

---

# TOTEM: Tokenized Time Series Embeddings for General Time Series Analysis

---

Sabera Talukder<sup>1</sup> Yisong Yue<sup>1</sup> Georgia Gkioxari<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

The field of general time series analysis has recently begun to explore unified modeling, where a common architectural backbone can be retrained on a specific task for a specific dataset. In this work, we approach unification from a complementary vantage point: unification across tasks and domains. To this end, we explore the impact of discrete, learnt, time series data representations that enable generalist, cross-domain training. Our method, TOTEM, or Tokenized Time Series Embeddings, proposes a simple tokenizer architecture that embeds time series data from varying domains using a discrete vectorized representation learned in a self-supervised manner. TOTEM works across multiple tasks and domains with minimal to no tuning. We study the efficacy of TOTEM with an extensive evaluation on 17 real world time series datasets across 3 tasks. We evaluate both the specialist (i.e., training a model on each domain) and generalist (i.e., training a single model on many domains) settings, and show that TOTEM matches or outperforms previous best methods on several popular benchmarks. The code can be found at: <https://github.com/SaberaTalukder/TOTEM>.

## 1. Introduction

Time series analysis encompasses a wide range of tasks, datasets, and applications in the real world. When considering training paradigms, time series analysis has historically been conducted via *specialist-training*, meaning that models are trained on a single time series domain (Zhou et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2022a; Nie et al., 2022; Zhang & Yan, 2022). *Generalist-training*, where models are simultaneously trained on multiple time series domains, contrasts the specialist paradigm. Both specialist and generalist models can be tested under various regimes. Within *in-domain-testing*, a model is tested on the same domain(s) it was trained on. In *zero-shot-testing*, a model is tested on different domains(s) than it was trained on. Some methods have

<sup>1</sup>California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA. Correspondence to: Sabera Talukder <sabera@caltech.edu>.

begun to explore the idea of zero-shot forecasting where (1) a forecaster trains on one dataset then predicts on a separate dataset (Zhou et al., 2023), or (2) a forecaster trains on a subset of channels (which we call *sensors*) from one dataset then zero-shot forecasts on the remaining sensors in the same dataset (Liu et al., 2023). Both of these models would be considered specialists, as they were trained on only one (or a subset of one) dataset.

Further, time series analysis has typically been restricted by task, where methods study only *forecasting* (Wu et al., 2021; Woo et al., 2022), *anomaly detection* (Xu et al., 2021; He & Zhao, 2019), or *imputation* (Luo et al., 2018; 2019; Talukder et al., 2022), among others. Recently, the field has become increasingly unified with respect to model architecture, with methods (Zhou et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2022a) exploring language and vision backbones on various time series tasks. These backbones, like previous methods, utilize specialist training (e.g., training separate imputers on each dataset).

Similarly, the field has also become increasingly unified with respect to data representation, with growing emphasis on learning performant data representations. For instance, Franceschi et al. (2019) utilize an exponentially dilated causal convolutional encoder to discover in-domain embeddings, Tonekaboni et al. (2021) leverage temporal neighborhood coding, Yang & Hong (2022) utilize temporal-spectral fusion, and Yue et al. (2022) employs hierarchical contrast-ing across the time and batch dimensions.

At a technical level, our approach bears closest affinity to methods that use vector quantized variational autoencoders (VQVAEs) (Van Den Oord et al., 2017; Duan et al., 2023; Rasul et al., 2022b;a). As we discuss further in Section 3, our goal is to develop a streamlined framework for learning a tokenized data representation (using VQVAEs) in a way that permits easy applicability and holistic empirical evaluation on a broad range of time series modeling tasks and data domains (including zero-shot generalization to new test domains) with minimal to no tuning.<sup>2</sup>

Motivated by the trend of time series analysis unification,

<sup>2</sup>As an aside, our approach to studying what is a performant general time series data representation shares a philosophical alignment with the development of large generalist models in natural language processing, which are also based on having a common tokenized representation (Gage, 1994; Radford et al., 2018).




Figure 1. **TOTEM & Evaluation Regimes.** An overview of TOTEM, the training schemas, and inference regimes. (a) The TOTEM VQVAE architecture consists of an 1D strided CNN encoder  $\mathcal{E}$ , quantizer, latent codebook, and 1D strided transpose CNN decoder  $\mathcal{D}$ . TOTEM’s VQVAE enables generalist training, *i.e.*, on all datasets jointly, and specialist training, *i.e.*, on one dataset at a time. (b) TOTEM’s discrete, self-supervised codebook can be leveraged for both in domain and zero shot testing.

we explore the value of a VQVAE-based tokenizer for time series imputation, anomaly detection, and forecasting. Unlike previous methods, we utilize self-supervised, discrete tokens, and extensively explore their utility in varied training and testing regimes. Our contributions are as follows:

1. We present TOTEM, a simple tokenizer architecture for time series analysis that works across domains and tasks with minimal to no tuning.
2. Despite its simplicity, TOTEM matches or outperforms the state-of-the-art on several popular benchmark datasets and tasks.
3. With an extensive evaluation in the generalist setting (training a single model on multiple domains), we show that TOTEM outperforms the leading state-of-the-art model in both in-domain and zero-shot testing regimes.

## 2. Related Work

Time series modeling methods utilize many techniques, ranging from statistical methods (Winters, 1960; Holt, 1957; Anderson, 1976; Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2018; Taylor & Letham, 2018) to multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) (Zeng et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Das et al., 2023; Challu et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Oreshkin et al., 2019) to convolutional neural networks (CNNs) (Wu et al., 2022a; Liu et al., 2022a; He & Zhao, 2019; Franceschi et al., 2019; Bai et al., 2018) to recurrent neural networks (RNNs) (Salinas et al., 2020; Shen et al., 2020; Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997) to transformers (Zhou et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023; Nie et al., 2022; Zhang & Yan, 2022; Woo et al., 2022;

Zhou et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022b; Wu et al., 2022b; Xu et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021; Kitaev et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019). Many models are hybrid solutions that blend aforementioned approaches.

Most of these methods intake time and then perform various combinations of normalization (Kim et al., 2021), frequency transformations (Wu et al., 2022a; Zhou et al., 2022), and patchification either along the time dimension (Liu et al., 2023; Zhang & Yan, 2022; Nie et al., 2022), or sensor dimension (Li et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021).<sup>3</sup> Patch lengths range from a single time-step / sensor, also known as point-wise, to the length of the entire time series / all sensors. Time and sensor patch dependencies are then learned, via an attention mechanism, convolution, recurrence, or linear layer, across the temporal dimension, sensor dimension, or both the temporal and sensor dimensions (Zhang & Yan, 2022). For multisensor modeling, one can model all sensors jointly or independently (*i.e.*, forecast each sensor independently) (Nie et al., 2022). These methods learn the underlying data representations end-to-end with the downstream task (*e.g.*, forecasting).

Specialist-training, where models are only trained on a single time series domain, is the most common regime amongst prior work (Zhou et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2022a; Nie et al., 2022; Zhang & Yan, 2022). These specialist models are primarily evaluated via in-domain-testing, where the test set is from the same domain as the train set. Recently, some methods (Zhou et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023) have begun to explore specialist zero-shot forecasting capabilities.

<sup>3</sup>In time series analysis, sensors, channels, and variates are synonymous terms; in this paper we adopt the sensor terminology.

The time series analysis field is undergoing unification along both the modeling axis (Zhou et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2022a) and data representation axis (Franceschi et al., 2019; Tonekaboni et al., 2021; Yang & Hong, 2022; Barnum et al., 2020; Yue et al., 2022). Unified data representations, both statistical and learnt, have been more extensively studied in language and vision modeling (Gage, 1994; Van Den Oord et al., 2017; Esser et al., 2021; Rombach et al., 2022). The vision modeling field distinguishes between discrete, learnt, tokens (Van Den Oord et al., 2017; Esser et al., 2021; Rombach et al., 2022) and patches (Dosovitskiy et al., 2020). Patches have been studied in time series modeling (Zhou et al., 2023; Nie et al., 2022; Zhang & Yan, 2022). In this work, we propose to use discrete, learnt tokenized representations, which we show lead to strong performance in both specialist and generalist settings, as well as in-domain and zero-shot testing regimes.

### 3. Method

Our proposed discrete time series tokenization enables the design of general models across a variety of time series domains, tasks, and evaluation schemas, Figure 1. We design a single tokenizer architecture that is generally applicable without extensive data engineering while being suitable for varying data dimensionalities across different tasks. There are many possibilities for how to introduce a discrete time series tokenizer, we extensively study one such methodology that satisfies the aforementioned design criteria.

**Data Engineering.** Prior work in time series analysis leverages data engineering such as the use of auxiliary features (e.g. day of the month, or minute in the hour, etc.) (Chen et al., 2023; Salinas et al., 2020), or frequency transformations (Wu et al., 2022a; Zhou et al., 2022). We forego any data engineering and operate directly on time steps. This enables generalist-training as differing data domains have widely varying sampling rates leading to distinct auxiliary features and frequency profiles.

**Varying Dimensionality.** A time series dataset consists of  $E$  examples (i.e. number of distinct recordings),  $S$  sensor channels, and  $T$  time steps, and can be formally expressed as  $\{\mathbf{x}_j\}_{j=1}^E \subset \mathbb{R}^{S \times T}$ . Even within a single task and single data domain where  $S$  does not change,  $E$  and  $T$  take on a wide range of values. As an example, canonical forecasting predictions lengths range from 96 to 720 time steps. When moving to generalist-training, datasets additionally have wide ranging sensor dimensionalities  $S$ . Our tokenizer handles varying dimensionality across  $E$ ,  $S$ , and  $T$  by creating non-overlapping tokens along the time-dimension that are smaller than the dimension  $T$ .

**Differing Tasks.** There are numerous tasks to tackle in time series analysis. Three significant ones are imputation,

anomaly detection, and forecasting. In *imputation*, models intake a masked time series  $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$ , and then reconstruct and impute  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$ . In *anomaly detection*, models intake a corrupted time series  $\mathbf{x}_{corr} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$  and reconstruct the data  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$ . The amount of corruption is considered known, at  $A\%$ . In *forecasting*, models intake a time series  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$  and predict future readings  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{out}}$ , where  $S$  is the number of sensors and  $T_{in}, T_{out}$  signify the durations of the preceding and succeeding time series, respectively. Our tokenizer is performant across all tasks despite their distinct representational requirements.

**TOTEM Implementation.** To realize a single tokenizer architecture that enables generalist modeling across differing domains and tasks we take inspiration from the VQVAE (Van Den Oord et al., 2017). The original VQVAE leverages a dilated convolutional architecture with a stride of 2 and window-size of 4, similar to the WaveNet (Oord et al., 2016) dilated, causal, convolutional decoder. A dilated convolution skips inputs allowing a filter to operate on a larger input area / coarser scale. Utilizing dilated convolutions is an architectural decision rooted in the high sampling rates of raw audio waveforms (Oord et al., 2016; Van Den Oord et al., 2017). High sampling rates are not a trait shared by many time series domains.

When adapting the VQVAE for general time series analysis, the TOTEM VQVAE:

1. Operates directly on time steps; no data engineering.
2. Creates discrete, non-overlapping tokens along the time dimension of length  $F$ , where  $F < T$ , thereby promoting training and testing on variable length examples,  $E$ , sensors,  $S$ , and time steps  $T$ .
3. Maintains the same architecture and objective regardless of the downstream task.
4. Aims to capture maximal information within a large receptive field by: (1) using a strided non-causal convolutional architecture with no dilation, (2) training on long time series inputs, (3) pre-striding the data by a stride of 1 so the tokenizer learns from maximal inputs.

The TOTEM VQVAE consists of an encoder, quantizer, latent codebook, and decoder. It takes in a univariate time series  $\{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^T\}_{i=1}^{E \cdot S}$  obtained by flattening the sensor channel of the multivariate data. This makes TOTEM’s VQVAE sensor-agnostic, enabling TOTEM’s generalist-training and zero-shot-testing. The encoder  $\mathcal{E}$  consists of strided 1D convolutions compressing the time series by a cumulative stride of  $F$ .  $\mathcal{E}$  maps a univariate time series  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^T$  to a latent representation  $\mathbf{z} = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{T/F \times D}$ , where  $D$  is the the hidden dimension. The latent codebook  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{c}_i\}_{i=1}^K$  consists of  $K$   $D$ -dim codewords  $\mathbf{c}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$ . During quantization, the

codebook is used to replace  $\mathbf{z}$  with  $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T/F \times D}$  such that  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_j = \mathbf{c}_k$ , where  $k = \arg \min_i \|\mathbf{z}_j - \mathbf{c}_i\|_2$ . The decoder  $\mathcal{D}$  follows the reverse architecture of the encoder  $\mathcal{E}$ , consisting of 1D transpose convolutions with a cumulative stride of  $1/F$  mapping the quantized  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  to a reconstructed time series  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{D}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \in \mathbb{R}^T$ . We learn  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  by optimizing the objective  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{cmt}}$  consisting of a reconstruction loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} = \frac{1}{E \cdot S} \sum_i \|\mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2^2$  and a commitment loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cmt}}$ , which allows the codebook to update despite the non-differentiable  $\arg \min$  operation during quantization. The final objective is  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} + \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{cmt}}$ , where  $\alpha$  is a scalar that weights the two losses. This objective does not change even when the underlying task, time series length, data masking, normalization schema, or data domain changes.

