

OPTIMAL EXPERIMENT DESIGN IN A FILTERING CONTEXT WITH APPLICATION TO SAMPLED NETWORK DATA

BY HARSH SINGHAL AND GEORGE MICHAILIDIS¹

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

We examine the problem of optimal design in the context of filtering multiple random walks. Specifically, we define the steady state E-optimal design criterion and show that the underlying optimization problem leads to a second order cone program. The developed methodology is applied to tracking network flow volumes using sampled data, where the design variable corresponds to controlling the sampling rate. The optimal design is numerically compared to a myopic and a naive strategy. Finally, we relate our work to the general problem of steady state optimal design for state space models.

1. Introduction. Consider a wide area computer network such as the one depicted in Figure 1. A *flow* is defined as all traffic with common origin and destination nodes. Monitoring flow volumes plays an important role in network management tasks, such as capacity planning by tracking demands and forecasting traffic, identifying failures together with their causes and impact, detecting malicious activity and configuring routing protocols [Barford et al. (2002), Soule et al. (2005)]. These flow volumes have been observed to exhibit complicated structure, as seen in Figure 2. For example, the highly aggregated flows usually have diurnal patterns [Figure 2(a)], while lighter flows can be extremely noisy [Figure 2(b)]. Network traffic is carried on packets that can be observed (and sampled) at router interfaces, henceforth called *observation points*. However, during the measurement process, sampling is employed due to high flow volumes and resource constraints at routers.

It is increasingly common for such measurement infrastructure to be deployed in computer networks [Duffield (2004)]. Each packet from the aggregate flow at an observation point is sampled independently with a cer-

Received January 2009; revised August 2009.

¹Supported in part by NSF Grants CCR-032557, DMS-05-05535 and DMS-08-06094.

Key words and phrases. Optimal design, Kalman filter, random walks, network monitoring.

<p>This is an electronic reprint of the original article published by the Institute of Mathematical Statistics in <i>The Annals of Applied Statistics</i>, 2010, Vol. 4, No. 1, 78–93. This reprint differs from the original in pagination and typographic detail.</p>




FIG. 1. *Geant Network*: (a) *geographic view* (www.geant.net) and (b) *the corresponding logical topology*.

tain probability (sampling rate) [Duffield, Lund and Thorup (2004)]. Typical sampling rates range between 0.001–0.01. For every packet sampled, its header information is recorded which allows one to reconstruct objects of interest, such as volumes of flows with a particular source and destination traversing the network. An important issue is how to *select* (design) the sampling rates across the network subject to resource constraints, in order to collect the maximum amount of information on the underlying source-destination flows. Obviously low sampling rates result in large sampling noise. One way of achieving lower estimation error with the same sampling rate is through *filtering*; that is, combining the present measurement with past measurements to track the time-series of flow volumes. In designing a




FIG. 2. *Flow volumes*: (a) *all flows* and (b) *one of the lighter flows*.

sampling scheme for this situation one needs to take into account measurement noise and process noise (innovation noise).

While modeling the dynamics of flow volumes is a challenging task in itself [Park and Willinger (2000)], we use a simple random walk model for this purpose. This is a robust enough model to be useful in a large range of applications and leads to scalable filters. We consider the problem of minimizing the (running) estimation error through optimal design of measurement scheme in the filtering context. In this paper we take an optimal design of experiment approach to the above problem and demonstrate its application to computer network monitoring using sampled data.

The related research on optimal design has focused on one of the following scenarios. There is a large body of work on optimal input design for dynamical systems [Goodwin (1977), Titterton (1980)]. There the focus is on parameter estimation (system identification) rather than filtering, as in this paper. Another related area is sequential design for nonlinear systems [Gautier and Pronzato (1998), Ford, Titterton and Kitsos (1989)], where the optimal design depends on values of unknown parameters. While there are some commonalities, the design problem in a filtering context is unique in that the design at any time affects not just the current estimation error but also future ones. The problem of optimal sensor placement in control system literature looks at an equivalent problem [Arbel (1982), Chmielewski, Palmer and Manousiouthakis (2002)]. However, the formulation is not in terms of information matrices and the special case of random walks has not been analyzed to our knowledge. More details are provided in Section 4.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we formulate and investigate the idealized problem of optimal design in the context of filtering for multiple random walks. In Section 3 we study its application to tracking flow volumes using sampled data. We end with discussion of a possible generalization and some comments in Section 4.

