis also assists in distinguishing the most robust model among the contextually enhanced transformers, as illustrated in Figure 3. Although the average performances of STF, TST and CF in terms of MAE, MSE, MAPE, and coefficient of determination are similar, STF, when enhanced with FCI, exhibits the lowest count of outliers and the smallest maximum outlier magnitude, establishing it as the most robust model against outliers.

Performance on ETTx: The *Railway* datasets, initially appearing similar to ETTx in terms of temporal resolution (hourly) and application (power systems), differ significantly in one key aspect: while the *Railway* datasets are specifically tailored with rich contextual details, the ETTx datasets are general-purpose and relatively limited in contextual depth. We demonstrate that our selected transformer models achieve competitive performance on the standard benchmark datasets ETTh1 and ETTh2. This is evidenced by their mean squared error (MSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) metrics, which compare favorably with SOTA timeseries forecasting models TiDE and DLinear, as detailed in Table 2.

6 DISCUSSION

This study highlights the vital role of integrating future contextual information (FCI) in enhancing the accuracy and robustness of load forecasting models. Our analyses reveal that while modern linear multi-step models perform well with datasets characterized by clear trends and periodicity, they are less effective in scenarios that require FCI for load forecasting. In contrast, our proposed encoder-decoder transformer models excel in handling multiple data streams, demonstrating their superior ability to leverage FCI. These insights challenge the prevailing notion established in recent literature that simpler, multi-step linear forecasting methods are universally effective Zeng et al. (2022); Das et al. (2023). Instead, we demonstrate that contextually enhanced encoder-decoder transformer models excel in leveraging FCI to enhance performance, as evidenced in the novel, complex, multi-year Railway load forecasting case studies introduced in this work.

Our research on transformer models reveals that despite their complexity and the advanced embedding strategies employed in the most recent models such as Crossformer or iTransformer, these approaches do not consistently yield superior outcomes when contextual information impacts the performance. Surprisingly, simpler linear embeddings that directly integrate FCI often outperform more intricate methods. This finding highlights the need to reevaluate embedding strategies in forecasting applications. It emphasizes the substantial impact that directly integrating FCI has on enriching model inputs, thereby enhancing forecasting accuracy and robustness across diverse and complex

(a) Outlier counts by forecasting model plotted against the MAPE threshold for the *Railway* test set.

(b) Comparison of the forecasting performance. Performance averaged over the test set.

Figure 3: Comparison of robustness and performance of contextually enhanced models: Cross-former (CF), Spacetimeformer (STF) and Timeseries Transformer (TF) trained on the *Railway* dataset. The linear regression model (EUB), currently the best performing model in production at the data supplier, is also included for comparison. Error bands illustrate the variation across different training initializations.

Table 1: MAE and MSE test set performance in megawatts on the grid load for both *Railway* datasets. Both datasets share the grid load as the target variable for forecasting. However, they differ in the type and level of detail provided for co-variates and length (Table 7 lists the data splits). The *Railway-agg* dataset offers a smaller set of aggregated co-variates, while the larger *Railway-agg* dataset provides spatially localized co-variates specific to different regions. Since the larger dataset *Railway* encompasses the time period of the smaller *Railway-agg*, we additionally evaluate its performance on the *Railway-agg* testing set.

Test Config	Test-Small-Agg		Test-Small		Test-Large	
Training Dataset	<i>Railway-Agg</i> Train		<i>Railway</i> Train		<i>Railway</i> Train	
Testing Dataset	<i>Railway-Agg</i> Test-Small		<i>Railway</i> Test-Small		<i>Railway</i> Test-Large	
# Covariates	16		56		56	
Trend Decomp.	yes		no		no	
Model / Metric	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE
CF	10.35 \pm 0.34	177.45 \pm 10.61	8.05 \pm 0.28	106.93 \pm 6.10	8.62 \pm 0.48	121.70 \pm 11.63
STF	8.68 \pm 0.12	126.70 \pm 4.28	7.58 \pm 0.23	93.82 \pm 5.55	8.28 \pm 0.35	112.26 \pm 9.64
TST	9.79 \pm 0.11	165.85 \pm 5.23	7.75 \pm 0.42	98.25 \pm 9.52	8.37 \pm 0.50	114.68 \pm 11.64
TiDE	12.00 \pm 0.08	294.64 \pm 2.41	11.92 \pm 0.09	287.97 \pm 2.93	11.50 \pm 0.06	270.91 \pm 1.98
DLinear	12.03 \pm 0.22	297.24 \pm 9.71	11.87 \pm 0.22	284.65 \pm 6.99	11.46 \pm 0.19	267.43 \pm 5.66
BiLSTM	10.40 \pm 0.51	179.01 \pm 18.10	8.97 \pm 0.36	130.09 \pm 10.27	9.76 \pm 0.32	154.48 \pm 10.22
XGBoost	10.75 \pm 0.09	194.43 \pm 2.63	9.20 \pm 0.04	140.52 \pm 1.75	9.76 \pm 0.02	157.45 \pm 1.43
Catboost	10.86 \pm 0.14	191.75 \pm 4.90	9.18 \pm 0.04	134.34 \pm 1.63	9.84 \pm 0.10	155.74 \pm 2.70
iTransformer	9.53 \pm 0.18	149.77 \pm 4.67	8.27 \pm 0.32	111.44 \pm 8.00	9.42 \pm 0.51	144.51 \pm 15.64
EUB	10.24	170.42	-	-	10.95	210.89

datasets. This approach often surpasses the effects of advanced embedding and trend decomposition strategies in the first layers of the model.