Notably imputation and anomaly detection can be directly solved with just TOTEM’s VQVAE, as they are fundamentally data representation tasks, whereas in forecasting further modeling is required, see Figure 2. In forecasting, the trained, frozen, codebook representation converts a sensor’s observed measurements  $\mathbf{x}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{T_{\text{in}}}$  to a sequence of  $T_{\text{in}}/F$  discrete tokens. The forecaster transformer encoder processes these tokenized time series independently for each sensor, adding time-based positional encodings to each token along the time dimension. Using a series of multi-head attention layers, the model predicts the forecasted measurements  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{T_{\text{out}}}$  for  $s = 1, \dots, S$ , applying the attention mechanism along the time dimension  $T$ . In parallel, the forecaster takes in  $\mathbf{x}_s$  and predicts the future’s mean,  $\mu_s$ , and standard deviation,  $\sigma_s$ , for each sensor  $s = 1, \dots, S$  to unnormalize the data. The final forecasted prediction is  $\mathbf{y}_s = \sigma_s \cdot \bar{\mathbf{y}}_s + \mu_s$ . The forecaster is trained in a supervised fashion by minimizing three smooth L1 losses between predictions  $\{\bar{\mathbf{y}}_s, \mu_s, \sigma_s\}$  and their ground truth respectively.

## 4. Experimental Setup

Through experiments in imputation (§5), anomaly detection (§6), and forecasting (§7), our goal is to explore the efficacy of TOTEM on standard benchmark datasets and tasks, and domain general settings. To briefly refresh: specialist refers to training on a single domain (Tables 1, 3, 5). Generalist refers to training on multiple domains (Tables 2, 4, 6). Finally, in-domain refers to testing on the training domain, and zero-shot to testing on a separate domain from training.

For all experiments & models, we run three seeds and report the mean; standard deviations are reported in the Appendix A. Following the field standard, we bold the **best** metric in all tables. Evaluation metrics differ across tasks. We report mean squared error MSE ( $\downarrow$ ), mean absolute error MAE ( $\downarrow$ ), precision P ( $\uparrow$ ), recall R ( $\uparrow$ ), and F1 score ( $\uparrow$ ); ( $\downarrow$ ) means lower is better, ( $\uparrow$ ) means higher performance is better. Given the varied metrics we calculate the average number of best results, or `AvgWins`, for each method and




Figure 2. **Forecaster Modeling.** The forecasting task requires modeling beyond the VQVAE. We leverage TOTEM’s pretrained, learnt, discrete codes as the input data representation and train a transformer encoder. We add positional embeddings along the time dimension, and use linear layers before the final output as well as to un-normalize the resulting forecast.

highlight the **best**, **second** best, and **third** best methods.

**Baselines.** We compare to two families of approaches: methods designed for multiple tasks (**multitask**) – TOTEM belongs in this category – and methods designed for a specific task (**singletask**), and are adapted to other tasks.

We compare against two recent **multitask** models, the transformer based GPT2 (Zhou et al., 2023) and the convolutional TimesNet [TiNet] (Wu et al., 2022a). For **singletask** models we compare against PatchTST [Patch] (Nie et al., 2022), ETSFormer [ETS] (Woo et al., 2022), Fedformer [FED] (Zhou et al., 2022), Non-stationary trans. [Stat] (Liu et al., 2022b), Autoformer [Auto] (Wu et al., 2021), Informer [Inf] (Zhou et al., 2021), Reformer [Re] (Kitaev et al., 2020), LightTS [LiTS] (Zhang et al., 2022), DLinear [DLin] (Zeng et al., 2023), Anomaly trans. [ATran] (Xu et al., 2021), Pyraformer [Pyra] (Liu et al., 2021), LogTrans. [LogTr] (Li et al., 2019), Trans. [Trans] (Vaswani et al., 2017), Crossformer [Cross] (Zhang & Yan, 2022), TiDE (Das et al., 2023), RLinear [RLin] (Li et al., 2023), SciNet [SCi] (Liu et al., 2022a), & iTrans. [iTrans] (Liu et al., 2023).

**Datasets.** We leverage 12 benchmark datasets: weather [W], electricity [E], traffic [T], ETTm1 [m1], ETTm2 [m2], ETTh1 [h1], ETTh2 [h2], SMD, MSL, SMAP, SWAT, PSM that are commonly used for imputation, anomaly detection and forecasting (Zhou et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2022a; Xu et al., 2021; Zhang & Yan, 2022; Nie et al., 2022). For the zero shot settings, we leverage 5 benchmark datasets: neuro2 [N2], neuro5 [N5] (Peterson et al., 2022), and saugeen river flow [R], U.S. births [B], and sunspot [S] (Godaheva et al., 2021). 17 datasets in total.

Table 1. **Specialist Imputation** ( $\downarrow$ ). Across all datasets, metrics, and masking percentages, TOTEM has the highest AvgWins (**52.1%**), followed by GPT2 (**35.4%**). TOTEM values are means from 3 seeds; baseline values are from (Zhou et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2022a).

Model	Metric	TOTEM		GPT2		TiNet		Patch		ETS		FED		Stat		Auto		Inf		Re		LiTS		Dlin	
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
W	12.5%	0.028	<b>0.046</b>	<b>0.026</b>	0.049	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.045</b>	0.029	0.049	0.057	0.141	0.041	0.107	0.027	0.051	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.047</b>	0.037	0.093	0.031	0.076	0.047	0.101	0.039	0.084
	25%	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.031</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.052</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.052</b>	0.031	0.053	0.065	0.150	0.064	0.163	<b>0.029</b>	0.056	0.036	0.054	0.042	0.100	0.035	0.082	0.052	0.111	0.048	0.103
	37.5%	<b>0.031</b>	<b>0.048</b>	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.060</b>	<b>0.031</b>	<b>0.057</b>	0.035	<b>0.058</b>	0.081	0.180	0.107	0.239	0.033	0.062	<b>0.032</b>	0.060	0.049	0.111	0.040	0.091	0.058	0.121	0.057	0.117
	50%	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.052</b>	<b>0.037</b>	<b>0.065</b>	<b>0.034</b>	<b>0.062</b>	0.038	<b>0.063</b>	0.102	0.207	0.183	0.312	<b>0.037</b>	0.068	<b>0.037</b>	0.067	0.053	0.114	0.046	0.099	0.065	0.133	0.066	0.134
E	12.5%	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.154</b>	<b>0.089</b>	<b>0.194</b>	0.085	0.202	<b>0.055</b>	<b>0.160</b>	0.196	0.321	0.107	0.237	0.093	0.210	0.089	0.210	0.218	0.326	0.190	0.308	0.102	0.229	0.092	0.214
	25%	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.120</b>	<b>0.087</b>	<b>0.156</b>	0.089	0.206	<b>0.055</b>	<b>0.160</b>	0.207	0.332	0.120	0.231	0.097	0.214	0.096	0.220	0.219	0.326	0.192	0.319	0.121	0.252	0.118	0.247
	37.5%	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.169</b>	<b>0.094</b>	<b>0.211</b>	<b>0.094</b>	0.213	<b>0.076</b>	<b>0.189</b>	0.219	0.344	0.136	0.258	0.102	0.230	0.104	0.259	0.232	0.328	0.203	0.315	0.141	0.273	0.144	0.276
	50%	<b>0.079</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>0.101</b>	<b>0.220</b>	<b>0.100</b>	0.221	<b>0.091</b>	<b>0.208</b>	0.235	0.357	0.138	0.284	0.108	0.228	0.113	0.239	0.228	0.331	0.210	0.319	0.160	0.293	0.175	0.305
m1	12.5%	0.049	0.125	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.085</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.097</b>	0.041	0.130	0.067	0.188	0.035	0.135	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.107</b>	0.034	0.124	0.047	0.155	0.032	0.126	0.075	0.180	0.058	0.163
	25%	<b>0.052</b>	<b>0.128</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.085</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.097</b>	0.041	0.130	0.067	0.188	0.035	0.135	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.107</b>	0.034	0.124	0.047	0.155	0.032	0.126	0.075	0.180	0.058	0.163
	37.5%	<b>0.055</b>	<b>0.132</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.111</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.111</b>	0.049	0.133	0.133	0.271	0.069	0.191	<b>0.039</b>	<b>0.131</b>	0.057	0.109	0.200	0.063	0.182	0.113	0.231	0.103	0.219	
	50%	<b>0.061</b>	<b>0.139</b>	<b>0.040</b>	<b>0.128</b>	<b>0.036</b>	<b>0.124</b>	0.055	0.151	0.186	0.323	0.089	0.218	<b>0.047</b>	<b>0.145</b>	0.067	0.174	0.093	0.218	0.082	0.208	0.134	0.255	0.132	0.248
m2	12.5%	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.078</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.076</b>	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.080</b>	0.026	0.094	0.108	0.239	0.056	0.159	0.021	0.088	0.023	0.092	0.133	0.270	0.108	0.228	0.034	0.127	0.062	0.166
	25%	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.084</b>	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.080</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.097</b>	0.030	0.104	0.154	0.304	0.066	0.195	0.024	0.096	0.026	0.101	0.140	0.262	0.102	0.227	0.042	0.143	0.085	0.190
	37.5%	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.088</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.095</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.098</b>	0.034	0.110	0.162	0.323	0.082	0.196	0.020	0.096	0.026	0.101	0.140	0.262	0.102	0.227	0.042	0.143	0.085	0.190
	50%	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.088</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.095</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.098</b>	0.034	0.110	0.162	0.323	0.082	0.196	0.020	0.096	0.026	0.101	0.140	0.262	0.102	0.227	0.042	0.143	0.085	0.190
h1	12.5%	0.119	0.212	<b>0.043</b>	<b>0.140</b>	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.159</b>	0.093	0.201	0.126	0.263	0.070	0.190	<b>0.060</b>	<b>0.165</b>	0.074	0.182	0.114	0.234	0.074	0.182	0.240	0.345	0.151	0.267
	25%	0.127	0.220	<b>0.043</b>	<b>0.140</b>	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.159</b>	0.107	0.217	0.169	0.304	0.066	0.236	<b>0.080</b>	<b>0.189</b>	0.090	0.203	0.140	0.262	0.102	0.227	0.265	0.364	0.180	0.292
	37.5%	0.138	0.230	<b>0.072</b>	<b>0.180</b>	<b>0.083</b>	<b>0.198</b>	0.120	0.230	0.220	0.347	0.124	0.258	<b>0.102</b>	<b>0.212</b>	0.109	0.222	0.174	0.293	0.135	0.261	0.296	0.382	0.215	0.318
	50%	0.157	0.247	<b>0.107</b>	<b>0.216</b>	<b>0.102</b>	<b>0.215</b>	0.141	0.248	0.293	0.402	0.165	0.299	<b>0.133</b>	<b>0.240</b>	0.137	0.248	0.215	0.325	0.179	0.298	0.334	0.404	0.257	0.347
h2	12.5%	<b>0.040</b>	<b>0.129</b>	<b>0.039</b>	<b>0.125</b>	<b>0.040</b>	<b>0.130</b>	0.057	0.152	0.187	0.319	0.095	0.212	0.042	0.133	0.044	0.138	0.305	0.431	0.163	0.289	0.101	0.231	0.100	0.216
	25%	<b>0.044</b>	<b>0.131</b>	<b>0.044</b>	<b>0.135</b>	<b>0.046</b>	<b>0.131</b>	0.061	0.158	0.200	0.320	0.137	0.308	0.049	0.147	0.050	0.149	0.322	0.444	0.206	0.331	0.115	0.250	0.127	0.247
	37.5%	<b>0.047</b>	<b>0.132</b>	<b>0.047</b>	<b>0.136</b>	<b>0.047</b>	<b>0.136</b>	0.067	0.166	0.200	0.325	0.137	0.308	0.056	0.158	0.060	0.163	0.353	0.443	0.232	0.370	0.126	0.250	0.128	0.247
	50%	<b>0.047</b>	<b>0.142</b>	<b>0.059</b>	<b>0.158</b>	<b>0.060</b>	<b>0.162</b>	0.073	0.174	0.202	0.322	0.134	0.341	0.065	0.170	0.068	0.173	0.369	0.472	0.316	0.419	0.136	0.268	0.183	0.299
AvgWins		<b>52.1%</b>		<b>35.4%</b>		<b>18.8%</b>		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

Table 2. **Generalist Imputation** ( $\downarrow$ ). TOTEM & GPT2 simultaneously train on all in domain datasets, 3 seeds each. **A. In-Domain Performance.** TOTEM has the highest AvgWins at **58.3%**. **B. Zero-Shot Performance.** We test on unseen datasets zero-shot. TOTEM again has the highest AvgWins at **80.0%**.