2. Optimal design for multiple random walks. Let us first briefly review the concept of E-optimality from classical design-of-experiment literature for a simple setting. Assume we have *independent* observations

$$(2.1) \quad y_i \sim N(x_i, 1/m_i),$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_r$. The natural estimate for x_i is $\hat{x}_i = y_i$ for all i . It is standard to assume that the inverse variance of observation noise is roughly proportional to design variables. The inverse variance, m_i , can be thought of as the information collected on parameter x_i . Specifically, we assume that the relation between an $n_r \times 1$ information vector m and an $n_o \times 1$ vector of design variables ξ is

$$(2.2) \quad m = J\xi.$$

For example, suppose there is a library of measurements z_1, \dots, z_{n_o} , each of which is independently distributed as $z_i \sim N(x_{[i]}, \sigma_i^2 I)$, where $x_{[i]}$ is a subset of elements of x . Let ξ_i be equal to (or proportional to) the number of independent measurement of type i (replications of z_i) collected during the experiment. Then, the weighted least squares estimate y of x can be shown to have distribution given by (2.1) and (2.2). The matrix J depends on the membership of subsets $x_{[i]}$ and variances σ_i^2 (assumed known), for $i = 1, \dots, n_o$.

We assume that the design variables are constrained to be positive and, in addition, satisfy n_v linear inequality constraints. These can be written as $R\xi \leq b$, where R is an $n_v \times n_o$ matrix and b is $n_v \times 1$ vector. We think of this type of constraint as a budgetary one, that specifies upper limits on weighted sums of the design variables.

Now the E-optimal design problem is given by

$$\arg \max_{R\xi \leq b} \min_i m_i.$$

The objective function, $\min_i m_i$, is the minimum information over all flows. Note that this corresponds to minimizing the maximum mean squared error (MSE) since $1/m_i$ is the MSE in the estimate of x_i . Using maximum MSE as the objective function corresponds to aiming for the best possible worst case performance.

As an example consider the situation where $m_1 = 40\xi_1 + 10\xi_2$ and $m_2 = 10\xi_1 + 40\xi_2$. Further assume the constraint

$$\xi_1 + \xi_2 \leq 1.$$




FIG. 3. Contours of the objective function for E-optimal design.

Figure 3 shows the contours of the objective function, that is, $\min_i m_i$. The region below the thick line is the constraint space. As usual, the optimal solution corresponds to the point where the contour of the objective function is “tangent” to the boundary of the constraint space. It is clear that the optimal design would be $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = 0.50$, which is also reasonable from the symmetry of the setup.

We now extend the above criteria to the optimal design for random walks in a steady state. Consider a collection of *independent* random walks

$$x_i(t) = x_i(t-1) + \varepsilon_i(t),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$ and $t = 1, 2, \dots$. The term $\varepsilon_i(t)$ is called the innovation noise and we assume that $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_i(t)) = \sigma_i^2$, which is referred to as the innovation variance. Further, suppose we have noisy observations

$$y_i(t) = x_i(t) + \eta_i(t).$$

Let $\text{Var}(\eta_i(t)) = 1/m_i$. As before, we assume the relation between observed information and design variables to be $m = J\xi$, with $n_r \times n_o$ matrix J assumed known.

The estimates of interest in this case are the ones obtained through filtering

$$\hat{x}_i(t) = E[x_i(t)|y_i(t), y_i(t-1), \dots].$$

Let $s_i(t) = \text{Var}(\hat{x}_i(t)|y_i(t), y_i(t-1), \dots)$. Further, let $\tilde{m}_i = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} 1/s_i(t)$ when it exists. We will refer to this as the *steady state information*. When the innovation and measurement noise, $\varepsilon_i(t)$ and $\eta_i(t)$ respectively, are Gaussian, the optimal filter corresponds to a Kalman filter and in this case the steady state always exists [Harvey (1990)]. For the remainder of the paper we will assume that $\varepsilon_i(t)$ and $\eta_i(t)$ are independent mean 0 Gaussian random variables. If $s_i(t|t-1) = \text{Var}(\hat{x}_i(t)|y_i(t-1), y_i(t-2), \dots)$, then the Kalman filter update equations give us

$$(2.3) \quad s_i(t|t-1) = s_i(t-1) + \sigma_i^2$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad s_i(t)^{-1} = s_i(t|t-1)^{-1} + m_i$$

$$(2.5) \quad = \left(\frac{1}{s_i(t-1)^{-1}} + \sigma_i^2 \right)^{-1} + m_i.$$

Note that, given $s_i(0)$, σ_i^2 and m_i , one can calculate $s_i(t)$ at any time t by iterating the above equations. Further, the choice of m_i impacts $s_i(t)$ not just for a specific t but for all t . Thus,

$$\tilde{m}_i = \left(\frac{1 + \sigma_i^2 \tilde{m}_i}{\tilde{m}_i} \right)^{-1} + m_i$$