Figure 4: Comparison of the forecasting performance of Crossformer (cf), Spacetimeformer (stf), Timeseries Transformer (tf) and TiDE (tide) trained on the *Railway* dataset for each day of the week, starting on Monday on a logarithmic scale. We also include the linear regression model (EUB) currently in production at the Swiss Federal Railways. Performance averaged over the test set.

Table 2: MAE and MSE performance on the ETTx datasets for a forecasting window of 24. We use the same training environment as for the *Railway* datasets.

	ETTh1		ETTh2	
	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE
CF	0.371 \pm 0.008	0.309 \pm 0.007	0.400 \pm 0.011	0.316 \pm 0.024
DLinear	0.345 \pm 0.000	0.298 \pm 0.001	0.274 \pm 0.005	0.183 \pm 0.005
STF	0.386 \pm 0.009	0.335 \pm 0.007	0.332 \pm 0.022	0.239 \pm 0.030
TiDE	0.352 \pm 0.000	0.312 \pm 0.000	0.260 \pm 0.000	0.171 \pm 0.001

Our comprehensive analysis across both established and novel datasets underscores a crucial take-away: forecasting models must evolve beyond relying solely on historical data. The integration of dynamic, context-specific information during the forecasting period is indispensable for models facing varied and unpredictable environments. In summary, our research not only demonstrates the superior capability of contextually enhanced transformer models in handling complex data challenges, but also emphasizes their adaptability and robustness. The findings encourage continued exploration and refinement of transformer architectures across various energy forecasting scenarios, promising significant contributions to the field. They also advocate for a broader application of these models in forecasting tasks, particularly highlighting their ability to learn relationships between recorded data

Table 3: Ablation study on *Railway*. We list the performance in megawatts on the *Railway* dataset. We show the input window length w and if the model has access to *future contextual information* (FCI).

Ablation	Config		Test-Small		Test-Large	
	w	FCI	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE
<i>With and without future contextual information</i>						
DLinear	672	✓	11.87 ± 0.22	284.65 ± 6.99	11.46 ± 0.19	267.43 ± 5.66
DLinear	672	✗	11.83 ± 0.18	283.82 ± 5.67	11.44 ± 0.17	267.44 ± 5.08
TiDE	672	✓	11.92 ± 0.09	287.97 ± 2.93	11.50 ± 0.06	270.91 ± 1.98
TiDE	672	✗	11.92 ± 0.09	287.97 ± 2.93	11.50 ± 0.06	270.91 ± 1.98
TST	24	✓	7.75 ± 0.42	98.25 ± 9.52	8.37 ± 0.50	114.68 ± 11.64
TST	24	✗	13.54 ± 1.57	383.59 ± 99.00	14.02 ± 1.25	411.06 ± 87.52
CF	24	✓	8.05 ± 0.28	106.93 ± 6.10	8.62 ± 0.48	121.70 ± 11.63
CF	24	✗	16.94 ± 0.31	596.83 ± 10.46	17.24 ± 0.34	631.23 ± 9.72
STF	24	✓	7.58 ± 0.23	93.82 ± 5.55	8.28 ± 0.35	112.26 ± 9.64
STF	24	✗	11.19 ± 1.00	248.24 ± 55.58	11.28 ± 0.64	241.67 ± 33.76
<i>Short input window for multi-step linear models</i>						
TiDE	24	✓	26.16 ± 0.10	1487.62 ± 2.09	25.80 ± 0.12	1454.53 ± 4.39
TiDE	24	✗	26.15 ± 0.08	1488.08 ± 2.08	25.79 ± 0.11	1454.46 ± 3.80
DLinear	24	✓	25.00 ± 0.11	1201.12 ± 5.80	24.88 ± 0.09	1198.84 ± 4.62
DLinear	24	✗	25.03 ± 0.17	1199.81 ± 13.79	24.88 ± 0.15	1193.86 ± 12.60
<i>Ablations on Spacetimeformer</i>						
STF	192	✓	10.00 ± 0.60	159.21 ± 17.28	11.02 ± 0.72	197.39 ± 26.48
STF ($N_{\text{heads}}=4$)	24	✓	7.61 ± 0.32	94.02 ± 6.85	8.33 ± 0.52	113.03 ± 12.75
STF (Causal Attention)	24	✓	7.69 ± 0.13	97.00 ± 3.20	8.24 ± 0.24	111.33 ± 6.21
STF (w/o Enc TS)	24	✓	9.32 ± 0.89	138.06 ± 27.42	11.67 ± 0.94	219.22 ± 33.08
STF (w/o Enc CI)	24	✓	7.60 ± 0.35	94.29 ± 8.10	8.55 ± 0.49	118.38 ± 13.01

and inputs from secondary forecasting models to effectively forecast. This addresses the nuanced demands of multilayered and complex data environments.

7 METHODS

We reconceptualize multi-step time-series forecasting as a combined forecasting and regression problem, leveraging both historical data and rich, timetable-based *future contextual information*. In this work, we propose to address this challenge through a sequence modeling approach using transformer models enriched with contextual information. The transformer Vaswani et al. (2017) has achieved remarkable success in natural language processing. Since then, it has also become a foundation model for computer vision Dosovitskiy et al. (2021), and time-series Das et al. (2024), as it adheres to the scaling law where larger models will continue to perform better Kaplan et al. (2020). Building on the inherent strengths of transformers, our approach modifies its architecture to more effectively manage and integrate complex temporal contexts. Our proposed approach adapts the transformer architecture to compute a sequence of predictions that integrate both past and future contextual information. We specifically employ encoder-decoder style transformers for this purpose.