#### A. In-Domain Performance

Model	Metric	TOTEM		GPT2	
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
W	12.5%	<b>0.029</b>	0.060	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.045</b>
	25%	<b>0.030</b>	0.060	0.033	<b>0.048</b>
	37.5%	<b>0.032</b>	0.062	0.037	<b>0.054</b>
	50%	<b>0.036</b>	0.067	0.043	<b>0.061</b>
E	12.5%	<b>0.065</b>	<b>0.171</b>	0.080	0.186
	25%	<b>0.071</b>	<b>0.179</b>	0.091	0.197
	37.5%	<b>0.080</b>	<b>0.189</b>	0.108	0.213
	50%	<b>0.095</b>	<b>0.205</b>	0.132	0.236
m1	12.5%	<b>0.041</b>	<b>0.132</b>	0.052	0.141
	25%	<b>0.044</b>	<b>0.135</b>	0.065	0.154
	37.5%	<b>0.048</b>	<b>0.139</b>	0.085	0.171
	50%	<b>0.058</b>	<b>0.152</b>	0.117	0.196
m2	12.5%	0.040	0.125	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.095</b>
	25%	0.041	0.126	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.101</b>
	37.5%	0.043	0.129	<b>0.038</b>	<b>0.110</b>
	50%	0.048	0.136	<b>0.045</b>	<b>0.121</b>
h1	12.5%	<b>0.100</b>	<b>0.201</b>	0.113	0.217
	25%	<b>0.128</b>	<b>0.209</b>	0.131	0.231
	37.5%	<b>0.128</b>	<b>0.209</b>	0.131	0.231
	50%	<b>0.144</b>	<b>0.234</b>	0.182	0.266
h2	12.5%	0.075	0.175	<b>0.067</b>	<b>0.155</b>
	25%	0.076	0.177	<b>0.071</b>	<b>0.160</b>
	37.5%	0.093	0.195	<b>0.077</b>	<b>0.167</b>
	50%	0.089	0.192	<b>0.086</b>	<b>0.179</b>
AvgWins		<b>58.3%</b>		43.8%	

#### B. Zero-Shot Performance

Model	Metric	TOTEM		GPT2	
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
N2	12.5%	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.120</b>	0.047	0.145
	25%	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.127</b>	0.064	0.164
	37.5%	<b>0.041</b>	<b>0.139</b>	0.090	0.191
	50%	<b>0.056</b>	<b>0.160</b>	0.131	0.228
N5	12.5%	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.085</b>	0.021	0.095
	25%	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.090</b>	0.028	0.107
	37.5%	<b>0.022</b>	<b>0.098</b>	0.039	0.123
	50%	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.110</b>	0.055	0.145
R	12.5%	<b>0.071</b>	<b>0.109</b>	0.093	0.119
	25%	<b>0.087</b>	<b>0.117</b>	0.125	0.134
	37.5%	<b>0.112</b>	<b>0.129</b>	0.167	0.154
	50%	<b>0.148</b>	<b>0.147</b>	0.220	0.182
B	12.5%	0.632	0.642	<b>0.392</b>	<b>0.496</b>
	25%	0.693	0.665	<b>0.444</b>	<b>0.553</b>
	37.5%	0.761	0.690	<b>0.591</b>	<b>0.599</b>
	50%	0.827	0.718	<b>0.591</b>	<b>0.599</b>
S	12.5%	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.160</b>	0.070	0.173
	25%	<b>0.061</b>	<b>0.168</b>	0.084	0.189
	37.5%	<b>0.069</b>	<b>0.178</b>	0.103	0.209
	50%	<b>0.082</b>	<b>0.193</b>	0.128	0.234
AvgWins		<b>80.0%</b>		20.0%	

## 5. Imputation

In imputation, models intake a masked time series  $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$ , and then reconstruct and impute  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$ . We experiment with four canonical masking percentages at 12.5%, 25%, 37.5%, 50%, and report MSE and MAE.

**Specialist.** In Table 1 we compare TOTEM to baselines. All models are trained and evaluated on the same dataset (in-domain). TOTEM has the highest AvgWins with 52.1%, followed by GPT2 at 35.4%, and TiNet at 18.8%. TOTEM performance for m1 and h1 is lower; notably these datasets are the minute and hour resampling of the same raw data respectively. We investigate and discuss TOTEM’s success

across different domains in Table 9.

**Generalist.** In Table 2 we compare TOTEM to GPT2 (best performing models above), when both models are trained on the aggregate of W, E, m1, m2, h1, h2. We test them on the in-domain and zero-shot test sets. TOTEM outperforms GPT2 in-domain, 58.3% vs. 43.8%, and by a much larger margin in zero-shot, 80% vs. 20%.

Table 3. **Specialist Anomaly Detection** ( $\uparrow$ ). TOTEM has the highest AvgWins at **33.3%** followed by a five-way tie between GPT2, TiNet, ATrans, ETS, and LogTr at **13.3%**. Some prior methods use the test set as a validation set for early stopping of the learning algorithm, which can inflate performance. We do not adopt this practice and train TOTEM for a set number of iterations.

Model	TOTEM	GPT2	TiNet	ATran	Patch	ETS	FED	Stat	Auto	Pyra	Inf	Re	LogTr	Trans	LiTS	DLin	
F1	SMD	79.62	<b>86.89</b>	84.61	<b>85.49</b>	84.62	83.13	85.08	84.62	<b>85.11</b>	83.04	81.65	75.32	76.21	79.56	82.53	77.10
	MSL	82.38	82.45	81.84	83.31	78.70	<b>85.03</b>	78.57	77.50	79.05	<b>84.86</b>	84.06	84.40	79.57	78.68	78.95	<b>84.88</b>
	SMAP	<b>94.02</b>	<b>72.88</b>	69.39	<b>71.18</b>	68.82	69.50	70.76	71.09	71.12	71.09	69.92	70.40	69.97	69.70	69.21	69.26
	SWAT	<b>94.27</b>	<b>94.23</b>	93.02	83.10	85.72	84.91	93.19	79.88	92.74	91.78	81.43	82.80	80.52	80.37	<b>93.33</b>	87.52
	PSM	95.87	97.13	<b>97.34</b>	79.40	96.08	91.76	<b>97.23</b>	<b>97.29</b>	93.29	82.08	77.10	73.61	76.74	76.07	97.15	93.55
R	SMD	76.06	<b>84.98</b>	81.54	82.23	82.14	79.23	<b>82.39</b>	81.21	<b>82.35</b>	80.61	77.23	69.24	70.13	76.13	78.42	71.52
	MSL	82.85	82.91	75.36	<b>87.37</b>	70.96	84.93	80.07	<b>89.14</b>	80.92	85.93	86.48	83.31	<b>87.37</b>	<b>87.37</b>	75.78	85.42
	SMAP	<b>94.04</b>	<b>60.95</b>	56.40	58.11	55.46	55.75	58.10	<b>59.02</b>	58.62	57.71	57.13	57.44	57.59	57.12	55.27	55.41
	SWAT	95.91	96.34	95.40	<b>97.32</b>	80.94	80.36	96.42	<b>96.75</b>	95.81	96.00	<b>96.75</b>	96.53	<b>97.32</b>	96.53	94.72	95.30
	PSM	94.21	95.68	96.20	94.72	93.47	85.28	<b>97.16</b>	<b>96.76</b>	88.15	96.02	96.33	95.38	<b>98.00</b>	96.56	95.97	89.26
P	SMD	83.54	<b>88.89</b>	87.91	<b>88.91</b>	87.26	87.44	87.95	<b>88.33</b>	88.06	85.61	86.60	82.58	83.46	83.58	87.10	83.62
	MSL	82.32	82.00	<b>89.54</b>	79.61	<b>88.34</b>	85.13	77.14	68.55	77.27	83.81	81.77	<b>85.51</b>	73.05	71.57	82.40	84.34
	SMAP	<b>94.00</b>	90.60	90.14	91.85	90.64	92.25	90.47	<b>89.37</b>	90.40	<b>92.54</b>	90.11	90.91	89.15	89.37	<b>82.58</b>	92.32
	SWAT	<b>92.68</b>	<b>92.20</b>	90.75	72.51	91.10	90.02	90.17	68.03	89.85	87.92	70.29	72.50	68.67	68.84	<b>91.98</b>	80.91
	PSM	97.58	98.62	98.51	68.35	<b>98.84</b>	<b>99.31</b>	97.31	<b>97.82</b>	<b>99.08</b>	71.67	64.27	59.93	63.06	62.75	98.37	98.28
AvgWins	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	0%	<b>13.3%</b>	0%	6.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<b>13.3%</b>	0%	0%	0%	

Table 4. **Generalist Anomaly Detection** ( $\uparrow$ ). We train TOTEM & GPT2 on all datasets and then perform in-domain and zero-shot evaluations. **A. In-Domain Performance.** TOTEM outperforms GPT2: **80.0%** vs. 20.0%. **B. Zero-Shot Performance.** TOTEM again outperforms GPT2: **73.3%** vs. 26.7%.

A. In-Domain Performance			B. Zero-Shot Performance			
Model	TOTEM	GPT2	Model	TOTEM	GPT2	
F1	SMD	78.64	<b>79.73</b>	N2	<b>51.29</b>	39.02
	MSL	<b>83.29</b>	80.17	N5	<b>51.28</b>	42.19
	SMAP	<b>92.51</b>	67.05	R	<b>49.39</b>	36.14
	SWAT	<b>94.37</b>	89.62	R	<b>49.15</b>	20.81
	PSM	<b>95.78</b>	90.47	S	<b>52.17</b>	38.12
R	SMD	72.07	<b>73.42</b>	N2	<b>76.88</b>	33.69
	MSL	<b>82.96</b>	78.48	N5	<b>76.84</b>	36.77
	SMAP	<b>91.48</b>	53.42	R	<b>70.49</b>	29.66
	SWAT	<b>96.13</b>	87.53	R	<b>73.71</b>	17.67
	PSM	<b>93.90</b>	87.76	S	<b>77.36</b>	31.83
P	SMD	86.66	<b>87.44</b>	N2	38.49	<b>46.43</b>
	MSL	<b>83.64</b>	81.95	N5	38.48	<b>49.58</b>
	SMAP	<b>93.56</b>	90.01	R	38.02	<b>46.30</b>
	SWAT	<b>92.68</b>	91.83	R	<b>36.86</b>	25.33
	PSM	<b>97.74</b>	93.39	S	39.35	<b>47.72</b>
AvgWins	<b>80.0%</b>	20.0%	AvgWins	<b>73.3%</b>	26.7%	

settings demonstrate that tokens are a performant representation for anomaly detection.

## 7. Forecasting

In forecasting, models intake a time series  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{in}}$  and predict future readings  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T_{out}}$ , where  $S$  is the number of sensors and  $T_{in}, T_{out}$  signify the durations of the preceding and succeeding time series, respectively. The pairs  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are generated by striding the original time series data.

All models have a lookback of  $T_{in} = 96$ , with prediction lengths  $T_{out} = \{96, 192, 336, 720\}$ . Numbers for other methods are from (Liu et al., 2023). We run GPT2 with  $T_{in} = 96$  as they originally report varying, dataset-specific, lookback lengths. We report MSE ( $\downarrow$ ) and MAE ( $\downarrow$ ).

**Specialist.** From Table 5 we find that TOTEM achieves the highest AvgWins at 28.6% followed by iTrans at 26.8%. TOTEM has first finishes in five datasets while iTrans’ first finishes are concentrated in only electricity and traffic.

**Generalist.** In Table 6 we compare generalist TOTEM

and GPT2. TOTEM outperforms GPT2 for both in-domain (67.9% vs. 33.9%) and zero-shot (90.0% vs. 12.5%).

TOTEM’s AvgWins forecasting performance across the training and testing regimes demonstrates that tokens are a performant representation for forecasting.

## 8. Ablations

**Tokens vs. Time.** To evaluate if tokens enable TOTEM’s performance, we implement TimeTOTEM. TimeTOTEM has the identical architecture to TOTEM, except we replace the VQVAE with an MLP trained end-to-end with the downstream forecaster. We compare Totem vs. TimeTOTEM in the specialist in-domain, and generalist in-domain and zero-shot regimes (Table 7). In all cases TOTEM outperforms TimeTOTEM - specialist: 67.9% vs. 39.3%, generalist in-domain: 78.6% vs. 23.2%, generalist zero-shot: 67.5% vs. 35.0%. TOTEM’s performance demonstrates that tokens, when compared to time, lead to better performance.

**Codebook Size.** In Table 7 we explore the affect of the codebook size,  $K$ , on the VQVAE’s MSE and MAE reconstruction performance. As expected, we find that as  $K$  increases from 32 to 256 to 512 the reconstruction performance improves.

## 9. Exploratory Studies in Generalist Modeling

**Generalist Codebooks.** To further explore the capabilities of a generalist codebook data representation we train models that utilize a general codebook but dataset-specific transformer forecasters, e.g. a TOTEM VQVAE trained on multiple domains with a forecaster trained only on electricity, Table 8. We compare these mixed models to generalist and specialist models trained on the same domains. All models use the same the codebook hyperparameters (number of codewords  $K = 256$ , compression factor  $F = 4$ , code dimensionality  $D = 64$ ) as well as the forecaster transformer architecture to ensure a fair comparison.

Table 5. **Specialist Forecasting** ( $\downarrow$ ). TOTEM has the best AvgWins (**28.6%**), followed by iTrans (**26.8%**). Notably, TOTEM has first place finishes in 5 datasets, while iTrans’ first places are concentrated in only electricity and traffic. All models have lookback  $T_{in} = 96$ .

