

Μ X) Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office



ISKANDAR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Global Future Cities Programme

Smart GIS Training: Session 3 **Advanced Analytics**

MOTT

7 December 2021



Introductions



Jonathan McCallum Senior Consultant



George Doughty Data Scientist



Matthew Fredericks Data Scientist





Please complete quick survey for later... "sentiments"

https://forms.office.com/r/WmuPKEYiUd



Overview

Overview

Over the next 3 sessions we will look at the work performed to produce the Smart GIS as part of the pilot project on the Iskandar intervention:

- Collect Data
- Process it into GIS formats
- Apply analytics
- Produce visualisations
- Generate additional functionality We will cover:
- GIS Fundamentals
- Derivation of Data
- Advanced Analytics



Overview

Recap from Session 1 and 2

Theory

- GIS Fundamentals (best practice, naming conventions, data formats)
- Online storage and interaction (direct links, APIs)

Application (via SIMMS)

- ArcGIS servers (Moata Platform)
- Data collection

Practical

- Basic GIS operations
- Publishing to ArcGIS Online for data collection

Theory

- Urban and transport planning metrics
- Concepts of connectivity, entropy and mobility

Application (via SIMMS)

- How the metrics were derived and use of a master shapefile
- Granularity as a critical aspect of work
- Dashboards and geospatial tools

Practical

 Performing spatial queries to derive new metrics



Advanced Analytics

Advanced Analytics

- PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level)
- Sentiment analysis of complaints
- Machine learning prediction



PTAL theory

A measure of connectivity to Public Transport

- Divide the region into 100m x 100m squares.
- Calculate the distance to the nearest bus stops (within 1km) from the centre of each grid.
- For each bus stop within the radius calculate:
 - the walk time (based on a configurable walking speed): T
 - the standard waiting time: $SWT = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{60}{Bus \ Frequency}$
 - the average waiting time: AWT = SWT + 2
 - Total Access Time: TAT = T + AWT
 - equivalent doorstep frequency: $EDF = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{60}{TAT}$,
 - Access index: $AI = Max(EDF) + 0.5 \times \sum_{Bus \ Stops} EDF$ (Used for grids with more than one bus stop)
 - Covert to PTAL using bandings of Access Index scores.



More information can be found at: https://content.tfl.gov.uk/connectivity-assessment-guide.pdf

Some definitions

- use of computing to
- Artificial intelligence (AI) use of computing to mimic human decision-making and functions
- Machine learning (ML) use of algorithms to "learn" patterns in data
 - Supervised learning teaching with examples.
 e.g. Identifying cats vs dogs.
 - **Unsupervised learning** teaching without examples e.g. grouping similar pets together.
- Natural language processing (NLP) use of algorithms to process human language
 - **Sentiment analysis** aims to quantify the sentiment (attitude or emotion) behind text



Α

Machine learning theory



- Linear regression is a ML algorithm that fits a linear relationship between features and the label
 - Minimise the loss in the objective function:

Hours of sleep = $\mathbf{A} \times \text{coffee drunk} + \mathbf{B} \times \text{hours of exercise} + \mathbf{C} \times \text{house number} + \mathbf{D}$

• For the example above, after machine learning we might get:

$$A = -0.01$$
, $B = 2$, $C = 0.0001$, $D = 8$

Meaning for the highlighted row, the model predicts:

 $(-0.01)^*$ 500 + 2*1 + 0.0001*25 + 8 = 5.0025 hrs of sleep

Machine learning theory

Decision trees and random forests





A **decision tree** is a simplistic ML algorithm that makes a prediction by following a series of splits based on features. For a continuous label, the prediction is just the average of the training labels at that end node. A **random forest** is a ML algorithm that uses a collection of decision trees which each independently find the best way to separate the training labels.

A feature's importance is measured by how well it's able to affect the split of training labels.

Sentiment analysis theory

Training a word scoring model



Result

Sentiment analysis theory

Grammar and syntactical rules

• However, human languages aren't that simple!

"I don't like oranges": **?** Neutral + negative + positive + neutral = neutral

But this should be negative!

"I like oranges": positive "I love oranges": positive "I adore oranges": positive

We want to score/rank these!

Solution: word vectors and other NLP techniques to capture word relationships.

"I like oranges"	[1 0.6 1]
"I love oranges"	[1 0.8 1]
"I adore oranges"	[1 0.9 1]
"I don't like oranges"	[1 -0.6 1]



Application

PTAL example

Worked example of PTAL Calculation



	Walk Time	Average Wait Time (AWT)	Equivalent Doorstep Frequency (EDF)	PTAL Score
Grid A	7 Minutes	$(0.5 \times 20) + 2 = 12$ Minutes	$\frac{60}{2 \times 19} \approx 1.579$	$1.5 \leq EDF < 1.75 \rightarrow PTAL = 4$
Grid B	4 Minutes	$(0.5 \times 20) + 2 = 12$ Minutes	$\frac{60}{2 \times 16} = 1.875$	$1.75 \le EDF < 2 \rightarrow PTAL = 5$



- Common problems (e.g. translating place names, or unusual words not having scores)
- We expanded the vocabulary of our sentiment "lexicon" using a pre-trained model (on many GB of Google News data) to check unknown words for "similar" known words

Framing the problem



Sentiment: -1.55 Mean vehicle speed: 60km/h Number of accidents: 15 Number of primary schools: 1

Sentiment: -0.32 Mean vehicle speed: 40km/h Number of accidents: 3 Number of primary schools: 2

Why machine learning?

- Understand more about causes for complaints.
- Make predictions for areas where we lack complaints data.

Exploratory analysis



Prediction of sentiment

• Train the model...



Results



- Areas with busy roads and zones have worse sentiment.
- Sentiment is worse in areas with many bus stops, possibly as they are in busier urban centres with more destinations where complaints could arise.
- Areas near primary schools have better sentiment, but worse for other educational institutes.

Limitations

- Average sentiment is dependent on the likelihood of complaint submission and the accuracy of our sentiment calculation. It is not an observable outcome such as a census result on quality of life.
- Confounding factors such as population would invalidate our insights and mean that we may be inadvertently predicting population hotspots rather than complaint sentiment.
- We are missing suitable feature data on important quantities like population, salary and poverty. The features we do have may not be linked to complaints at all (evidenced by correlogram).



Practical

Practical conclusion

How can we get better results?

(i) useful data (data that is relevant to the question we are trying to answer, for example socioeconomic data like qol, poverty levels when trying to predict sentiment);

(ii) high quality data (data that is accurate and well-labeled, with datasets that cover a large shared area).



Summary

Summary

Theory

- Machine Learning
- Sentiment Analysis

Application (via SIMMS)

- Deriving PTAL scores
- Citizen complaint data

Practical

• Simple sentiment analysis example



Thank you