FIG. 4. Contours of the objective function for steady state E-optimal design.

or

$$\sigma_i^2 \tilde{m}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2 m_i \tilde{m}_i - m_i = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{m}_i = \frac{m_i \sigma_i^2 + \sqrt{m_i^2 \sigma_i^4 + 4m_i \sigma_i^2}}{2\sigma_i^2}.$$

We define the steady state E-optimal design problem as

$$\arg \max_{R\xi \leq b} \min_i \tilde{m}_i.$$

As an example consider the same setting as above, with $m_1 = 40\xi_1 + 10\xi_2$ and $m_2 = 10\xi_1 + 40\xi_2$. Further, let the innovation noise be characterized by $\sigma_1 = 0.1$ and $\sigma_2 = 0.2$. As before, we assume the design constraint

$$\xi_1 + \xi_2 \leq 1.$$

Notice in Figure 4 that even though there is symmetry in the measured information, the first random walk is smoother than the second one and, hence, less measurement resources need to be allocated to it.

2.1. *Optimization for the steady state E-optimal design.* We establish next the main technical result of the paper, that the steady state E-optimal design problem is a second order cone program. First, we introduce a new variable θ as the lower bound for the steady state information over all flows.

To solve the steady state E-optimal design problem, we have to maximize θ subject to

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{m_i \sigma_i^2 + \sqrt{m_i^2 \sigma_i^4 + 4m_i \sigma_i^2}}{2\sigma_i^2} \geq \theta,$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$ and

$$R\xi \leq b.$$

Equation (2.6) can be equivalently written as

$$(2.7) \quad \theta^2 \leq m_i \left(\theta + \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \right),$$

which is a hyperbolic constraint [Lobo et al. (1998)]. Thus, this problem can be cast as a second order cone program (see the [Appendix](#) for a review of second order cone programs and the representation of the above optimization in canonical form). Such optimization programs can be solved efficiently through interior point methods [Boyd and Vandenberghe (2004)], software implementations of which are commonly available [Benson and Ye (2008), Grant and Boyd (2009)].

2.2. Myopic approach. In the following, we present a greedy alternative to the steady state optimal design. As before, assume $y_i(t) = x_i(t) + \eta_i(t)$. Further, we assume that $\text{Var}(\eta_i(t)) = 1/m_i(t)$; that is, we allow for time varying design variables $\xi(t)$ with $m(t) = J\xi(t)$. As before, $s_i(t) = \text{Var}(\hat{x}_i(t)|y_i(t), y_i(t-1), \dots)$. Define the information at time t to be given by $\tilde{m}_i(t) = 1/s_i(t)$. Note that $\tilde{m}_i(t)$ is a function of $\xi(t), \xi(t-1), \dots$.

The myopic E-optimal design at time t is defined as

$$\arg \max_{R\xi(t) \leq b} \min_i \tilde{m}_i(t).$$

Note that the objective function only involves $\tilde{m}_i(t)$, that is, the information at time t . However, the choice of $\xi(t)$ impacts not just $\tilde{m}_i(t)$ but also $\tilde{m}_i(t+1), \tilde{m}_i(t+2), \dots$, due to the iterative nature of Kalman filtering. Since it ignores this “long term impact,” we refer to this scheme as myopic. Equation (2.5) implies that

$$\tilde{m}_i(t) = s_i(t|t-1)^{-1} + J\xi(t).$$

As before, a new variable θ can be introduced to lower bound $\tilde{m}_i(t)$ which gives a new set of constraints

$$s_i(t|t-1)^{-1} + J\xi(t) \geq \theta,$$

in addition to the original constraint $R\xi(t) \leq b$. Now the objective is to maximize θ with the optimization variables being θ and $\xi(t)$. Since both




FIG. 5. Schematic representation of an observation, observation points and flows.

the objective function and the constraints are linear in $\xi(t)$ and θ , the above optimization is a linear program. Not surprisingly, the myopic optimal design is a much easier problem than the steady-state optimal design even in more general settings as noted in Section 4. Note that since the sampling rates are allowed to vary with time, the myopic optimal design may have an objective function larger than the steady state optimal case. However, as the objective of optimization is to maximize present information with no regard to impact on future information, such a scheme can not be guaranteed to perform well in the long run.