Model	TOTEM		GPT2		TiNet		iTrans		Patch		Cross		FED		Stat		TiDE		RLin		DLin		SCi		
	Metric	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE		
W	96	<b>0.165</b>	<b>0.208</b>	0.184	0.224	<b>0.172</b>	<b>0.214</b>	0.174	<b>0.218</b>	<b>0.158</b>	<b>0.230</b>	0.217	0.296	0.173	0.223	0.202	0.261	0.192	0.232	0.261	0.196	0.255	0.221	0.306	
	192	<b>0.267</b>	<b>0.259</b>	0.231	0.263	<b>0.216</b>	<b>0.261</b>	0.221	<b>0.254</b>	0.225	<b>0.259</b>	<b>0.206</b>	0.276	0.276	0.276	0.245	0.285	0.242	0.298	0.240	0.271	0.237	0.296	0.261	
	336	<b>0.257</b>	<b>0.291</b>	0.285	0.302	<b>0.280</b>	<b>0.306</b>	0.285	<b>0.278</b>	<b>0.296</b>	<b>0.272</b>	0.335	0.339	0.380	0.321	0.338	0.287	0.335	0.292	0.307	0.283	0.335	0.309	0.378	
	720	<b>0.326</b>	<b>0.340</b>	0.362	0.351	0.365	0.359	0.358	<b>0.349</b>	0.354	<b>0.348</b>	0.398	0.418	0.403	0.428	0.414	0.410	<b>0.351</b>	0.386	0.364	0.353	<b>0.345</b>	0.381	0.377	0.427
E	96	<b>0.178</b>	<b>0.263</b>	0.186	<b>0.272</b>	<b>0.168</b>	<b>0.272</b>	<b>0.148</b>	<b>0.240</b>	0.195	0.285	0.219	0.314	0.193	0.308	<b>0.169</b>	0.273	0.237	0.329	0.201	0.281	0.197	0.282	0.247	0.345
	192	<b>0.187</b>	<b>0.272</b>	0.190	<b>0.278</b>	<b>0.184</b>	0.289	0.162	<b>0.253</b>	0.199	0.280	0.231	0.322	0.201	0.315	<b>0.182</b>	0.286	0.236	0.350	0.201	0.283	0.196	0.285	0.257	0.355
	336	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.263</b>	0.204	<b>0.271</b>	<b>0.168</b>	0.289	0.178	<b>0.269</b>	0.215	0.305	0.236	0.337	0.214	0.329	0.200	0.304	0.239	0.344	0.215	0.298	0.209	0.301	0.269	0.369
	720	<b>0.236</b>	<b>0.318</b>	0.245	0.324	<b>0.220</b>	<b>0.320</b>	<b>0.225</b>	<b>0.317</b>	0.256	0.337	0.280	0.363	0.246	0.355	<b>0.222</b>	0.321	0.284	0.373	0.257	0.331	0.245	0.333	0.299	0.390
T	96	<b>0.523</b>	<b>0.303</b>	<b>0.471</b>	0.311	0.593	0.321	<b>0.395</b>	<b>0.268</b>	0.544	0.359	<b>0.526</b>	<b>0.290</b>	0.587	0.366	0.612	0.338	0.805	0.493	0.649	0.389	0.650	0.396	0.788	0.499
	192	<b>0.530</b>	<b>0.311</b>	<b>0.490</b>	0.317	0.617	0.336	<b>0.417</b>	<b>0.276</b>	0.540	0.334	<b>0.536</b>	<b>0.304</b>	0.604	0.373	0.613	0.366	0.756	0.474	0.609	0.366	0.593	0.373	0.797	0.508
	336	<b>0.549</b>	<b>0.311</b>	<b>0.490</b>	0.317	0.629	0.336	<b>0.433</b>	<b>0.283</b>	0.551	0.338	<b>0.558</b>	<b>0.305</b>	0.621	0.383	0.618	0.328	0.762	0.477	0.609	0.369	0.605	0.373	0.797	0.508
	720	<b>0.598</b>	<b>0.331</b>	<b>0.524</b>	0.336	0.640	0.350	<b>0.467</b>	<b>0.302</b>	<b>0.536</b>	0.375	<b>0.589</b>	<b>0.328</b>	0.626	0.382	0.653	0.355	0.719	0.449	0.647	0.387	0.645	0.394	0.841	0.523
m1	96	<b>0.320</b>	<b>0.347</b>	<b>0.328</b>	<b>0.363</b>	0.338	0.375	0.334	0.368	<b>0.329</b>	<b>0.367</b>	0.404	0.426	0.379	0.419	0.386	0.398	0.364	0.387	0.355	0.376	0.345	0.372	0.418	0.438
	192	<b>0.379</b>	<b>0.382</b>	<b>0.368</b>	<b>0.382</b>	<b>0.374</b>	0.387	0.377	0.391	<b>0.367</b>	<b>0.385</b>	0.450	0.451	0.426	0.441	0.459	0.444	0.398	0.404	0.391	0.392	0.380	0.389	0.439	0.450
	336	<b>0.406</b>	<b>0.402</b>	<b>0.385</b>	<b>0.404</b>	0.410	0.411	0.426	0.420	<b>0.399</b>	<b>0.410</b>	0.532	0.515	0.445	0.459	0.495	0.464	0.438	0.428	0.423	0.424	0.415	0.413	0.413	0.490
	720	<b>0.471</b>	<b>0.438</b>	<b>0.462</b>	<b>0.440</b>	0.478	0.450	0.491	0.459	<b>0.454</b>	<b>0.439</b>	0.666	0.589	0.543	0.490	0.585	0.516	0.487	0.461	0.487	0.450	0.474	0.453	0.595	0.550
m2	96	<b>0.176</b>	<b>0.253</b>	<b>0.178</b>	<b>0.263</b>	0.187	0.267	0.180	0.264	<b>0.175</b>	<b>0.259</b>	0.287	0.366	0.203	0.287	0.192	0.274	0.207	0.305	0.182	0.265	0.193	0.292	0.286	0.377
	192	<b>0.247</b>	<b>0.302</b>	<b>0.245</b>	<b>0.307</b>	0.249	0.309	0.250	0.309	<b>0.241</b>	<b>0.302</b>	0.414	0.492	0.269	0.328	0.280	0.339	0.290	0.364	<b>0.246</b>	<b>0.304</b>	0.284	0.362	0.399	0.445
	336	<b>0.406</b>	<b>0.459</b>	<b>0.348</b>	<b>0.424</b>	0.431	0.448	0.435	0.448	<b>0.305</b>	<b>0.406</b>	0.597	0.542	0.325	0.366	0.334	0.361	0.277	0.422	<b>0.340</b>	<b>0.342</b>	0.369	0.427	0.637	0.591
	720	<b>0.426</b>	<b>0.410</b>	<b>0.410</b>	<b>0.409</b>	<b>0.408</b>	<b>0.403</b>	0.412	0.407	<b>0.402</b>	<b>0.400</b>	1.730	1.042	0.421	0.415	0.417	0.413	0.558	0.524	<b>0.407</b>	<b>0.398</b>	0.554	0.522	0.960	0.735
h1	96	<b>0.380</b>	<b>0.394</b>	<b>0.379</b>	<b>0.397</b>	0.384	0.402	0.386	0.405	0.414	0.419	0.423	0.448	<b>0.376</b>	0.419	0.513	0.491	0.479	0.464	0.386	<b>0.395</b>	0.386	0.400	0.654	0.599
	192	<b>0.434</b>	<b>0.427</b>	<b>0.438</b>	<b>0.427</b>	<b>0.436</b>	0.429	0.441	0.436	0.460	0.445	0.471	0.474	<b>0.420</b>	0.448	0.534	0.504	0.525	0.492	<b>0.424</b>	<b>0.424</b>	0.437	0.432	0.719	0.631
	336	<b>0.443</b>	<b>0.459</b>	<b>0.474</b>	<b>0.449</b>	0.491	0.460	0.487	<b>0.458</b>	0.501	0.466	0.570	0.546	<b>0.459</b>	0.465	0.588	0.535	0.565	0.518	<b>0.479</b>	<b>0.476</b>	0.481	0.459	0.778	0.689
	720	<b>0.539</b>	<b>0.513</b>	<b>0.496</b>	<b>0.449</b>	0.521	0.500	0.505	0.491	<b>0.500</b>	<b>0.468</b>	0.653	0.621	0.506	0.507	0.643	0.616	0.594	0.558	<b>0.481</b>	<b>0.476</b>	0.519	0.516	0.836	0.699
h2	96	<b>0.293</b>	<b>0.338</b>	<b>0.295</b>	<b>0.348</b>	0.340	0.374	0.297	0.349	0.302	<b>0.348</b>	0.745	0.584	0.358	0.397	0.476	0.458	0.400	0.440	<b>0.288</b>	<b>0.338</b>	0.333	0.387	0.707	0.621
	192	<b>0.375</b>	<b>0.390</b>	0.384	0.402	0.402	0.414	<b>0.380</b>	<b>0.400</b>	0.388	<b>0.400</b>	0.877	0.656	0.429	0.439	0.512	0.493	0.528	0.509	<b>0.374</b>	<b>0.390</b>	0.477	0.476	0.860	0.689
	336	<b>0.422</b>	<b>0.431</b>	<b>0.418</b>	<b>0.432</b>	0.431	0.431	0.428	<b>0.435</b>	0.426	0.433	1.043	0.731	0.496	0.487	0.552	0.551	0.643	0.571	<b>0.425</b>	<b>0.426</b>	0.594	0.541	1.000	0.843
	720	<b>0.610</b>	<b>0.567</b>	<b>0.423</b>	<b>0.436</b>	0.462	0.468	<b>0.427</b>	<b>0.445</b>	0.431	<b>0.446</b>	1.104	0.765	0.465	0.474	0.562	0.560	0.874	0.679	<b>0.420</b>	<b>0.440</b>	0.831	0.657	1.249	0.838
AvgWins	<b>28.6%</b>	1.8%	1.8%	<b>26.8%</b>	14.3%	3.6%	5.4%	0%	0%	<b>25%</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

Table 6. **Generalist Forecasting** ( $\downarrow$ ). Here we evaluate the generalist TOTEM and GPT2 models. **A. In-Domain Performance.** TOTEM outperforms GPT2: 67.9% to 33.9%. **B. Zero-Shot Performance.** TOTEM outperforms GPT2: 90.0% to 12.5%.

A. In-Domain Performance			B. Zero-Shot Performance		
Model	TOTEM	GPT2	Model	TOTEM	GPT2
Metric	MSE	MAE	Metric	MSE	MAE
W	96	<b>0.172</b>	<b>0.216</b>	0.201	0.237
	192	<b>0.217</b>	<b>0.256</b>	0.247	0.275
	336	<b>0.266</b>	<b>0.295</b>	0.298	0.311
	720	<b>0.334</b>	<b>0.342</b>	0.372	0.360
E	96	<b>0.179</b>	<b>0.264</b>	0.194	0.278
	192	<b>0.181</b>	<b>0.267</b>	0.199	0.284
	336	<b>0.196</b>	<b>0.283</b>	0.214	0.300
	720	<b>0.230</b>	<b>0.314</b>	0.255	0.331
T	96	<b>0.507</b>	<b>0.284</b>	<b>0.484</b>	0.320
	192	<b>0.311</b>	<b>0.282</b>	<b>0.488</b>	0.326
	336	<b>0.335</b>	<b>0.292</b>	<b>0.508</b>	0.326
	720	<b>0.580</b>	<b>0.309</b>	<b>0.534</b>	0.343
m1	96	<b>0.374</b>	<b>0.384</b>	0.487	0.468
	192	<b>0.400</b>	<b>0.399</b>	0.516	0.480
	336	<b>0.432</b>	<b>0.424</b>	0.548	0.499
	720	<b>0.487</b>	<b>0.460</b>	0.581	0.511
m2	96	<b>0.198</b>	<b>0.275</b>	0.243	0.315
	192	<b>0.266</b>	<b>0.319</b>	0.297	0.346
	336	<b>0.365</b>	<b>0.377</b>	<b>0.349</b>	<b>0.376</b>
	720	<b>0.588</b>	<b>0.511</b>	<b>0.439</b>	<b>0.423</b>
h1	96	<b>0.382</b>	<b>0.404</b>	0.421	0.408
	192	<b>0.463</b>	<b>0.435</b>	0.480	0.436
	336	<b>0.507</b>	<b>0.463</b>	0.518	0.453
	720	<b>0.517</b>	<b>0.500</b>	<b>0.517</b>	<b>0.467</b>
h2	96	0.307	0.345	<b>0.298</b>	<b>0.343</b>
	192	0.406	0.403	<b>0.381</b>	<b>0.392</b>
	336	0.505	0.460	<b>0.406</b>	<b>0.419</b>
	720	0.661	0.557	<b>0.423</b>	<b>0.438</b>
AvgWins	<b>67.9%</b>	33.9%	AvgWins	<b>90.0%</b>	12.5%

Since we are evaluating the specialists, mixed-models, and generalist on in-domain test data one might expect that the TOTEM specialists will significantly outperform all models. Surprisingly this intuition is not correct. When comparing models trained using specialist codebooks to models trained using a single generalist codebook we find that generalist codebook models outperform specialist codebook models: 66.1% vs. 57.1%. Upon further inspection we find that the fully-generalist model (far right column Table 8) significantly outperforms the mixed-models (middle column Table 8) in traffic (T) and electricity (E). This dominant

performance is puzzling until considering the training sizes.

The largest training set across domains belongs to traffic (T) at 10.2M training examples. In dataset T, the fully generalist models achieves 100% AvgWins . The second largest training set belongs to electricity (E) at 5.8M training examples, with 75% AvgWins for the fully-generalist model. Unfortunately there is a sharp drop off in training set sizes, with the rest of the data domains collectively comprising 1.6M training examples. These results evoke questions. For instance: does training on the smaller datasets act like form of regularization? Or: how does in-domain generalist performance scale with dataset size? We leave these exciting directions for future work. The generalist codebook’s performance across datasets highlights the potential of unified, discrete, token representations for in-domain evaluations.

**Zero Shot Vignette: Training Size & Data Diversity.** Here we further explore generalist and specialist zero-shot testing capabilities, Table 9. We take the two largest TOTEM specialist, traffic at

Table 7. **Ablations** ( $\downarrow$ ). Across the Tokens vs. Time (TvT) experiments tokens outperform time. (A) specialist: 67.9% to 39.3%, (B) in-domain generalist: 78.6% to 23.2%, and (C) zero-shot generalist: 67.5% to 35%. (D) As the codebook size  $K$  increases the VQVAE reconstruction performance improves.