Notation: In this work, we use slicing notation denoted using the colon ($:$) symbol. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where m and n denote the number of rows and columns, respectively, slicing is denoted by $A[i : j, k : l]$ or $A_{i:j, k:l}$, where the indices i through $j - 1$ select rows and k through $l - 1$ select columns of matrix A . The omission of i or k implies selection starting from the first row or column, while the omission of j or l extends the selection to the last row or column. We use \otimes to denote element wise multiplication and \oplus for concatenation. The Frobenius norm is represented by $\|\bullet\|_F$.

7.1 PROBLEM FORMULATION

Let $X_i[t - w : t] = \{x_{t-w}, \dots, x_{t-1}\}$ represent the i -th input sequence and $X_i[t : t + h] = \{x_t, x_{t+1}, \dots, x_{t+h}\}$ the associated target sequence which lies in the future – the grid load in this work – with a past window of length w , a forecasting horizon h . The target sequence is D_t -dimensional such that $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_t}$. Similarly, we denote the associated tabular, contextual information from the past as: $C_i^p[t - w : t] = \{c_{t-w}^p, \dots, c_{t-1}^p\}$, $c_t^p \in \mathbb{R}^{D_c^p}$ and the *future contextual information* as: $C_i^f[t : t + h] = \{c_t^f, c_{t+1}^f, \dots, c_{t+h}^f\}$, $c_t^f \in \mathbb{R}^{D_c^f}$ for each time step in the past and future. Here D_c^p and D_c^f are the number of past and future covariates, respectively. We use these definitions to introduce the **time-series regression task** where we predict the grid load $\tilde{X}_i[t : t + h]$ by simultaneously considering the regression problem $\tilde{X}_i[t : t + h] = f_r(C_i^f)$ and the forecasting problem $\tilde{X}_i[t : t + h] = f_f(X_i[t - w : t])$. In this work, we define a unified, parametrized forecasting model M_θ as a function $\tilde{X}_i[t : t + h] = M_\theta(X_i[t - w : t], C_i^p, C_i^f)$ for a specific point in time $w < t < T$, predicting the grid load $\tilde{X}_i[t : t + h]$.

7.2 TRANSFORMER FOR THE TIMESERIES REGRESSION TASK

For model M_θ , we propose to adapt an encoder-decoder transformer architecture where the encoder processes the past and the decoder processes the *future contextual information*. The transformer operates on a sequence of embedding vectors (embeddings). Since *future contextual information* embeddings differ from the past grid load embeddings, we adopt the strategy to separate the future contextual sequence C_i^f from the past sequence C_i^p and train specialized encoder f_f and decoder f_r contextual embedding layers. Specifically, we use:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Encoder: } Z_i &= f_f(\text{Embed}_c(C_i^p) \bullet \text{Embed}_x(X_i[t - w : t])) \\ \text{Decoder: } \tilde{X}_i[t : t + h] &= f_r(\text{Embed}_c(C_i^f), Z_i) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where \bullet represents a monoidal composition. In this setup, the decoder serves as the regressor, by using *non-causal attention* to attend to data from the *expected future*, while the encoder learns a representation of the past data.

Non-Causal Attention: In our experiments, we adopt non-causal (bi-directional) attention, as introduced by Devlin et al. (2019) in the BERT model. This choice is motivated by the non-causal nature of our time-series regression task, where the entire context – both past and future – is accessible at any point during the forecasting period. By leveraging bi-directional attention, we effectively utilize all available data, enabling more comprehensive integration of contextual information to enhance forecasting accuracy. This approach contrasts with causal attention mechanisms, which prevent unavailable future tokens from influencing the prediction of current tokens. Causal attention ensures that the model only uses information available at the time of prediction. However, in our context, where future contextual information is available and beneficial, non-causal attention can provide an advantage. This is typically achieved through a masking technique:

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T + O}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V \quad (2)$$

Here, O_{ij} is set to $-\infty$ if $j > i$ (for future tokens) and 0 otherwise, effectively ignoring positions j that are greater than i . By modifying the mask $O_{ij} = 0$ for all i and j , the model can leverage the full bidirectional future context. This adjustment enhances the model’s ability to integrate information across the entire input sequence, enabling it to utilize both past and future data effectively. The Spacetimeformer, which emerged as the best performing model in our tests, leverages the permutation invariance property of self-attention. This allows it to flatten the multivariate time series, extending the attention across all $N_i \times w$ tokens in the encoder and $N_i \times h$ tokens in the decoder, respectively.

7.3 CONTEXTUAL EMBEDDING

The inherent attention mechanism of the traditional transformer model is invariant to the order of input sequences; however, time series data fundamentally relies on sequentiality. To address this, extensive research has been dedicated to developing temporal and positional encoding strategies has been that reintroduce the concept of sequence into transformers. The predominant method has been the use of additive embeddings Dufter et al. (2022). Research has highlighted that the absence of positional and temporal embeddings can lead to a significant increase in forecasting errors in transformer models Zeng et al. (2022). This suggests the critical role these embeddings play in improving the accuracy of time-series predictions made by transformers. Despite these advancements, there remains no universally accepted strategy for encoding time series data, leading to varied results among different transformer models. For instance, models like the Crossformer have shown decreased forecasting performance when additional covariates are embedded Zhang & Yan (2022). This divergence highlights the ongoing debate and experimentation on the optimal way to incorporate timesemantics of time into data embeddings. Several innovative embedding strategies have been proposed to overcome these challenges, ranging from variable selection networks and LSTM preprocessing Lim et al. (2020) to convolutional preprocessing Zhou et al. (2021). More recent approaches have modified the self-attention mechanism itself, employing techniques such as full dimension-wise embeddings in the iTransformer Liu et al. (2023) and dimension-segment-wise embeddings in the Crossformer Zhang & Yan (2022). These methods reflect the ongoing evolution and diversity in embedding strategies, underscoring the complex nature of effectively capturing time series semantics within transformer architectures.

