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Introduction
- Advances in information technology area has enabled smart grids to realize the two-way communication effectively for energy delivery, and allowed seamless integration of renewables. However, The inherent weakness of communication technology has exposed the system to numerous security threats.
- False Data Injection (FDI) attack can disturb the conditions of the grid, state estimation and the energy distribution process seriously.
- In FDI, the attacker may inject malicious packets into the network by either compromising the sensing layers or hijacking the communication channels resulting in incorrect decision making process to trip relays or circuit breakers or other grid state conditions.

Goal
- The purpose of this research is to detect the false data injection attack (FDI) in Smart Grids by developing a machine learning based approach.

Methodology
- **Data set**
  - The data set used in this project includes the electricity demand profiles for seven households for the Midwest region of the United States.
- **Features**
  - The relevant features selected from this data set are:
    - Date
    - Time
    - Electricity demand for Household
  - Additionally, another feature is included related to the Cost per kWh (time-of-use)
- **Attack model**
  - To model the FDI attack, several membership functions are used to falsify the legitimate data set.
  - Example of these functions are given below:

Preliminary Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithms</th>
<th>Probability of detection</th>
<th>Probability of false alarm</th>
<th>Probability of miss detection</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVM (RBF Kernel)</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM (Sigmoid)</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM (Polynomial)</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Network (RBF function, 100)</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Network (Logistic function, 100)</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Network (Tanh function, 100)</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forest (10 trees)</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forest (100 trees)</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
- The experiment results indicate that ANN is an optimal approach for detecting the falsified injected data over other approaches.
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