A. TvT Specialist					B. TvT In-Domain Generalist					
Model	TOTEM	TimeTOTEM	Metric		Model	TOTEM	TimeTOTEM	Metric		
	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	
W	96	0.165	0.208	0.164	0.209	96	0.172	0.216	0.173	0.218
	192	0.207	0.250	0.209	0.251	192	0.217	0.256	0.218	0.261
	336	0.257	0.291	0.261	0.293	336	0.266	0.295	0.267	0.299
	720	0.326	0.340	0.332	0.340	720	0.334	0.342	0.337	0.347
E	96	0.178	0.263	0.179	0.262	96	0.179	0.264	0.183	0.267
	192	0.187	0.272	0.185	0.269	192	0.181	0.267	0.189	0.275
	336	0.199	0.285	0.204	0.289	336	0.196	0.283	0.204	0.291
	720	0.236	0.318	0.244	0.325	720	0.230	0.314	0.242	0.325
T	96	0.523	0.303	0.528	0.310	96	0.507	0.284	0.517	0.293
	192	0.530	0.303	0.500	0.349	192	0.511	0.282	0.526	0.296
	336	0.549	0.311	0.531	0.365	336	0.535	0.292	0.552	0.304
	720	0.598	0.331	0.578	0.398	720	0.580	0.309	0.602	0.326
m1	96	0.320	0.347	0.326	0.355	96	0.374	0.384	0.428	0.420
	192	0.379	0.382	0.377	0.386	192	0.400	0.399	0.438	0.427
	336	0.406	0.402	0.409	0.409	336	0.432	0.424	0.469	0.447
	720	0.471	0.438	0.469	0.441	720	0.487	0.460	0.546	0.493
m2	96	0.176	0.253	0.176	0.254	96	0.198	0.275	0.207	0.286
	192	0.247	0.302	0.247	0.303	192	0.266	0.319	0.269	0.325
	336	0.317	0.348	0.318	0.350	336	0.365	0.377	0.358	0.377
	720	0.426	0.410	0.419	0.411	720	0.588	0.511	0.521	0.482
h1	96	0.380	0.394	0.377	0.395	96	0.382	0.404	0.401	0.410
	192	0.434	0.427	0.428	0.428	192	0.463	0.435	0.453	0.441
	336	0.490	0.459	0.480	0.462	336	0.507	0.463	0.496	0.468
	720	0.539	0.513	0.530	0.522	720	0.517	0.503	0.518	0.510
h2	96	0.293	0.338	0.294	0.338	96	0.307	0.345	0.305	0.346
	192	0.375	0.390	0.374	0.389	192	0.406	0.403	0.396	0.402
	336	0.422	0.431	0.423	0.433	336	0.505	0.460	0.492	0.458
	720	0.610	0.567	0.591	0.556	720	0.661	0.557	0.599	0.531
AvgWins <b>67.9%</b>   39.3%					AvgWins <b>78.6%</b>   23.2%					

C. TvT Zero-Shot Generalist

Model	TOTEM	TimeTOTEM	Metric		
	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	
N2	96	1.138	0.777	1.127	0.773
	192	1.149	0.785	1.169	0.793
	336	1.092	0.770	1.115	0.780
	720	1.045	0.754	1.070	0.766
N5	96	0.483	0.484	0.481	0.483
	192	0.495	0.491	0.508	0.500
	336	0.468	0.483	0.481	0.491
	720	0.451	0.477	0.467	0.488
R	96	1.120	0.582	1.102	0.578
	192	1.242	0.635	1.207	0.628
	336	1.237	0.626	1.190	0.613
	720	1.182	0.604	1.149	0.596
B	96	0.805	0.739	0.825	0.751
	192	0.836	0.752	0.847	0.761
	336	0.809	0.748	0.831	0.764
	720	0.896	0.794	0.928	0.813
S	96	0.446	0.482	0.446	0.481
	192	0.462	0.491	0.478	0.499
	336	0.521	0.525	0.535	0.532
	720	0.717	0.625	0.736	0.631
AvgWins <b>67.5%</b>   35.0%					

D. Codebook Size Ablations

	Codebook Size $K$		
	32	256	512
	MSE		
All	0.0451	0.0192	<b>0.0184</b>
T	0.0312	0.0120	<b>0.0101</b>
E	0.0463	0.0209	<b>0.0152</b>
W	0.0393	0.0161	<b>0.0128</b>
	MAE		
All	0.1460	0.0937	<b>0.0913</b>
T	0.1204	0.0749	<b>0.0685</b>
E	0.1520	0.1027	<b>0.0878</b>
W	0.1122	0.0673	<b>0.0607</b>
AvgWins 0%   0%   100%			

electricity domain is more similar than the traffic domain to neuro, river, births, and sunspot. Another possible explanation comes from the raw time series dimensionality. Despite having fewer training examples, electricity has a higher number of raw time steps<sup>4</sup> compared to traffic: 26304 vs. 17544. However, traffic has a larger number of sensors: 862 vs. 321. This limited analysis suggests that a higher number of raw time steps is more valuable than more sensor readings. Untangling these possibilities and beginning to answer the questions: what is a unit of data in time series? And how does this unit scale as the time steps, sensors, and examples scale? are valuable future directions. The zero shot vignette has demonstrated the power of the token-enabled generalist over the traffic and electricity specialists, and has opened up exciting training size and data diversity questions.

<sup>4</sup>Raw time steps for all data. The train:val:test ratio is 7:1:2.

Table 8. Generalist codes beat specialist codes: 66.1% vs 57.1%.

Codebook Forecaster	Metric	Specialist		Generalist			
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE		
W	96	0.165	0.208	0.164	0.208	0.172	0.216
	192	0.207	0.250	0.208	0.251	0.217	0.256
	336	0.257	0.291	0.258	0.290	0.266	0.295
	720	0.326	0.340	0.329	0.338	0.334	0.342
E	96	0.178	0.263	0.178	0.263	0.179	0.264
	192	0.187	0.272	0.187	0.273	0.181	0.267
	336	0.199	0.285	0.199	0.285	0.196	0.283
	720	0.236	0.318	0.238	0.320	0.230	0.314
T	96	0.523	0.303	0.521	0.301	0.507	0.284
	192	0.530	0.303	0.530	0.303	0.511	0.282
	336	0.549	0.311	0.555	0.313	0.535	0.292
	720	0.598	0.331	0.605	0.337	0.580	0.309
m1	96	0.320	0.347	0.328	0.352	0.374	0.384
	192	0.379	0.382	0.377	0.383	0.400	0.399
	336	0.406	0.402	0.408	0.404	0.432	0.424
	720	0.471	0.438	0.470	0.440	0.487	0.460
m2	96	0.176	0.253	0.175	0.253	0.198	0.275
	192	0.247	0.302	0.247	0.302	0.266	0.319
	336	0.317	0.348	0.318	0.348	0.365	0.377
	720	0.426	0.410	0.427	0.410	0.588	0.511
h1	96	0.380	0.394	0.382	0.395	0.382	0.404
	192	0.434	0.427	0.437	0.427	0.463	0.435
	336	0.490	0.459	0.490	0.460	0.507	0.463
	720	0.539	0.513	0.536	0.512	0.517	0.500
h2	96	0.293	0.338	0.294	0.339	0.307	0.345
	192	0.375	0.390	0.375	0.391	0.406	0.403
	336	0.422	0.431	0.421	0.431	0.505	0.460
	720	0.610	0.567	0.610	0.567	0.661	0.557
AvgWins		<b>57.1%</b>		<b>66.1%</b>			

Table 9. Zero Shot Vignette: Training Size & Diversity

Model	TOTEM Generalist		TOTEM Specialist				
	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE			
Train Domain	ALL		Traffic	Electricity			
Sensor Num ( $S$ )	-		862	321			
Raw Length ( $T$ )	-		17544	26304			
Train Size	17.6M		10.2M	5.8M			
Metric	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE			
N2	96	1.138	0.777	1.194	0.798	1.193	0.802
	192	1.149	0.785	1.218	0.808	1.300	0.845
	336	1.092	0.770	1.190	0.804	1.260	0.837
	720	1.045	0.754	1.117	0.784	1.234	0.832
N5	96	0.483	0.484	0.515	0.505	0.489	0.490
	192	0.495	0.491	0.535	0.514	0.555	0.527
	336	0.468	0.483	0.524	0.513	0.538	0.525
	720	0.451	0.477	0.500	0.507	0.533	0.527
R	96	1.120	0.582	1.171	0.635	1.141	0.579
	192	1.242	0.635	1.273	0.673	1.297	0.652
	336	1.237	0.626	1.232	0.653	1.247	0.628
	720	1.182	0.604	1.198	0.642	1.236	0.633
B	96	0.805	0.739	0.812	0.749	0.820	0.756
	192	0.836	0.752	0.858	0.767	0.843	0.759
	336	0.809	0.748	0.826	0.759	0.791	0.741
	720	0.896	0.794	0.919	0.803	0.886	0.790
S	96	0.446	0.482	0.476	0.508	0.460	0.487
	192	0.462	0.491	0.511	0.528	0.505	0.511
	336	0.521	0.525	0.576	0.568	0.569	0.545
	720	0.717	0.625	0.795	0.685	0.764	0.641
AvgWins		<b>85.0%</b>		<b>2.5%</b>		<b>12.5%</b>	

## 10. Conclusions, Limitations & Future Work

We present TOTEM: a simple, performant tokenizer that works across domains and tasks thereby enabling generalist modeling. TOTEM demonstrates strong in-domain and zero-shot capabilities that match or outperform existing state-of-the-art approaches. Moving forward, an interesting limitation is that TOTEM does not support variable token lengths. Dynamic token lengths could potentially enhance unified data representations and further improve task performance. Other interesting directions include further investigating the relationship between generalist data representations, token length, data size, and domain diversity.



## 11. Impact Statement

There are no immediate ethical concerns that arise from our work. However, as with all data driven methods, certain societal consequences are important to be discussed, in this case surrounding time series modeling. A few are reported below:

**Privacy Concerns.** Time series data, especially when sourced from personal devices or applications, can contain sensitive information about individuals, e.g. for health domains. In this work, no time series were sourced from personal devices.

**Misuse.** Time series forecast models can be misused. For instance, if a model forecasts stock prices or market movements, it could be exploited for insider trading or other illegal financial activities. In this work, we are focused on domains pertinent to scientific disciplines.

**Economic Impacts.** Automated forecasts and decisions based on time series models can significantly impact industries and labor markets both positively and negatively. For instance, if a model can accurately predict weather patterns, it might affect farmers and their crop decisions, or if it can forecast energy consumption, it could impact the energy sector.

## References

- Anderson, O. D. Time-series. 2nd edn., 1976.
- Bai, S., Kolter, J. Z., and Koltun, V. An empirical evaluation of generic convolutional and recurrent networks for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01271*, 2018.
- Barnum, G., Talukder, S., and Yue, Y. On the benefits of early fusion in multimodal representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07191*, 2020.
- Challu, C., Olivares, K. G., Oreshkin, B. N., Ramirez, F. G., Canseco, M. M., and Dubrawski, A. Nhits: Neural hierarchical interpolation for time series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 6989–6997, 2023.
- Chen, S.-A., Li, C.-L., Yoder, N., Arik, S. O., and Pfister, T. Tsmixer: An all-mlp architecture for time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06053*, 2023.
- Das, A., Kong, W., Leach, A., Sen, R., and Yu, R. Long-term forecasting with tide: Time-series dense encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08424*, 2023.
- Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- Duan, Y., Zhou, J., Wang, Z., Wang, Y.-K., and Lin, C.-T. Dewave: Discrete eeg waves encoding for brain dynamics to text translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14030*, 2023.
- Esser, P., Rombach, R., and Ommer, B. Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 12873–12883, 2021.
- Franceschi, J.-Y., Dieuleveut, A., and Jaggi, M. Unsupervised scalable representation learning for multivariate time series. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Gage, P. A new algorithm for data compression. *C Users Journal*, 12(2):23–38, 1994.
- Godahewa, R., Bergmeir, C., Webb, G. I., Hyndman, R. J., and Montero-Manso, P. Monash time series forecasting archive. In *Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021.
- He, Y. and Zhao, J. Temporal convolutional networks for anomaly detection in time series. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 1213, pp. 042050. IOP Publishing, 2019.
- Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- Holt, C. C. Forecasting trends and seasonals by exponentially weighted moving averages. *ONR Memorandum*, 52 (52):5–10, 1957.
- Hyndman, R. J. and Athanasopoulos, G. *Forecasting: principles and practice*. OTexts, 2018.
- Kim, T., Kim, J., Tae, Y., Park, C., Choi, J.-H., and Choo, J. Reversible instance normalization for accurate time-series forecasting against distribution shift. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Kitaev, N., Kaiser, Ł., and Levskaya, A. Reformer: The efficient transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04451*, 2020.
- Li, S., Jin, X., Xuan, Y., Zhou, X., Chen, W., Wang, Y.-X., and Yan, X. Enhancing the locality and breaking the memory bottleneck of transformer on time series forecasting. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Li, Z., Qi, S., Li, Y., and Xu, Z. Revisiting long-term time series forecasting: An investigation on linear mapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10721*, 2023.

- Liu, M., Zeng, A., Chen, M., Xu, Z., Lai, Q., Ma, L., and Xu, Q. Scinet: Time series modeling and forecasting with sample convolution and interaction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:5816–5828, 2022a.
- Liu, S., Yu, H., Liao, C., Li, J., Lin, W., Liu, A. X., and Dustdar, S. Pyraformer: Low-complexity pyramidal attention for long-range time series modeling and forecasting. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2021.
- Liu, Y., Wu, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Non-stationary transformers: Exploring the stationarity in time series forecasting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9881–9893, 2022b.
- Liu, Y., Hu, T., Zhang, H., Wu, H., Wang, S., Ma, L., and Long, M. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06625*, 2023.
- Luo, Y., Cai, X., Zhang, Y., Xu, J., et al. Multivariate time series imputation with generative adversarial networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Luo, Y., Zhang, Y., Cai, X., and Yuan, X. E2gan: End-to-end generative adversarial network for multivariate time series imputation. In *Proceedings of the 28th international joint conference on artificial intelligence*, pp. 3094–3100. AAAI Press Palo Alto, CA, USA, 2019.
- Nie, Y., Nguyen, N. H., Sinthong, P., and Kalagnanam, J. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14730*, 2022.
- Oord, A. v. d., Dieleman, S., Zen, H., Simonyan, K., Vinyals, O., Graves, A., Kalchbrenner, N., Senior, A., and Kavukcuoglu, K. Wavenet: A generative model for raw audio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03499*, 2016.
- Oreshkin, B. N., Carpov, D., Chapados, N., and Bengio, Y. N-beats: Neural basis expansion analysis for interpretable time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10437*, 2019.
- Peterson, S. M., Singh, S. H., Dichter, B., Scheid, M., Rao, R. P., and Brunton, B. W. Ajile12: Long-term naturalistic human intracranial neural recordings and pose. *Scientific data*, 9(1):184, 2022.
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., Sutskever, I., et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- Rasul, K., Gupta, U., Ghonia, H., and Nevmyvaka, Y. Vq-tr: Vector quantized attention for time series forecasting. 2022a.
- Rasul, K., Park, Y.-J., Ramström, M. N., and Kim, K.-M. Vq-ar: Vector quantized autoregressive probabilistic time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15894*, 2022b.
- Rombach, R., Blattmann, A., Lorenz, D., Esser, P., and Ommer, B. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 10684–10695, 2022.
- Salinas, D., Flunkert, V., Gasthaus, J., and Januschowski, T. Deepar: Probabilistic forecasting with autoregressive recurrent networks. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 36(3):1181–1191, 2020.
- Shen, L., Li, Z., and Kwok, J. Timeseries anomaly detection using temporal hierarchical one-class network. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:13016–13026, 2020.
- Talukder, S., Sun, J. J., Leonard, M., Brunton, B. W., and Yue, Y. Deep neural imputation: A framework for recovering incomplete brain recordings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08094*, 2022.
- Taylor, S. J. and Letham, B. Forecasting at scale. *The American Statistician*, 72(1):37–45, 2018.
- Tonekaboni, S., Eytan, D., and Goldenberg, A. Unsupervised representation learning for time series with temporal neighborhood coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00750*, 2021.
- Van Den Oord, A., Vinyals, O., et al. Neural discrete representation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Winters, P. R. Forecasting sales by exponentially weighted moving averages. *Management science*, 6(3):324–342, 1960.
- Woo, G., Liu, C., Sahoo, D., Kumar, A., and Hoi, S. Etsformer: Exponential smoothing transformers for time-series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01381*, 2022.
- Wu, H., Xu, J., Wang, J., and Long, M. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22419–22430, 2021.