Rich contextual embedding vectors:

Given the absence of a universal embedding strategy, we propose a method for embedding *future contextual information* by replicating the value embedding technique used in each respective transformer model. We modify the encoder and decoder embeddings for the Spacetimeformer, Crossformer, and Timeseries Transformer as detailed in Table 4. Depending on the model, we apply either summation or the concatenation operation \oplus to integrate contextual information with additional embeddings such as positional and temporal embeddings, to enhance the model’s understanding of the data.

Table 4: Comparison of embedding strategies for the proposed contextually enhanced transformer models. C_i^p and C_i^f denote past and future contextual information respectively, while C_t represents a periodic representation of time, and E_{pos} is the positional embedding of the token. The DSW layer is a feature of Crossformer introduced by its creators.

Name	Encoder Embedding (\mathbf{E}_{enc})	Decoder Embedding (\mathbf{E}_{dec})
STF	$\text{Linear}(x_i \oplus \text{Linear}(C_i^p) \oplus \text{Linear}(C_t)) + E_{pos}$	$\text{Linear}(\text{Linear}(C_i^f) \oplus \text{Linear}(C_t)) + E_{pos}$
CF	$\text{LayerNorm}(\text{DSW}(X_i \oplus C_i^p \oplus C_t) + E_{pos})$	$\text{LayerNorm}(\text{DSW}(C_i^f \oplus C_t) + E_{pos})$
TST	$\text{Conv1d}(X_i) + \text{Conv1d}(C_i^p) + E_{pos}$	$\text{Conv1d}(C_i^f) + E_{pos}$

We maintain the same embedding dimensions across all models, with the exception of the Spacetimeformer. In this model, each token encapsulates a scalar value x_i that spans across signals and time. For the Spacetimeformer, we concatenate these scalar values with the value embeddings, and a final linear layer projects them to the standard embedding dimension. Additionally, we enrich the models with temporal embeddings (C_t), such as hour-of-the-day, day-of-the-week, calendar week and month, along with positional embeddings that denote the sequence position (E_{pos}). These enhancements are implemented in accordance with the established practices in transformer architectures.

7.4 TRAINING OBJECTIVE

To train our transformer model, we use a specific portion of the dataset, designated as the training dataset, denoted by $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Train}}$. We also set up analogous comparable validation and test datasets, represented as \mathcal{D}^{Val} and $\mathcal{D}^{\text{Test}}$, respectively. Although the future contextual information is only provided daily for the upcoming 24 hours starting at 00:00h, we expand the training dataset by implementing

a striding strategy with an hourly step size. The model is optimized based on minimizing the forecasting error across the entire sequence and all context windows. The training objective formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C}) = \|M_\theta(\mathbf{X}[t-w:t], \mathbf{C}) - \mathbf{X}[t:t+h]\|_F^2 \quad (3)$$

During the training process, our goal is to determine the optimal set of parameters θ^* for the model M_θ that minimizes the expected loss. This is achieved using gradient descent, as formulated below:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C} \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{Train}}} [\mathcal{L}_\theta(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C}; \theta)] \quad (4)$$

We use the performance metrics derived from \mathcal{D}^{Val} to guide the adjustment and optimization of hyper-parameters.

7.5 DATASETS

In our work, we investigate the challenges of integrating contextual information for forecasting, using four datasets across two distinct environments. We highlight how variations in available information impact model performance, examining two datasets without contextual data and two datasets with contextual information at varying spatial resolution. The two datasets ETT1 and ETT2 (referred to as ETTx) without future contextual information are commonly utilized in time series research as benchmarks for long-range, multi-variate time-series forecasting Zhang & Yan (2022); Liu et al. (2023); Zeng et al. (2022). The *Railway* datasets were collected to support grid operators and energy traders in the day-ahead energy market. This market is crucial for the *wholesale electricity and power sector*, allowing traders to submit their bids and offers for the electricity delivery for each hour of the following day before the market closes Weron (2014). Additionally, predictive models developed using these datasets are designed to anticipate demand surges and facilitate efficient load management, thereby contributing significantly to the stability and efficiency of energy markets.

ETTh1 / ETTh2: The Electricity Transformer Temperature (ETTx) datasets comprise high-resolution time series capturing the operational conditions of electricity transformers, which include oil temperature readings and six power load features Zhou et al. (2021). For this dataset, we adopt the data splits and preprocessing methodologies detailed in Zeng et al. (2022).

Railway / Railway-agg: The Swiss Federal Railways (SBB) operates a dedicated railway traction network (RTN) at 132kV / 15kV, single phase, designed to power rolling stock of the national railway network, including more than 8000 daily train journeys. The RTN operates at 16.7 Hz frequency, distinct from the standard 50 Hz used in the consumer grid. The boundary integral of the network is well supported by dedicated power plants and integrated with the main grid by 11 frequency converters. This provides a controlled environment, making it an ideal case study for examining the impact of contextual information on forecasting within well defined operational conditions. The datasets utilized in this research were derived from this RTN and were obtained in collaboration with SBB specifically for load forecasting. The grid load within these datasets is defined as the boundary integral net input from power plants, neighboring networks and frequency converters. From 2018 to 2023, we compiled two comprehensive multi-year datasets that include measurements of the grid load along with a rich set of covariates. Transport-related covariates are derived from SBB’s internal operational planning models, while weather data is sourced from weather stations or external climate models. The future contextual information is provided in daily intervals for the day ahead (the next 24 hours). The *Railway* dataset includes 52 covariates of four geographic sectors (west, east, central, south). This regional data includes temperature readings, tonnage, kilometers traveled, gross tonne-kilometers, and train counts derived from the timetable for regional, long-distance or intercity, and cargo trains. The *Railway-Agg* dataset, a condensed variant on the national scale, comprises 16 covariates of identical types derived from an alternative operational planning model. For a detailed breakdown of the date ranges and further dataset specifics, please refer to Appendix B. To enhance the understanding of grid load dynamics within this network, we have included visualizations depicting the grid load for three representative weeks in Appendix B. These visualizations are designed to illustrate typical load scenarios, providing a clear view of the fluctuations encountered. Additionally, they highlight the challenges associated with forecasting these highly varying dynamics, thereby underlining the complexity of the task at hand.