3. Application to tracking flow volumes. The ideas developed above can be used for designing the sampling rate in a computer network for tracking flow volumes. As mentioned in the introduction, we will use the random walk model for flow volumes due to its simplicity and robustness.

Suppose there are n_r origin-destination flows in a network. Let $x_i(t)$ be the volume of the i th flow in the t -th time interval, for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$. These flow volumes are tracked using sampled data which are noisy. Recall that flows are sampled at router interfaces, which we refer to as observation points. In the past, a systematic sampling scheme was the dominant technology, but truly random sampling technologies have recently become available and are commonly deployed [Duffield, Lund and Thorup (2004)]. All flows traversing an observation point (router interface) experience the same sampling rate. Each incoming edge at a node in Figure 1(b) is an interface of the corresponding router. Each router typically has multiple interfaces and each flow may traverse multiple observation points due to multi-hop paths and multi-path routing.

Suppose there are n_o observation points on the network where sampled data on flows can be collected. Further, assume that sampling rates of $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n_o})'$ are used at observation points $1, \dots, n_o$, respectively. Any given observation point $k \in \{1, \dots, n_o\}$ generates estimates for g_k elements of $x(t)$, that is, the number of flows that go through that node. Thus, a

total of $n_g = \sum_{k=1}^{n_o} g_k$ measurements are available in each time interval t , say, $z_1(t), \dots, z_{n_g}(t)$, which need to be optimally combined to get the required estimates. Consider the router in Figure 5. Assume that $k(i)$ is the observation point at which the i th measurement is collected, $i = 1, \dots, n_g$, and $l(i)$ the corresponding flow. Thus, $k(\cdot): \{1, \dots, n_g\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n_o\}$ and $l(\cdot): \{1, \dots, n_g\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n_r\}$. Further, let

$$E[z_i(t)|x_{l(i)}(t)] = x_{l(i)}(t)$$

and for the moment assume

$$(3.1) \quad \text{Cov}(z_i(t)|x_{l(i)}(t)) = \mu_{l(i)}/\xi_{k(i)},$$

where $\mu_i = E[x_i(t)]$. The exact sampling mechanism and approximation involved in the above relation are described in Section 3.2. Thus, in vector notation we get

$$(3.2) \quad E[z(t)|x(t)] = Lx(t),$$

where L is a $n_g \times n_r$ matrix with $L_{ij} = 1$ only if $l(i) = j$ (i.e., i th measurement corresponds to j flow) and 0 otherwise and

$$(3.3) \quad \text{Cov}(z(t)|x(t)) = D,$$

where D is a $n_g \times n_g$ diagonal matrix, with $[D]_{ii} = \mu_{l(i)}/\xi_{k(i)}$. Using (3.1), the inverse of D is given by $D^{-1} = \sum_k \xi_k \Psi_k$, where Ψ_k , $k = 1, \dots, n_o$, are $n_g \times n_g$ diagonal matrices with their i th element given by

$$(3.4) \quad [\Psi_k]_{ii} = \begin{cases} 1/\mu_{l(i)}, & \text{if } k = k(i), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $y(t)$ be the general least squares estimate of $x(t)$, under equation (3.2) and (3.3). Thus,

$$(3.5) \quad \text{Cov}(y(t)|x(t)) = (L'D^{-1}L)^{-1}$$

$$(3.6) \quad = \left(\sum_k (L'\Psi_k L)\xi_k \right)^{-1}.$$

From the definition of L , it follows that the j th elements of any two columns of L cannot be nonzero simultaneously. Thus, the matrix in (3.5) is diagonal. Further,

$$\text{Diag}(\text{Cov}(y(t)|x(t)))^{-1} = m = J\xi,$$

where

$$[J]_{ik} = L'_{\cdot,i} \Psi_k L_{\cdot,i}.$$

We will refer to the above as the linear model.