- Wu, H., Hu, T., Liu, Y., Zhou, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02186*, 2022a.
- Wu, H., Wu, J., Xu, J., Wang, J., and Long, M. Flowformer: Linearizing transformers with conservation flows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06258*, 2022b.
- Xu, J., Wu, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Anomaly transformer: Time series anomaly detection with association discrepancy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.02642*, 2021.
- Yang, L. and Hong, S. Unsupervised time-series representation learning with iterative bilinear temporal-spectral fusion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 25038–25054. PMLR, 2022.
- Yue, Z., Wang, Y., Duan, J., Yang, T., Huang, C., Tong, Y., and Xu, B. Ts2vec: Towards universal representation of time series. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pp. 8980–8987, 2022.
- Zeng, A., Chen, M., Zhang, L., and Xu, Q. Are transformers effective for time series forecasting? In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 11121–11128, 2023.
- Zhang, T., Zhang, Y., Cao, W., Bian, J., Yi, X., Zheng, S., and Li, J. Less is more: Fast multivariate time series forecasting with light sampling-oriented mlp structures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01186*, 2022.
- Zhang, Y. and Yan, J. Crossformer: Transformer utilizing cross-dimension dependency for multivariate time series forecasting. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Zhou, H., Zhang, S., Peng, J., Zhang, S., Li, J., Xiong, H., and Zhang, W. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 11106–11115, 2021.
- Zhou, T., Ma, Z., Wen, Q., Wang, X., Sun, L., and Jin, R. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 27268–27286. PMLR, 2022.
- Zhou, T., Niu, P., Wang, X., Sun, L., and Jin, R. One fits all: Power general time series analysis by pretrained lm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11939*, 2023.

## A. Appendix

### A.1. Codebook Visualizations.




Figure 3. **TOTEM Codebooks.** We visualize all 256 codes for the generalist (All), and three specialists (Traffic, Electricity, and Weather). The top row visualizes codes in the latent space, the bottom row visualizes codes in the decoded time space. We additionally highlight codeword pairs matched via low MSE between All-Traffic, All-Electricity, and All-Weather in the bottom row.

### A.2. TOTEM Examples.




Figure 4. **TOTEM Examples.** In the top row we visualize four weather forecasts for  $T_{in}=96$  and  $T_{out}=96$ . In the bottom row we visualize four ETTm2 imputations. In all cases the model input is in grey, the predictions are in blue, and the ground truth is in green.

**A.3. Architecture Details.**

**VQVAE.** For imputation, anomaly detection, and forecasting the VQVAE’s number of residual layers = 2, residual hidden size = 64, and block hidden size = 128 for all datasets. Each residual block has 2 non-causal, non-dilated 1D convolutional layers. The residual blocks are paired with additional non-causal, non-dilated 1D convolutional layers, where the number of additional layers is determined by the desired compression factor. See Table 10 for more hyperparameter details.

Table 10. **VQVAE Hyperparameters** (A) Imputation generalist (All) and specialists. (B) Anomaly detection generalist (All) and specialists. The anomaly %s for all of the zero shot datasets are 2%. (C) Forecasting generalist (All) and specialists.

A. Imputation.							B. Anomaly Detection.							
Dataset	LR	Iter.	BS	# CW	CW Dim.	CF	Dataset	LR	Iter.	BS	# CW	CW Dim.	CF	Anomaly %
All	1e-3	120000	8192	512	64	4	All	1e-3	120000	4096	1024	64	4	Varies by test set.
Elec.	1e-3	15000	8192	512	64	4	SMD	1e-3	60000	4096	1024	64	4	0.5
Weather	1e-3	15000	8192	512	64	4	MSL	1e-3	15000	4096	1024	64	4	2
ETIm1	1e-3	15000	8192	512	64	4	PSM	1e-3	60000	4096	1024	64	4	1
ETIm2	1e-3	15000	8192	512	64	4	SMAP	1e-3	15000	4096	1024	64	4	1
ETTh1	1e-3	15000	8192	512	64	4	SWAT	1e-3	15000	4096	1024	64	4	1
ETTh2	1e-3	15000	8192	512	64	4								

C. Forecasting.						
Dataset	LR	Iter.	BS	# CW	CW Dim.	CF
All	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
Elec.	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
Weather	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
Traffic	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
ETIm1	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
ETIm2	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
ETTh1	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4
ETTh2	1e-3	15000	4096	256	64	4

**Downstream Forecaster.** The downstream forecaster has two components the transformer encoder that intakes codes and outputs a normalized time forecast, and the feedforward neural network that takes in time and outputs predictions for the forecast’s mean and standard deviation. The downstream forecaster is a transformer encoder with a model dimension = 64, hidden dimension = 256, number of heads = 4, number of layers = 4. The transformer encoder applies a sin / cos positional embedding along the time dimension and applies its attention mechanism to each sensor independently. There is a single linear layer applied after the transformer encoder output. The feedforward neural network takes in the input time steps, and predicts the future’s mean and standard deviation.

**A.4. Training Details.**

In imputation, anomaly detection, and forecasting the VQVAE is trained with a learning rate of 0.001 using the Adam optimizer, embedding dimension of 64, commitment cost of 0.25, and compression factor of 4; see Table 10 for more hyperparameters. In all tasks there is a global normalization, and local normalization (Kim et al., 2021); both are standard throughout prior work. In imputation we only leverage global normalization, in anomaly detection and forecasting we utilize both global and local normalization. In anomaly detection we evaluate the models we run, TOTEM and GPT2, with both local normalized data and non-local normalized data for each method and report whichever schema leads to the best performance. In forecasting the downstream model is a transformer encoder with 4 layers and 4 attention heads and a feed-forward hidden dimension of 256. We train using Adam with a base learning rate of 0.0001 and a one cycle learning rate scheduler in accordance with (Nie et al., 2022) on A100s.

## A.5. Imputation Results - Means and Std. Devs.

Table 11. TOTEM - Specialist Imputation (↓)

Metric	MSE	MAE
W	12.5%	0.028 ± 0.0000 0.046 ± 0.0006
	25%	0.029 ± 0.0000 0.047 ± 0.0010
	37.5%	0.031 ± 0.0006 0.048 ± 0.0015
	50%	0.033 ± 0.0000 0.052 ± 0.0006
E	12.5%	0.054 ± 0.0006 0.154 ± 0.0015
	25%	0.059 ± 0.0006 0.160 ± 0.0010
	37.5%	0.067 ± 0.0006 0.169 ± 0.0012
	50%	0.079 ± 0.0012 0.183 ± 0.0012
m1	12.5%	0.049 ± 0.0000 0.125 ± 0.0006
	25%	0.052 ± 0.0006 0.128 ± 0.0006
	37.5%	0.055 ± 0.0000 0.132 ± 0.0006
	50%	0.061 ± 0.0006 0.139 ± 0.0006
m2	12.5%	0.016 ± 0.0006 0.078 ± 0.0010
	25%	0.017 ± 0.0006 0.081 ± 0.0006
	37.5%	0.018 ± 0.0000 0.084 ± 0.0006
	50%	0.020 ± 0.0000 0.088 ± 0.0000
h1	12.5%	0.119 ± 0.0010 0.212 ± 0.0006
	25%	0.127 ± 0.0015 0.220 ± 0.0006
	37.5%	0.138 ± 0.0012 0.230 ± 0.0006
	50%	0.157 ± 0.0006 0.247 ± 0.0010
h2	12.5%	0.040 ± 0.0006 0.129 ± 0.0017
	25%	0.041 ± 0.0010 0.131 ± 0.0012
	37.5%	0.043 ± 0.0006 0.136 ± 0.0006
	50%	0.047 ± 0.0006 0.142 ± 0.0012

Table 12. TOTEM - Generalist Imputation (↓)

Metric	MSE	MAE
W	12.5%	0.029 ± 0.0012 0.060 ± 0.0047
	25%	0.030 ± 0.0006 0.060 ± 0.0047
	37.5%	0.032 ± 0.0006 0.062 ± 0.0030
	50%	0.036 ± 0.0006 0.067 ± 0.0036
E	12.5%	0.065 ± 0.0020 0.171 ± 0.0032
	25%	0.071 ± 0.0015 0.179 ± 0.0031
	37.5%	0.080 ± 0.0025 0.189 ± 0.0032
	50%	0.095 ± 0.0026 0.205 ± 0.0032
m1	12.5%	0.041 ± 0.0006 0.132 ± 0.0015
	25%	0.044 ± 0.0000 0.135 ± 0.0010
	37.5%	0.048 ± 0.0006 0.139 ± 0.0040
	50%	0.058 ± 0.0010 0.152 ± 0.0000
m2	12.5%	0.040 ± 0.0020 0.125 ± 0.0067
	25%	0.041 ± 0.0015 0.126 ± 0.0058
	37.5%	0.043 ± 0.0015 0.129 ± 0.0049
	50%	0.048 ± 0.0010 0.136 ± 0.0038
h1	12.5%	0.100 ± 0.0049 0.201 ± 0.0049
	25%	0.108 ± 0.0049 0.209 ± 0.0038
	37.5%	0.122 ± 0.0064 0.220 ± 0.0044
	50%	0.144 ± 0.0078 0.237 ± 0.0049
h2	12.5%	0.075 ± 0.0012 0.175 ± 0.0053
	25%	0.076 ± 0.0006 0.177 ± 0.0036
	37.5%	0.093 ± 0.0222 0.195 ± 0.0200
	50%	0.089 ± 0.0010 0.192 ± 0.0035
<b>Zero-Shot</b>		
N2	12.5%	0.029 ± 0.0015 0.120 ± 0.0045
	25%	0.033 ± 0.0010 0.127 ± 0.0035
	37.5%	0.041 ± 0.0006 0.139 ± 0.0025
	50%	0.056 ± 0.0006 0.160 ± 0.0012
N5	12.5%	0.017 ± 0.0010 0.085 ± 0.0030
	25%	0.019 ± 0.0010 0.090 ± 0.0030
	37.5%	0.022 ± 0.0006 0.098 ± 0.0025
	50%	0.029 ± 0.0006 0.110 ± 0.0025
R	12.5%	0.071 ± 0.0070 0.109 ± 0.0040
	25%	0.087 ± 0.0064 0.117 ± 0.0031
	37.5%	0.112 ± 0.0050 0.129 ± 0.0035
	50%	0.148 ± 0.0032 0.147 ± 0.0023
B	12.5%	0.632 ± 0.0087 0.642 ± 0.0068
	25%	0.693 ± 0.0070 0.665 ± 0.0047
	37.5%	0.761 ± 0.0055 0.692 ± 0.0023
	50%	0.827 ± 0.0044 0.718 ± 0.0000
S	12.5%	0.057 ± 0.0012 0.160 ± 0.0023
	25%	0.061 ± 0.0006 0.168 ± 0.0021
	37.5%	0.069 ± 0.0006 0.178 ± 0.0021
	50%	0.082 ± 0.0010 0.193 ± 0.0015

Table 13. GPT2 - Generalist Imputation (↓)

Metric	MSE	MAE
W	12.5%	0.029 ± 0.0000 0.045 ± 0.0006
	25%	0.033 ± 0.0006 0.048 ± 0.0006
	37.5%	0.037 ± 0.0006 0.054 ± 0.0012
	50%	0.043 ± 0.0012 0.061 ± 0.0017
E	12.5%	0.008 ± 0.0020 0.186 ± 0.0035
	25%	0.091 ± 0.0020 0.197 ± 0.0025
	37.5%	0.108 ± 0.0021 0.213 ± 0.0026
	50%	0.132 ± 0.0026 0.236 ± 0.0026
m1	12.5%	0.052 ± 0.0012 0.141 ± 0.0016
	25%	0.065 ± 0.0021 0.154 ± 0.0021
	37.5%	0.085 ± 0.0038 0.171 ± 0.0026
	50%	0.117 ± 0.0052 0.196 ± 0.0026
m2	12.5%	0.029 ± 0.0000 0.095 ± 0.0006
	25%	0.033 ± 0.0006 0.101 ± 0.0006
	37.5%	0.038 ± 0.0006 0.110 ± 0.0012
	50%	0.045 ± 0.0006 0.121 ± 0.0012
h1	12.5%	0.113 ± 0.0012 0.217 ± 0.0021
	25%	0.131 ± 0.0010 0.231 ± 0.0015
	37.5%	0.153 ± 0.0012 0.247 ± 0.0017
	50%	0.182 ± 0.0006 0.266 ± 0.0012
h2	12.5%	0.067 ± 0.0010 0.155 ± 0.0015
	25%	0.071 ± 0.0006 0.160 ± 0.0015
	37.5%	0.077 ± 0.0010 0.167 ± 0.0015
	50%	0.086 ± 0.0032 0.179 ± 0.0038
<b>Zero-Shot</b>		
N2	12.5%	0.047 ± 0.0006 0.145 ± 0.0015
	25%	0.064 ± 0.0017 0.164 ± 0.0015
	37.5%	0.090 ± 0.0036 0.191 ± 0.0032
	50%	0.131 ± 0.0051 0.228 ± 0.0044
N5	12.5%	0.021 ± 0.0006 0.095 ± 0.0012
	25%	0.028 ± 0.0006 0.107 ± 0.0010
	37.5%	0.039 ± 0.0015 0.123 ± 0.0015
	50%	0.055 ± 0.0015 0.145 ± 0.0023
R	12.5%	0.093 ± 0.0010 0.119 ± 0.0015
	25%	0.125 ± 0.0006 0.134 ± 0.0026
	37.5%	0.167 ± 0.0021 0.154 ± 0.0042
	50%	0.220 ± 0.0045 0.182 ± 0.0057
B	12.5%	0.392 ± 0.0064 0.496 ± 0.0023
	25%	0.444 ± 0.0071 0.523 ± 0.0029
	37.5%	0.498 ± 0.0080 0.553 ± 0.0023
	50%	0.591 ± 0.0700 0.599 ± 0.0275
s	12.5%	0.070 ± 0.0012 0.173 ± 0.0017
	25%	0.084 ± 0.0010 0.189 ± 0.0015
	37.5%	0.103 ± 0.0010 0.209 ± 0.0021
	50%	0.128 ± 0.0015 0.234 ± 0.0021

A.6. Anomaly Detection Results - Means and Std Devs.