7.6 MODEL TRAINING AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

For model training, we use `PyTorch` and its implementation of the `AdamW` optimizer. Our training regimen incorporates a custom learning rate scheduling that includes a warm-up phase and reduces the learning rate upon reaching a plateau. We use min-max normalization. All four datasets consist of hourly averages, and consequently, we forecast a horizon h of 24 time-steps for the day-ahead load forecast. Training and validation processes are detailed in Appendix B. To preserve the integrity of the evaluation, the temporal ordering of the training, validation, and test datasets is strictly maintained, – ensuring that the indices for validation testing are sequentially higher than those of training. For the Spacetimeformer, we specifically disable the global local- and cross-attention mechanisms on the ETTh1 and ETTh2 datasets. Our evaluation metrics include the standard deviation. Due to the proprietary nature of the data provider’s EUB model, we report only a single set of results for this model. A notable limitation of time series transformers is their limited capability to inherently decompose trends and seasonality, especially with smaller datasets Zhou et al. (2022); Bentsen et al. (2023). To address this, we manually apply trend decomposition for the smaller *Railway-Agg* dataset by subtracting a 96 time-step moving average.

7.7 BASELINE MODELS

Publicly Available Models

In our analysis, we benchmark our contextually enhanced transformer models against the current state-of-the-art (SOTA) models in long-range time-series forecasting. Within the family of transformer-based models, we incorporate adaptations of the Spacetimeformer Grigsby et al. (2022), Crossformer Zhang & Yan (2022), and evaluate the unique embedding strategies used by iTransformer Liu et al. (2023). Additionally, from the recent advancements in multi-step linear models, we include DLinear Zeng et al. (2022) and TiDE, a dense residual model noted for its effectiveness in long-term forecasting Das et al. (2023). We also assess the performance of more traditional time-series forecasting techniques, such as the bidirectional LSTM – which integrates future covariates effectively Siami-Namini et al. (2019) – to provide a comprehensive comparison. Additionally, we extend our comparison to include popular gradient boosting frameworks such as CatBoost Prokhorenkova et al. (2018) and XGBoost Chen & Guestrin (2016), which are well-regarded for their robustness and efficiency in various predictive modeling challenges.

Parametric Linear Regression (EUB) We used the SBB proprietary forecasting model, known as EUB, as the baseline for our predictions. This parametric linear regression model integrates multiple data sources, including weather forecasts, gross-ton kilometers, temperature predictions, as well as national and international workdays and holidays, coupled with historical data. The development of the EUB model benefits from the deep expertise of SBB traders in forecasting, incorporating their insights into the dynamics of load variations influenced by regional, national and international public holidays in Switzerland and neighbouring countries. Based on the observation that load patterns from Tuesdays to Thursdays are generally similar, while Mondays, Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays exhibit distinct characteristics Bosch (2017), EUB uses data from several preceding similar days to establish day-ahead forecasts. Due to proprietary constraints, we are unable to publish the detailed workings of the model and its complete data sources.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All of the data that support the findings of this study are available with the software bundle.

CODE AVAILABILITY

We provide step-by-step instructions to use the contextually enhanced transformer for the timeseries regression task in the software bundle. The code will be openly available on Github on publication of the paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded by the Swiss Federal Office of Transport (FOT) under the project INtelli-geNT maIntenance rAilway power sysTEms (INITIATE). The authors would like to thank FOT for

the project coordination and Swiss Federal Railways (SBB) for providing the data for this research and the discussions on the research results and the paper.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT as language polishing service in order to improve the readability and clarity. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

- John Abbott. Understanding and Managing the Unknown: The Nature of Uncertainty in Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(3):237–251, March 2005. ISSN 0739-456X. doi: 10.1177/0739456X04267710.
- Md Atik Ahamed and Qiang Cheng. TimeMachine: A Time Series is Worth 4 Mambas for Long-term Forecasting, March 2024.
- Sabeen Ahmed, Ian E. Nielsen, Aakash Tripathi, Shamoan Siddiqui, Ravi P. Ramachandran, and Ghulam Rasool. Transformers in Time-Series Analysis: A Tutorial. *Circuits, Systems, and Signal Processing*, 42(12):7433–7466, December 2023. ISSN 1531-5878. doi: 10.1007/s00034-023-02454-8.
- Muhammad Rizwan Asghar, Gyorgy Dan, Daniele Miorandi, and Imrich Chlamtac. Smart Meter Data Privacy: A Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 19(4):2820–2835, 2017. ISSN 1553-877X. doi: 10.1109/COMST.2017.2720195.
- Lars Ødegaard Bentsen, Narada Dilp Warakagoda, Roy Stenbro, and Paal Engelstad. Spatio-Temporal Wind Speed Forecasting using Graph Networks and Novel Transformer Architectures. *Applied Energy*, 333:120565, March 2023. ISSN 03062619. doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.120565.
- Jannis Born and Matteo Manica. Regression Transformer enables concurrent sequence regression and generation for molecular language modelling. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(4):432–444, April 2023. ISSN 2522-5839. doi: 10.1038/s42256-023-00639-z.
- Julius Bosch. *Prognosen Des Leistungsbedarfs Volatiler Energieversorgungsnetze Am Beispiel Elektrischer Bahnen*. Deutscher Industrieverlag, 2017.
- Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '16*, pp. 785–794, New York, NY, USA, August 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-4232-2. doi: 10.1145/2939672.2939785.
- Abhimanyu Das, Weihao Kong, Andrew Leach, Shaan K. Mathur, Rajat Sen, and Rose Yu. Long-term Forecasting with TiDE: Time-series Dense Encoder. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, May 2023. ISSN 2835-8856.
- Abhimanyu Das, Weihao Kong, Rajat Sen, and Yichen Zhou. A decoder-only foundation model for time-series forecasting, February 2024.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding, May 2019.
- Celina Dittmer, Johannes Krümpel, and Andreas Lemmer. Power demand forecasting for demand-driven energy production with biogas plants. *Renewable Energy*, 163:1871–1877, January 2021. ISSN 0960-1481. doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2020.10.099.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale, June 2021.