Sampling is employed in network flow measurements because measurement resources like CPU time and available storage are limited. Typically, all observation points (router interfaces) belonging to a particular router share these resources. We assume that the sampling rates are constrained to lie in a convex polygon $R\xi_t \leq b$. This includes the case where the sum of sampling rates on the interfaces of a router is bounded above by the budget for that router. We will focus on this constraint for the rest of the paper. In this case, the constraints are given as one linear inequality for each router.

For the available data, we set up the performance evaluation as follows. We use the Geant network topology, which has $n_v = 23$ nodes (routers) and 37×2 bidirectional edges. The available data [Uhlig et al. (2006)] correspond to flow volumes over time. Each time interval is equal to 15 minutes. The original data set spans 4 months, but we focus on the first 200 time intervals to avoid severe non-stationarities inherent in an evolving network. Further, we focus on the top 25% of measured flows by volumes since one is typically interested in tracking heavy flows. This corresponds to $n_r = 76$ flows. We assume that sampled data can be collected at each incoming edge of a router and, thus, we have $n_o = 37 \times 2$ observation points. We assume that these flows are routed through minimum distance paths, which is a common routing mechanism in wide area networks [Peterson and Davie (2003)]. This leads to $n_g = 163$ and the routing information gives us the mapping $l(\cdot)$ and hence the matrix L . Matrix L is 163×76 , matrices $D, \Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_{74}$ are all 163×163 . We assume that the sum of sampling rates on all interfaces of a router is bounded above by 0.01, that is, $b_i = 0.01$ and $R_{ij} = 1$ if observation point j is an interface of router i and 0 otherwise. Thus, matrix R is 23×74 . Finally, we estimate the σ_i^2 and μ_i parameters associated with the flow volume processes, and assume they are available for filtering purposes and measurement design. As we have argued, both the steady state optimal and myopic design problems are standard optimization programs and once they are written as such, any standard optimization package [Benson and Ye (2008), Grant and Boyd (2009)] can be used to solve them numerically.

For the purpose of comparison, we also define a naive sampling scheme as follows. For any given router, an equal sampling rate is allocated to every interface that carries any of the 76 flows of interest. This allocation is done so as to make the corresponding budget constraint tight. For example, suppose the i th router has 5 interfaces, but only 4 of them are traversed by one of the 76 flows of interest. In this case, each of the latter 4 interfaces will be allocated a sampling rate of $b_i/4$, while the remaining interface will be allocated a sampling rate of 0.

3.1. *Performance of various sampling schemes for the linear model.* Figure 6(a) shows the value of the maximum MSE as a function of time. Note

that as information accumulates over time, we obtain an improvement in performance under all three sampling mechanisms, myopic, naive and steady state optimal. Here performance is measured as the maximum of $s_i(t)$ over all flows, calculated using equations (2.3) and (2.5). Surprisingly, both the myopic and steady state optimal sampling mechanisms perform equally well in the steady state and achieve a 42% improvement over the naive sampling in the steady state. Figure 6(b) shows that the myopic optimal sampling rates at all observation points reach a steady state. Figure 7 shows the value of steady state sampling rates at various router interfaces in the network topology. Even though the myopic scheme has the flexibility of time varying sampling rates, if the sampling rates do reach a steady state, its performance can clearly be no better than the steady-state optimal scheme. However, as Figure 6 shows, in this case, the additional flexibility permits the myopic scheme to reach steady state performance faster than the steady state optimal one.

3.2. *Departures from the linear model: performance with geant data.* A more detailed model for flow volumes and sampled measurements would have to include significant departures from the linear model assumed above. First, the true flow volumes clearly have more structure than independent random walks, as seen in Figure 2. In applying the above ideas to the Geant data, we will investigate their robustness to the independent random walk assumption.

A more serious departure is the following. Suppose that a flow with volume X in a certain time interval is sampled at a rate ξ . If the number of sampled packets is N , then the usual (approximate maximum likelihood) estimate of flow volume is $Z \equiv N/\xi$. The variance of measurement noise can be shown




FIG. 6. Performance of various sampling schemes [panel (a)] and sampling rates at various interfaces under a myopic scheme [panel (b)].