Table 14. TOTEM - Specialist Anomaly Detection ( $\uparrow$ )

	Mean $\pm$ Std
SMD	0.7962 $\pm$ 0.0137
MSL	0.8258 $\pm$ 0.0052
$E_1$ SMAP	0.9402 $\pm$ 0.0008
SWAT	0.9427 $\pm$ 0.0006
PSM	0.9587 $\pm$ 0.0008
<hr/>	
SMD	0.7606 $\pm$ 0.0207
MSL	0.8285 $\pm$ 0.0071
$R$ SMAP	0.9404 $\pm$ 0.0013
SWAT	0.9591 $\pm$ 0.0012
PSM	0.9421 $\pm$ 0.0004
<hr/>	
SMD	0.8354 $\pm$ 0.0054
MSL	0.8232 $\pm$ 0.0033
$P_1$ SMAP	0.9400 $\pm$ 0.0004
SWAT	0.9268 $\pm$ 0.0003
PSM	0.9758 $\pm$ 0.0012

Table 15. TOTEM - Generalist Anomaly Detection ( $\uparrow$ )

	Mean $\pm$ Std
SMD	0.7864 $\pm$ 0.0386
MSL	0.8329 $\pm$ 0.0020
SMAP	0.9251 $\pm$ 0.0014
SWAT	0.9437 $\pm$ 0.0005
$E_1$ PSM	0.9578 $\pm$ 0.0002
N2	0.5129 $\pm$ 0.0397
N5	0.5128 $\pm$ 0.0390
R	0.4939 $\pm$ 0.0625
B	0.4915 $\pm$ 0.0229
S	0.5217 $\pm$ 0.0418
<hr/>	
SMD	0.7207 $\pm$ 0.0565
MSL	0.8296 $\pm$ 0.0046
SMAP	0.9148 $\pm$ 0.0020
SWAT	0.9613 $\pm$ 0.0010
$R$ PSM	0.9390 $\pm$ 0.0004
N2	0.7688 $\pm$ 0.0594
N5	0.7684 $\pm$ 0.0582
R	0.7049 $\pm$ 0.0825
B	0.7371 $\pm$ 0.0340
S	0.7736 $\pm$ 0.0581
<hr/>	
SMD	0.8666 $\pm$ 0.0114
MSL	0.8364 $\pm$ 0.0014
SMAP	0.9356 $\pm$ 0.0009
SWAT	0.9268 $\pm$ 0.0001
$P_1$ PSM	0.9774 $\pm$ 0.0002
N2	0.3849 $\pm$ 0.0299
N5	0.3848 $\pm$ 0.0294
R	0.3802 $\pm$ 0.0502
B	0.3686 $\pm$ 0.0172
S	0.3935 $\pm$ 0.0325

Table 16. GPT2 - Generalist Anomaly Detection ( $\uparrow$ )

	Mean $\pm$ Std
SMD	0.7973 $\pm$ 0.0326
MSL	0.8017 $\pm$ 0.0205
SMAP	0.6705 $\pm$ 0.0041
SWAT	0.8962 $\pm$ 0.0016
$E_1$ PSM	0.9047 $\pm$ 0.0759
N2	0.3902 $\pm$ 0.0596
N5	0.4219 $\pm$ 0.0047
R	0.3614 $\pm$ 0.0204
B	0.2081 $\pm$ 0.0462
S	0.3812 $\pm$ 0.0621
<hr/>	
SMD	0.7342 $\pm$ 0.0559
MSL	0.7848 $\pm$ 0.0277
SMAP	0.5342 $\pm$ 0.0051
SWAT	0.8753 $\pm$ 0.0033
$R$ PSM	0.8776 $\pm$ 0.0624
N2	0.3369 $\pm$ 0.0592
N5	0.3677 $\pm$ 0.0498
R	0.2966 $\pm$ 0.0218
B	0.1767 $\pm$ 0.0426
S	0.3183 $\pm$ 0.0648
<hr/>	
SMD	0.8744 $\pm$ 0.0029
MSL	0.8195 $\pm$ 0.0130
SMAP	0.9001 $\pm$ 0.0007
SWAT	0.9183 $\pm$ 0.0006
$P_1$ PSM	0.9339 $\pm$ 0.0925
N2	0.4643 $\pm$ 0.0561
N5	0.4958 $\pm$ 0.0396
R	0.4630 $\pm$ 0.0139
B	0.2533 $\pm$ 0.0498
S	0.4772 $\pm$ 0.5000

A.7. Forecasting Results - Means and Std Devs.

Table 17. TOTEM - Specialist Forecasting (↓)

Metric	Mean ± Std			
	MSE		MAE	
W	96	0.165 ± 0.0015	0.208 ± 0.0012	
	192	0.207 ± 0.0006	0.250 ± 0.0012	
	336	0.257 ± 0.0002	0.291 ± 0.0006	
	720	0.326 ± 0.0035	0.340 ± 0.0023	
E	96	0.178 ± 0.0015	0.263 ± 0.0010	
	192	0.187 ± 0.0015	0.272 ± 0.0015	
	336	0.199 ± 0.0012	0.285 ± 0.0012	
	720	0.236 ± 0.0035	0.318 ± 0.0031	
T	96	0.523 ± 0.0010	0.303 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.530 ± 0.0015	0.303 ± 0.0017	
	336	0.549 ± 0.0017	0.311 ± 0.0021	
	720	0.598 ± 0.0095	0.331 ± 0.0062	
m1	96	0.320 ± 0.0006	0.347 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.379 ± 0.0017	0.382 ± 0.0012	
	336	0.406 ± 0.0040	0.402 ± 0.0026	
	720	0.471 ± 0.0006	0.438 ± 0.0010	
m2	96	0.176 ± 0.0006	0.253 ± 0.0010	
	192	0.247 ± 0.0012	0.302 ± 0.0015	
	336	0.317 ± 0.0046	0.348 ± 0.0031	
	720	0.426 ± 0.0085	0.410 ± 0.0062	
h1	96	0.380 ± 0.0006	0.394 ± 0.0000	
	192	0.434 ± 0.0010	0.427 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.490 ± 0.0023	0.459 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.539 ± 0.0031	0.513 ± 0.0020	
h2	96	0.293 ± 0.0015	0.338 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.375 ± 0.0031	0.390 ± 0.0026	
	336	0.422 ± 0.0046	0.431 ± 0.0031	
	720	0.610 ± 0.0095	0.567 ± 0.0081	

Table 18. GPT2 - Specialist Forecasting, Lookback of 96 (↓)

Metric	Mean ± Std			
	MSE		MAE	
W	96	0.184 ± 0.0013	0.224 ± 0.0014	
	192	0.231 ± 0.0012	0.263 ± 0.0009	
	336	0.285 ± 0.0015	0.302 ± 0.0013	
	720	0.362 ± 0.0016	0.351 ± 0.0008	
E	96	0.186 ± 0.0004	0.272 ± 0.0005	
	192	0.190 ± 0.0007	0.278 ± 0.0008	
	336	0.204 ± 0.0003	0.291 ± 0.0005	
	720	0.245 ± 0.0012	0.324 ± 0.0014	
T	96	0.471 ± 0.0016	0.311 ± 0.0016	
	192	0.479 ± 0.0017	0.312 ± 0.0010	
	336	0.490 ± 0.0009	0.317 ± 0.0010	
	720	0.524 ± 0.0019	0.336 ± 0.0018	
m1	96	0.328 ± 0.0022	0.363 ± 0.0014	
	192	0.368 ± 0.0006	0.382 ± 0.0004	
	336	0.400 ± 0.0013	0.404 ± 0.0011	
	720	0.462 ± 0.0010	0.440 ± 0.0009	
m2	96	0.178 ± 0.0000	0.263 ± 0.0000	
	192	0.245 ± 0.0000	0.307 ± 0.0000	
	336	0.307 ± 0.0000	0.346 ± 0.0000	
	720	0.410 ± 0.0000	0.409 ± 0.0000	
h1	96	0.379 ± 0.0032	0.397 ± 0.0007	
	192	0.438 ± 0.0037	0.427 ± 0.0004	
	336	0.474 ± 0.0045	0.448 ± 0.0004	
	720	0.496 ± 0.0066	0.475 ± 0.0033	
h2	96	0.295 ± 0.0000	0.348 ± 0.0000	
	192	0.384 ± 0.0000	0.402 ± 0.0000	
	336	0.418 ± 0.0000	0.432 ± 0.0000	
	720	0.423 ± 0.0000	0.446 ± 0.0000	

Table 19. TOTEM - Generalist and Zero-Shot Forecasting (↓)

Metric	Mean ± Std			
	MSE		MAE	
W	96	0.172 ± 0.0010	0.216 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.217 ± 0.0006	0.256 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.266 ± 0.0015	0.295 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.334 ± 0.0010	0.342 ± 0.0012	
E	96	0.179 ± 0.0006	0.264 ± 0.0012	
	192	0.181 ± 0.0006	0.267 ± 0.0000	
	336	0.196 ± 0.0020	0.283 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.230 ± 0.0035	0.314 ± 0.0029	
T	96	0.507 ± 0.0020	0.284 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.511 ± 0.0030	0.282 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.535 ± 0.0076	0.292 ± 0.0012	
	720	0.580 ± 0.0046	0.309 ± 0.0006	
m1	96	0.374 ± 0.0000	0.384 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.400 ± 0.0015	0.399 ± 0.0023	
	336	0.432 ± 0.0040	0.424 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.487 ± 0.0081	0.460 ± 0.0017	
m2	96	0.198 ± 0.0006	0.275 ± 0.0012	
	192	0.266 ± 0.0035	0.319 ± 0.0021	
	336	0.365 ± 0.0115	0.377 ± 0.0038	
	720	0.588 ± 0.0699	0.511 ± 0.0281	
h1	96	0.382 ± 0.0364	0.404 ± 0.0012	
	192	0.463 ± 0.0025	0.435 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.507 ± 0.0025	0.463 ± 0.0010	
	720	0.517 ± 0.0010	0.500 ± 0.0017	
h2	96	0.307 ± 0.0012	0.345 ± 0.0015	
	192	0.406 ± 0.0038	0.403 ± 0.0023	
	336	0.505 ± 0.0114	0.460 ± 0.0035	
	720	0.661 ± 0.0514	0.557 ± 0.0215	
Zero-Shot				
N2	96	1.138 ± 0.0032	0.777 ± 0.0012	
	192	1.149 ± 0.0026	0.785 ± 0.0012	
	336	1.092 ± 0.0062	0.770 ± 0.0026	
	720	1.045 ± 0.0040	0.754 ± 0.0023	
N5	96	0.483 ± 0.0012	0.484 ± 0.0012	
	192	0.495 ± 0.0021	0.491 ± 0.0015	
	336	0.468 ± 0.0035	0.483 ± 0.0029	
	720	0.451 ± 0.0023	0.477 ± 0.0023	
R	96	1.120 ± 0.0081	0.582 ± 0.0036	
	192	1.242 ± 0.0151	0.635 ± 0.0074	
	336	1.237 ± 0.0153	0.626 ± 0.0076	
	720	1.182 ± 0.0151	0.604 ± 0.0050	
B	96	0.805 ± 0.0070	0.739 ± 0.0035	
	192	0.836 ± 0.0040	0.752 ± 0.0021	
	336	0.809 ± 0.0038	0.748 ± 0.0021	
	720	0.896 ± 0.0137	0.794 ± 0.0085	
S	96	0.446 ± 0.0032	0.482 ± 0.0017	
	192	0.462 ± 0.0015	0.491 ± 0.0010	
	336	0.521 ± 0.0122	0.525 ± 0.0068	
	720	0.717 ± 0.0096	0.625 ± 0.0040	

Table 20. GPT2 - Generalist and Zero-Shot Forecasting (↓)