- Philipp Dufter, Martin Schmitt, and Hinrich Schütze. Position Information in Transformers: An Overview. *Computational Linguistics*, 48(3):733–763, September 2022. ISSN 0891-2017. doi: 10.1162/coli.a.00445.
- Jake Grigsby, Zhe Wang, and Yanjun Qi. Long-Range Transformers for Dynamic Spatiotemporal Forecasting, May 2022.
- Rebecca Haehn, Erika Ábrahám, and Nils Nießen. Freight Train Scheduling in Railway Systems. In Holger Hermanns (ed.), *Measurement, Modelling and Evaluation of Computing Systems*, pp. 225–241, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-43024-5. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-43024-5_14.
- Julia Heil, Kirsten Hoffmann, and Udo Buscher. Railway crew scheduling: Models, methods and applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 283(2):405–425, June 2020. ISSN 0377-2217. doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2019.06.016.
- Tao Hong, Pierre Pinson, Yi Wang, Rafał Weron, Dazhi Yang, and Hamidreza Zareipour. Energy Forecasting: A Review and Outlook. *IEEE Open Access Journal of Power and Energy*, 7:376–388, 2020. ISSN 2687-7910. doi: 10.1109/OAJPE.2020.3029979.
- Ross Irwin, Spyridon Dimitriadis, Jiazhen He, and Esben Jannik Bjerrum. Chemformer: A pre-trained transformer for computational chemistry. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 3(1):015022, January 2022. ISSN 2632-2153. doi: 10.1088/2632-2153/ac3ffb.
- Pierre-alexandre Kamienny, Stéphane d’Ascoli, Guillaume Lample, and Francois Charton. End-to-end Symbolic Regression with Transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10269–10281, December 2022.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models, January 2020.
- Janne Karelaki, Pekka Vainiomäki, and Tapio Westerlund. Large Scale Production Planning in the Stainless Steel Industry. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 50(9):4893–4906, May 2011. ISSN 0888-5885. doi: 10.1021/ie101376b.
- Roman V. Klyuev, Irbek D. Morgoev, Angelika D. Morgoeva, Oksana A. Gavrina, Nikita V. Martyushev, Egor A. Efremkov, and Qi Mengxu. Methods of Forecasting Electric Energy Consumption: A Literature Review. *Energies*, 15(23):8919, January 2022. ISSN 1996-1073. doi: 10.3390/en15238919.
- Prabha S. Kundur. Power System Stability. In *Power System Stability and Control*. CRC Press, 3 edition, 2012. ISBN 978-1-315-21676-8.
- Jesus Lago, Grzegorz Marcjasz, Bart De Schutter, and Rafał Weron. Forecasting day-ahead electricity prices: A review of state-of-the-art algorithms, best practices and an open-access benchmark. *Applied Energy*, 293:116983, July 2021. ISSN 0306-2619. doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116983.
- Alexandra L’Heureux, Katarina Grolinger, and Miriam A. M. Capretz. Transformer-Based Model for Electrical Load Forecasting. *Energies*, 15(14):4993, January 2022. ISSN 1996-1073. doi: 10.3390/en15144993.
- Zhe Li, Shiyi Qi, Yiduo Li, and Zenglin Xu. Revisiting Long-term Time Series Forecasting: An Investigation on Linear Mapping, May 2023.
- Bryan Lim, Sercan O. Arık, Nicolas Loeff, and Tomas Pfister. Temporal Fusion Transformers for Interpretable Multi-horizon Time Series Forecasting, September 2020.
- Bryan Lim, Sercan Ö. Arık, Nicolas Loeff, and Tomas Pfister. Temporal Fusion Transformers for interpretable multi-horizon time series forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 37(4): 1748–1764, October 2021. ISSN 0169-2070. doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.03.012.
- Yong Liu, Tengge Hu, Haoran Zhang, Haixu Wu, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, and Mingsheng Long. iTransformer: Inverted Transformers Are Effective for Time Series Forecasting, October 2023.