FIG. 7. *Spatial view of steady state optimal sampling rates.*

to be $\text{Var}(Z|X) \simeq X/\xi$ [Duffield, Lund and Thorup (2002)]. Thus, μ_i in (3.1) is actually equal to the unknown $x_i(t)$.

The observation above implies that in applying the presented techniques to sampled network data, one would have to rely on an approximate model for measurements $z_i(t)$. We will follow an approach similar to batch sequential design [Gautier and Pronzato (1998)]. Assume that the sampling rates are to be held constant for a batch of contiguous time intervals. At the beginning of each batch, we use the most recent estimate $\hat{x}_i(t-1)$ in place of μ_i in (3.4) for sampling rate design. For filtering purposes, we employ a Kalman filter with $\hat{x}_i(t-1)$ in place of μ_i in equation (3.4) at each time t . We replace the budget constraint inequalities $R\xi \leq b$ with the corresponding equalities $R\xi = b$ to force full utilization of available resources. For routers that are traversed by at least one of the 76 flows of interest, we introduce additional equality constraints as follows. Design variable ξ_k for an interface k not traversed by one of the 76 flows of interest is constrained to be identically 0. Figure 8 shows the performance of different sampling schemes averaged over 200 realizations of sampled data. The sampled data emulate the exact sampling mechanism described above (with respective sampling rates) with the Geant data treated as the underlying (unobserved) flow volumes.

Sampling rates were adjusted only at the beginning of a 40 time period block and were held constant over each block. In the first block, the sampling rates were forced to be the same as the naive scheme irrespective of the sampling mechanism under study. Notice that for low values of the objective function (maximum mean squared error) the myopic and steady state




FIG. 8. Performance of various sampling schemes using batch sequential design with flow volumes from the Geant data.

allocations perform better than the naive allocation. On the other hand, when the maximum mean squared error spikes, the naive allocation performs better, indicating robustness to model departures. The median (over time periods 41 to 200) of maximum MSE for myopic, naive and steady-state optimal sampling is 5.46×10^9 , 7.49×10^9 and 6.14×10^9 , respectively. Thus, the myopic scheme performs better than the steady state optimal scheme, which in turn performs better than the naive scheme.

Finally, we look at the performance of the myopic allocation when the above scheme is employed with a block size of just one time interval; that is, sampling rates were adjusted at the beginning of each time period using the myopic scheme. The results are displayed in Figure 9. As before, the current estimate of flow volumes is used in place of μ_i in equation (3.4) for both filtering and myopic sampling scheme design. The myopic sampling scheme can be seen to perform better than the naive version in most time periods. The median (over time periods 1 to 200) of maximum MSE is 4.50×10^9 and 7.44×10^9 for myopic and naive sampling, respectively.

4. Discussion and future work. The *specification* of the steady state optimal design problem can be easily generalized to linear dynamical systems. Such systems are described by a pair of equations [Harvey (1990)]. The state transition equation can be written as

$$x(t) = Cx(t-1) + w(t),$$

where $\text{Cov}(w(t)) = W$. The observation equation can be written as

$$y(t) = Lx(t) + \varepsilon(t).$$




FIG. 9. Performance of fully time varying myopic and naive sampling mechanism with flow volumes from Geant Data.

Assume $\text{Cov}(\varepsilon(t)) = \Psi(\xi)^{-1}$, where $\Psi(\cdot)$ is a linear function and ξ is the value of design variables.

For the above dynamical system a Kalman filter can be used to iteratively compute $E[x(t)|y(t), y(t-1), \dots]$. Let the steady state estimation error covariance be $\Sigma = \tilde{M}^{-1}$ (assuming the system is observable [Harvey (1990)]). Then, \tilde{M} satisfies the Algebraic Riccati equation:

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{M} = (C\tilde{M}^{-1}C' + W)^{-1} + L'\Psi(\xi)L.$$

Such equations have no analytic solution in general.

The steady state optimal design problem can now be defined as

$$\arg \max_{R\xi \leq b} f(\tilde{M}),$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is an appropriate scalarization of the information matrix [Fedorov and Hackl (1997)]. An interesting open problem is to solve the above optimization efficiently in the absence of an analytic solution to (4.1). The sensor placement problem in control system literature [Arbel (1982)] is equivalent, though not identical. The Newton-type algorithm proposed in [Arbel (1982)] for this problem requires the solution of the Algebraic Riccati equation at each iteration of the algorithm. It would be desirable to develop more efficient algorithms.