Metric	Mean ± Std			
	MSE		MAE	
W	96	0.201 ± 0.0017	0.237 ± 0.0012	
	192	0.247 ± 0.0020	0.275 ± 0.0015	
	336	0.298 ± 0.0006	0.311 ± 0.0006	
	720	0.372 ± 0.0010	0.360 ± 0.0006	
E	96	0.194 ± 0.0012	0.278 ± 0.0021	
	192	0.199 ± 0.0006	0.284 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.214 ± 0.0012	0.300 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.255 ± 0.0006	0.331 ± 0.0012	
T	96	0.484 ± 0.0046	0.320 ± 0.0042	
	192	0.488 ± 0.0006	0.320 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.502 ± 0.0020	0.326 ± 0.0021	
	720	0.534 ± 0.0021	0.343 ± 0.0021	
m1	96	0.487 ± 0.0106	0.468 ± 0.0035	
	192	0.516 ± 0.0071	0.480 ± 0.0021	
	336	0.548 ± 0.0015	0.493 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.581 ± 0.0031	0.511 ± 0.0012	
m2	96	0.243 ± 0.0021	0.315 ± 0.0021	
	192	0.297 ± 0.0012	0.346 ± 0.0010	
	336	0.349 ± 0.0025	0.376 ± 0.0020	
	720	0.439 ± 0.0010	0.423 ± 0.0010	
h1	96	0.421 ± 0.0058	0.408 ± 0.0010	
	192	0.480 ± 0.0025	0.436 ± 0.0020	
	336	0.518 ± 0.0161	0.453 ± 0.0070	
	720	0.517 ± 0.0036	0.467 ± 0.0035	
h2	96	0.298 ± 0.0090	0.343 ± 0.0049	
	192	0.381 ± 0.0153	0.392 ± 0.0072	
	336	0.406 ± 0.0271	0.419 ± 0.0144	
	720	0.423 ± 0.0078	0.438 ± 0.0051	
Zero-Shot				
N2	96	1.332 ± 0.0012	0.830 ± 0.0010	
	192	1.416 ± 0.0080	0.863 ± 0.0025	
	336	1.358 ± 0.0123	0.851 ± 0.0042	
	720	1.308 ± 0.0026	0.840 ± 0.0010	
N5	96	0.528 ± 0.0006	0.499 ± 0.0010	
	192	0.578 ± 0.0015	0.524 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.548 ± 0.0040	0.515 ± 0.0015	
	720	0.537 ± 0.0006	0.511 ± 0.0006	
R	96	1.465 ± 0.0185	0.725 ± 0.0031	
	192	1.638 ± 0.0280	0.785 ± 0.0078	
	336	1.601 ± 0.0244	0.769 ± 0.0060	
	720	1.552 ± 0.0110	0.760 ± 0.0035	
B	96	0.838 ± 0.0149	0.762 ± 0.0071	
	192	0.837 ± 0.0095	0.752 ± 0.0040	
	336	0.792 ± 0.0104	0.738 ± 0.0050	
	720	0.927 ± 0.0066	0.806 ± 0.0038	
S	96	0.443 ± 0.0010	0.478 ± 0.0006	
	192	0.481 ± 0.0006	0.499 ± 0.0006	
	336	0.541 ± 0.0010	0.533 ± 0.0006	
	720	0.773 ± 0.0020	0.643 ± 0.0010	



## A.8. Additional Ablations

Table 21. TimeTOTEM Ablation - Specialist Forecasting

		Mean $\pm$ Std	
		MSE	MAE
W	96	0.164 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.209 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.209 $\pm$ 0.0017	0.251 $\pm$ 0.0023
	336	0.261 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.293 $\pm$ 0.0017
	720	0.332 $\pm$ 0.0023	0.340 $\pm$ 0.0006
E	96	0.179 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.262 $\pm$ 0.0015
	192	0.185 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.269 $\pm$ 0.0000
	336	0.204 $\pm$ 0.0055	0.289 $\pm$ 0.0061
	720	0.244 $\pm$ 0.0040	0.325 $\pm$ 0.0036
T	96	0.528 $\pm$ 0.0081	0.310 $\pm$ 0.0092
	192	0.500 $\pm$ 0.0606	0.349 $\pm$ 0.0699
	336	0.531 $\pm$ 0.0424	0.365 $\pm$ 0.0852
	720	0.578 $\pm$ 0.0361	0.398 $\pm$ 0.1103
m1	96	0.326 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.355 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.377 $\pm$ 0.0023	0.386 $\pm$ 0.0012
	336	0.409 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.409 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	0.469 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.441 $\pm$ 0.0000
m2	96	0.176 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.254 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.247 $\pm$ 0.0031	0.303 $\pm$ 0.0026
	336	0.318 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.350 $\pm$ 0.0021
	720	0.419 $\pm$ 0.0067	0.411 $\pm$ 0.0044
h1	96	0.377 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.395 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.428 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.428 $\pm$ 0.0015
	336	0.480 $\pm$ 0.0021	0.462 $\pm$ 0.0012
	720	0.530 $\pm$ 0.0110	0.522 $\pm$ 0.0108
h2	96	0.294 $\pm$ 0.0021	0.338 $\pm$ 0.0010
	192	0.373 $\pm$ 0.0023	0.389 $\pm$ 0.0032
	336	0.423 $\pm$ 0.0031	0.433 $\pm$ 0.0025
	720	0.591 $\pm$ 0.0145	0.556 $\pm$ 0.0051

Table 22. TimeTOTEM Ablation - Generalist and Zero-Shot Forecasting

Metric		Mean $\pm$ Std	
		MSE	MAE
W	96	0.173 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.218 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.218 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.261 $\pm$ 0.0006
	336	0.267 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.299 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	0.337 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.347 $\pm$ 0.0006
E	96	0.183 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.267 $\pm$ 0.0012
	192	0.189 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.275 $\pm$ 0.0000
	336	0.204 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.291 $\pm$ 0.0010
	720	0.242 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.325 $\pm$ 0.0006
T	96	0.517 $\pm$ 0.0000	0.293 $\pm$ 0.0029
	192	0.526 $\pm$ 0.0030	0.296 $\pm$ 0.0006
	336	0.552 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.304 $\pm$ 0.0015
	720	0.602 $\pm$ 0.0046	0.326 $\pm$ 0.0015
m1	96	0.428 $\pm$ 0.0090	0.420 $\pm$ 0.0040
	192	0.438 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.427 $\pm$ 0.0010
	336	0.469 $\pm$ 0.0062	0.447 $\pm$ 0.0042
	720	0.546 $\pm$ 0.0081	0.493 $\pm$ 0.0017
m2	96	0.207 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.286 $\pm$ 0.0020
	192	0.269 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.325 $\pm$ 0.0010
	336	0.358 $\pm$ 0.0199	0.377 $\pm$ 0.0091
	720	0.521 $\pm$ 0.0165	0.482 $\pm$ 0.0026
h1	96	0.401 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.410 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.453 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.441 $\pm$ 0.0010
	336	0.496 $\pm$ 0.0017	0.468 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	0.518 $\pm$ 0.0020	0.510 $\pm$ 0.0017
h2	96	0.305 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.346 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.396 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.402 $\pm$ 0.0001
	336	0.492 $\pm$ 0.0310	0.458 $\pm$ 0.0131
	720	0.599 $\pm$ 0.0105	0.531 $\pm$ 0.0026
N2	96	1.127 $\pm$ 0.0017	0.773 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	1.169 $\pm$ 0.0032	0.793 $\pm$ 0.0010
	336	1.115 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.780 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	1.070 $\pm$ 0.0035	0.766 $\pm$ 0.0010
N5	96	0.481 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.483 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.508 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.500 $\pm$ 0.0000
	336	0.481 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.491 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	0.467 $\pm$ 0.0010	0.488 $\pm$ 0.0010
R	96	1.102 $\pm$ 0.0031	0.578 $\pm$ 0.0021
	192	1.207 $\pm$ 0.0036	0.628 $\pm$ 0.0017
	336	1.190 $\pm$ 0.0021	0.613 $\pm$ 0.0010
	720	1.149 $\pm$ 0.0017	0.596 $\pm$ 0.0020
B	96	0.825 $\pm$ 0.0079	0.751 $\pm$ 0.0076
	192	0.847 $\pm$ 0.0021	0.761 $\pm$ 0.0012
	336	0.831 $\pm$ 0.0066	0.764 $\pm$ 0.0042
	720	0.928 $\pm$ 0.0131	0.813 $\pm$ 0.0050
S	96	0.446 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.481 $\pm$ 0.0010
	192	0.478 $\pm$ 0.0015	0.499 $\pm$ 0.0000
	336	0.535 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.532 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	0.736 $\pm$ 0.0025	0.631 $\pm$ 0.0006

Table 23. Detailed Codebook Ablation ( $\downarrow$ )

	K	Mean $\pm$ Std	
		MSE	MAE
All	32	0.0451 $\pm$ 0.0014	0.1460 $\pm$ 0.0030
	256	0.0192 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.0937 $\pm$ 0.0007
	512	0.0184 $\pm$ 0.0025	0.0913 $\pm$ 0.0062
W	32	0.0393 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.1122 $\pm$ 0.0064
	256	0.0161 $\pm$ 0.0004	0.0673 $\pm$ 0.0011
	512	0.0128 $\pm$ 0.0011	0.0607 $\pm$ 0.0032
E	32	0.0463 $\pm$ 0.0007	0.1520 $\pm$ 0.0016
	256	0.0209 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.1027 $\pm$ 0.0029
	512	0.0152 $\pm$ 0.0005	0.0878 $\pm$ 0.0014
T	32	0.0312 $\pm$ 0.0007	0.1204 $\pm$ 0.0008
	256	0.0120 $\pm$ 0.0003	0.0749 $\pm$ 0.0007
	512	0.0101 $\pm$ 0.0012	0.0685 $\pm$ 0.0044

## A.9. Exploratory Results

Table 24. Mixed Models - Forecasting ( $\downarrow$ )

Metric	Mean $\pm$ Std	
	MSE	MAE
W	96	0.164 $\pm$ 0.0010
	192	0.208 $\pm$ 0.0010
	336	0.258 $\pm$ 0.0012
	720	0.329 $\pm$ 0.0021
		0.208 $\pm$ 0.0012
E	96	0.178 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.187 $\pm$ 0.0021
	336	0.199 $\pm$ 0.0012
	720	0.238 $\pm$ 0.0012
		0.263 $\pm$ 0.0010
T	96	0.521 $\pm$ 0.0010
	192	0.530 $\pm$ 0.0023
	336	0.555 $\pm$ 0.0080
	720	0.605 $\pm$ 0.0097
		0.301 $\pm$ 0.0010
m1	96	0.328 $\pm$ 0.0036
	192	0.377 $\pm$ 0.0021
	336	0.408 $\pm$ 0.0035
	720	0.470 $\pm$ 0.0035
		0.352 $\pm$ 0.0006
m2	96	0.175 $\pm$ 0.0006
	192	0.247 $\pm$ 0.0006
	336	0.318 $\pm$ 0.0006
	720	0.427 $\pm$ 0.0012
		0.253 $\pm$ 0.0010
h1	96	0.382 $\pm$ 0.0025
	192	0.437 $\pm$ 0.0012
	336	0.490 $\pm$ 0.0015
	720	0.536 $\pm$ 0.0031
		0.395 $\pm$ 0.0015
h2	96	0.294 $\pm$ 0.0010
	192	0.375 $\pm$ 0.0025
	336	0.421 $\pm$ 0.0050
	720	0.610 $\pm$ 0.0089
		0.339 $\pm$ 0.0012

Table 25. Traffic Only - Specialist Zero-Shot Performance ( $\downarrow$ )

Metric	Mean $\pm$ Std	
	MSE	MAE
N2	96	1.194 $\pm$ 0.0062
	192	1.218 $\pm$ 0.0074
	336	1.190 $\pm$ 0.0153
	720	1.117 $\pm$ 0.0137
		0.798 $\pm$ 0.0020
N5	96	0.515 $\pm$ 0.0026
	192	0.535 $\pm$ 0.0051
	336	0.524 $\pm$ 0.0071
	720	0.500 $\pm$ 0.0064
		0.505 $\pm$ 0.0012
R	96	1.171 $\pm$ 0.0023
	192	1.273 $\pm$ 0.0090
	336	1.232 $\pm$ 0.0055
	720	1.198 $\pm$ 0.0057
		0.635 $\pm$ 0.0019
B	96	0.812 $\pm$ 0.0037
	192	0.858 $\pm$ 0.0025
	336	0.826 $\pm$ 0.0041
	720	0.919 $\pm$ 0.0063
		0.749 $\pm$ 0.0025
S	96	0.476 $\pm$ 0.0012
	192	0.511 $\pm$ 0.0005
	336	0.576 $\pm$ 0.0024
	720	0.795 $\pm$ 0.0017
		0.508 $\pm$ 0.0012

Table 26. Electricity Only - Specialist Zero-Shot Performance ( $\downarrow$ )

Metric	Mean $\pm$ Std	
	MSE	MAE
N2	96	1.193 $\pm$ 0.0059
	192	1.300 $\pm$ 0.0016
	336	1.260 $\pm$ 0.0162
	720	1.234 $\pm$ 0.0054
		0.802 $\pm$ 0.0020
N5	96	0.489 $\pm$ 0.0024
	192	0.555 $\pm$ 0.0012
	336	0.538 $\pm$ 0.0064
	720	0.533 $\pm$ 0.0010
		0.490 $\pm$ 0.0011
R	96	1.141 $\pm$ 0.0056
	192	1.297 $\pm$ 0.0162
	336	1.247 $\pm$ 0.0108
	720	1.236 $\pm$ 0.0053
		0.579 $\pm$ 0.0028
B	96	0.820 $\pm$ 0.0065
	192	0.843 $\pm$ 0.0042
	336	0.791 $\pm$ 0.0023
	720	0.886 $\pm$ 0.0059
		0.756 $\pm$ 0.0034
S	96	0.460 $\pm$ 0.0017
	192	0.505 $\pm$ 0.0017
	336	0.569 $\pm$ 0.0020
	720	0.764 $\pm$ 0.0046
		0.487 $\pm$ 0.0010