- G. López and P. Arboleya. Short-term wind speed forecasting over complex terrain using linear regression models and multivariable LSTM and NARX networks in the Andes Mountains, Ecuador. *Renewable Energy*, 183:351–368, 2022. ISSN 0960-1481. doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2021.10.070.
- Richard M. Lusby, Jesper Larsen, and Simon Bull. A survey on robustness in railway planning. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 266(1):1–15, April 2018. ISSN 0377-2217. doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2017.07.044.
- Dávid Markovics and Martin János Mayer. Comparison of machine learning methods for photovoltaic power forecasting based on numerical weather prediction. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 161:112364, June 2022. ISSN 1364-0321. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2022.112364.
- Hermann Meissner, Rebecca Ilse, and Jan C. Aurich. Analysis of Control Architectures in the Context of Industry 4.0. *Procedia CIRP*, 62:165–169, January 2017. ISSN 2212-8271. doi: 10.1016/j.procir.2016.06.113.
- Yuqi Nie, Nam H. Nguyen, Phanwadee Sinthong, and Jayant Kalagnanam. A Time Series is Worth 64 Words: Long-term Forecasting with Transformers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, September 2022.
- Laurent Pagnier and Michael Chertkov. Physics-Informed Graphical Neural Network for Parameter & State Estimations in Power Systems, February 2021.
- Reese Pathak, Rajat Sen, Weihao Kong, and Abhimanyu Das. Transformers can optimally learn regression mixture models, November 2023.
- Liudmila Prokhorenkova, Gleb Gusev, Aleksandr Vorobev, Anna Veronika Dorogush, and Andrey Gulin. CatBoost: Unbiased boosting with categorical features. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- Peng Ran, Kun Dong, Xu Liu, and Jing Wang. Short-term load forecasting based on CEEMDAN and Transformer. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 214:108885, January 2023. ISSN 0378-7796. doi: 10.1016/j.epsr.2022.108885.
- Zhiyuan Si, Ming Yang, Yixiao Yu, and Tingting Ding. Photovoltaic power forecast based on satellite images considering effects of solar position. *Applied Energy*, 302:117514, November 2021. ISSN 0306-2619. doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117514.
- Sima Siami-Namini, Neda Tavakoli, and Akbar Siami Namin. The Performance of LSTM and BiLSTM in Forecasting Time Series. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pp. 3285–3292, Los Angeles, CA, USA, December 2019. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-72810-858-2. doi: 10.1109/BigData47090.2019.9005997.
- Sin Yong Teng, Michal Touš, Wei Dong Leong, Bing Shen How, Hon Loong Lam, and Vítězslav Máša. Recent advances on industrial data-driven energy savings: Digital twins and infrastructures. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 135:110208, January 2021. ISSN 13640321. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2020.110208.
- Kaleem Ullah, Abdul Basit, Zahid Ullah, Sheraz Aslam, and Herodotos Herodotou. Automatic Generation Control Strategies in Conventional and Modern Power Systems: A Comprehensive Overview. *Energies*, 14(9):2376, January 2021. ISSN 1996-1073. doi: 10.3390/en14092376.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- Qingsong Wen, Tian Zhou, Chaoli Zhang, Weiqi Chen, Ziqing Ma, Junchi Yan, and Liang Sun. Transformers in Time Series: A Survey, May 2023.
- Rafał Weron. Electricity price forecasting: A review of the state-of-the-art with a look into the future. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 30(4):1030–1081, October 2014. ISSN 0169-2070. doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2014.08.008.

- Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Lei Zhang, and Qiang Xu. Are Transformers Effective for Time Series Forecasting?, August 2022.
- Chuntian Zhang, Yuan Gao, Lixing Yang, Ziyou Gao, and Jianguo Qi. Joint optimization of train scheduling and maintenance planning in a railway network: A heuristic algorithm using Lagrangian relaxation. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 134:64–92, April 2020. ISSN 0191-2615. doi: 10.1016/j.trb.2020.02.008.
- Yunhao Zhang and Junchi Yan. Crossformer: Transformer utilizing cross-dimension dependency for multivariate time series forecasting. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Ze Zheng Zhao, Chunqiu Xia, Lian Chi, Xiaomin Chang, Wei Li, Ting Yang, and Albert Y. Zomaya. Short-Term Load Forecasting Based on the Transformer Model. *Information*, 12(12):516, December 2021. ISSN 2078-2489. doi: 10.3390/info12120516.
- Jian Zheng, Cencen Xu, Ziang Zhang, and Xiaohua Li. Electric load forecasting in smart grids using Long-Short-Term-Memory based Recurrent Neural Network. In *2017 51st Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, pp. 1–6, March 2017. doi: 10.1109/CISS.2017.7926112.
- Haoyi Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Jieqi Peng, Shuai Zhang, Jianxin Li, Hui Xiong, and Wancai Zhang. Informer: Beyond Efficient Transformer for Long Sequence Time-Series Forecasting. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(12):11106–11115, May 2021. ISSN 2374-3468, 2159-5399. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v35i12.17325.
- Tian Zhou, Ziqing Ma, Qingsong Wen, Xue Wang, Liang Sun, and Rong Jin. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 27268–27286. PMLR, 2022.

A ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS & INSIGHTS

Detailed Load Curves: Figure 5, Figure 6 and Figure 7 show typical load profiles for challenging contexts. The curves emphasize the dynamic power profile of the Swiss traction power grid throughout a single day with the typical two load peaks during the morning and afternoon rush hour that we forecast for this case study. Curve statistics such as the load peak magnitudes strongly differ when comparing workdays with the weekend or with seasonal events such as holidays and vacation periods, requiring the model to generalize well to different operational contexts and seasonal conditions. In the detailed curves we find that the model variance is much larger for different random initialization when not enhanced with *future contextual information*. Figure 5 depicts the forecast during International Workers’ Day, which is traditionally affected by strikes and thus unpredictable. Due to this unpredictability, we expect the forecast to be challenging and not in line with the *expected future*. On the contrary, Figure 6 is the regular beginning of national summer vacation time. In this time the results support our expectation and reveal that the *future contextual information* helps to reduce model variance and mean prediction error.

Outlier Distributions: In an additional study we analyze the outlier distributions by MAPE threshold (10%) for each time-series transformer. We plot the outlier distribution for all models selected by time-stamp of outliers of the reference model in Figure 9. We find that without contextual information, the other models’ outlier distributions do not align with the reference model, with the distributions’ means disagreeing with each other, indicating the models fail to generalize in certain random situations where other models perform well. With contextual information, the other model’s distributions’s mean is more aligned, indicating similar (weak) performance on few anomalous events inherently given by the dataset.

COVID-19 Case Study: The unforeseen onset of the pandemic lead to a distribution shift in gross tonne-kilometres transported on the railway network driven by changes in commercial and residential demand due to widespread lockdowns and work-from-home policies. Therefore, the *Railway* and *Railway-agg* datasets present a generalization challenge, as they include periods during and outside of the COVID-19 pandemic. We examine the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the Swiss




Figure 5: May 2023 (May 1st holiday) A typical load profile overlaid with the next day forecasts (24 time steps) by model (CF, TST, STF). We plot the forecast with (+fcf) and without *future contextual information*. Error bands show variation across training runs.




Figure 6: July 2023 (start of summer break) A typical load profile overlaid with the next day forecasts (24 time steps) by model (CF, TST, STF). We plot the forecast with (+fcf) and without *future contextual information*. Error bands show variation across training runs.

railway traction network. In Figure 10, we depict the data distribution shift. We list the forecasting performance of contextually enhanced transformers, trained exclusively on data from the pandemic period, in Table 5 (details on data splits are listed in Table 7). Both the validation set and the two test sets, Test-small and Test-large, are in the endemic phase. We observe that the contextually enhanced transformer manages the distribution shift effectively, experiencing a performance degradation of




Figure 7: August 2023 (national holiday) A typical load profile overlaid with the next day forecasts (24 time steps) by model (CF, TST, STF). We plot the forecast with (+fci) and without *future contextual information*. Error bands show variation across training runs.




Figure 8: Outlier counts by forecasting model plotted against the MAPE threshold for the full threshold range on the *Railway* test set.

22.1 % by mean MAE from **8.28** to **10.11** for out of distribution forecasting, still surpassing the performance of the current model employed by the data supplier (EUB) which was updated weekly.

ETT_x Comparison of SOTA Timeseries Transformer: We observe that the Spacetimeformer model, which performs best in our study, does not achieve the overall performance levels of Cross-former on ETTh1, as described in the original study, it however excels in the specific task of the 24-hour forecast on ETTh2, an aspect not previously listed in Zhang & Yan (2022). Interestingly, previous studies, such as those by Zhang et al. in Zhang & Yan (2022), have noted that segment-wise covariates could negatively impact forecasting on datasets like ETTh1. This discrepancy might stem from differences in the types of covariates used – periodic covariates, such as hour-of-the-day




Figure 9: Outlier severity distributions by MAPE for the *Railway* test set for each reference model. We select the outliers instanced where the MAPE is larger than 10%. We plot the median as a vertical line.

Table 5: Results COVID-19 study

Ablation	Test-Small		Test-Large		Validation	
	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE
CF	9.62 \pm 0.62	149.99 \pm 18.64	10.71 \pm 0.56	186.32 \pm 16.83	9.42 \pm 0.26	146.02 \pm 6.32
STF	9.21 \pm 0.58	135.63 \pm 15.12	10.11 \pm 0.95	166.85 \pm 30.07	8.05 \pm 0.05	105.94 \pm 1.28
TST	9.34 \pm 0.67	140.62 \pm 21.56	10.86 \pm 0.96	195.27 \pm 33.40	8.83 \pm 0.25	128.42 \pm 6.43
EUB	10.24	170.42	10.95	210.89	-	-

and day-of-the-week, versus the rich contextual information used in our *Railway* load forecasting. Our approach also includes separate embeddings for periodic covariates to ensure comprehensive contextual integration.

B ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Evaluation Metrics: We evaluate the models on MSE, MAE and MAPE:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \tilde{y}_i)^2 \quad (5)$$

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - \tilde{y}_i| \quad (6)$$




Figure 10: Data distribution shift of selected features during the COVID-19 period.

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{y_i - \tilde{y}_i}{y_i} \right| \quad (7)$$

Hyper-parameter optimization was performed using grid search, with initial parameter ranges selected from the original works. Hyper-parameter tuning was performed on the validation set. We list the best hyper-parameters in Table 6. and the data splits in Table 7.

Table 6: A comparison of the different hyper-parameters after tuning for the contextually enhanced transformer models and TiDE on the *Railway* dataset.

	STF	STF-Large	CF	TST	TiDE
Model dimension	128	128	128	128	256
Feed-forward	128	128	128	256	512
Encoder Layer	2	2	3	2	3
Decoder Layer	3	3	3	2	3
Attention heads	4	7	4	2	-
Input Window w	24	24	24	24	672
Forecasting Horizon h	24	24	24	24	24

Table 7: Data splits for the *Railway* and *Railway-Agg* datasets including date ranges

Dataset	Split Type	Samples	Date Range
Railway	Train	39264 (78%)	2018-04-04 - 2022-09-25
	Validation	2880 (7%)	2022-09-26 - 2023-01-23
	Test-Large	8208 (15%)	2023-01-24 - 2023-12-31
	Test-Small	4512	2023-01-24 - 2023-07-30
Railway-COVID	Train	14592	2019-12-01 - 2021-07-30
	Validation	2880	2022-09-26 - 2023-01-23
	Test-Large	8208	2023-01-24 - 2023-12-31
	Test-Small	4512	2023-01-24 - 2023-07-30
Railway-Agg	Train	13584 (70%)	2020-12-31 - 2022-07-19
	Validation	4512 (15%)	2022-07-20 - 2023-01-23
	Test-Small-Agg	4512 (15%)	2023-01-24 - 2023-07-30