In summary, we have shown that steady state E-optimal design for random walks is a second order cone program. We have illustrated numerically

that the performance of the Kalman filter can be significantly improved by incorporating an optimal experimental design. The linear state space model is of general interest and one would like to investigate the steady state optimal design problem described above. Finally, from a practical point of view, it would be useful to extend these ideas to nonlinear filtering.

APPENDIX: OPTIMIZATION REVIEW

In this section we summarize the concepts of second order cone programs and hyperbolic constraints from Lobo et al. (1998). We also present the steady state optimal design problem in the canonical form.

A second order cone program is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } f'x \\ & \text{subject to } \|P_i x + q_i\| \leq r'_i x + s_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the optimization variable, and the problem parameters are $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n}$, $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The norm in the constraints is the standard Euclidean norm. A second order cone program is a standard convex program and algorithms to numerically solve it are well studied and implemented in computational software.

A constraint of the form

$$w^2 \leq xy, \quad x \geq 0, \quad y \geq 0$$

is called hyperbolic. The above can be shown to be equivalent to

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} 2w \\ x - y \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq x + y.$$

Using the above representations, we can write the steady state optimal design problem as a canonical second order cone program as follows. Equation (2.7) can be equivalently written as

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \theta \\ m_i - \theta - \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq m_i + \theta + \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

Thus, the steady state optimal problem is a second order cone program with $N = n_r + n_v$, $x' = (\theta, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n_o})$, $f' = (-1, 0, \dots, 0)$,

$$P_i = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & J_{i,1} & \cdots & J_{i,n_o} \end{pmatrix},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$ and $P_i = \mathbf{0}$, for $i = n_r + 1, \dots, n_r + n_v$, $q'_i = (0, -1/\sigma_i^2)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$ and $q_i = \mathbf{0}$, for $i = n_r + 1, \dots, n_r + n_v$, $r'_i = (1, J_{i,1}, \dots, J_{i,n_o})$, for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$ and $r'_i = (0, -R_{i-n_r,1}, \dots, -R_{i-n_r,n_o})$, for $i = n_r + 1, \dots, n_r + n_v$, $s_i = 1/\sigma_i^2$, for $i = 1, \dots, n_r$ and $s_i = b_{i-n_r}$, for $i = n_r + 1, \dots, n_r + n_v$.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank the Editor Steve Fienberg, the Associate Editor and two referees for helpful comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- ARBEL, A. (1982). Sensor placement in optimal filtering and smoothing problems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **27** 94–98.
- BARFORD, P., KLINE, J., PLONKA, D. and RON, A. (2002). A signal analysis of network traffic anomalies. In *IMW'02: Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Internet Measurement* 71–82. ACM Press, New York.
- BENSON, S. J. and YE, Y. (2008). Algorithm 875: DSDP5—software for semidefinite programming. Technical Report No. 3, New York.
- BOYD, S. and VANDENBERGHE, L. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge Univ. Press. [MR2061575](#)
- CHMIELEWSKI, D. J., PALMER, T. and MANOUSIOUTHAKIS, V. (2002). On the theory of optimal sensor placement. *AIChE Journal* **48** 1001–1012.
- DUFFIELD, N. G. (2004). Sampling for passive internet measurement: A review. *Statist. Sci.* **19** 472–498. [MR2185627](#)
- DUFFIELD, N., LUND, C. and THORUP, M. (2002). Properties and prediction of flow statistics from sampled packet streams. In *IMW'02: Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Internet Measurement* 159–171. ACM Press, New York.
- DUFFIELD, N., LUND, C. and THORUP, M. (2004). Flow sampling under hard resource constraints. In *SIGMETRICS'04/Performance'04: Proceedings of the Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems* 85–96. ACM Press, New York.
- FEDOROV, V. V. and HACKL, P. (1997). *Model-Oriented Design of Experiments*. Springer, New York. [MR1454123](#)
- FORD, I., TITTERINGTON, D. M. and KITSOS, C. P. (1989). Recent advances in nonlinear experimental design. *Technometrics* **31** 49–60. [MR0997670](#)
- GAUTIER, R. and PRONZATO, L. (1998). Sequential design and active control. In *New Developments and Applications in Experimental Design* (N. Flournoy, W. F. Rosenberger and W. K. Wong, eds.) 138–151. IMS, Hayward, CA.
- GOODWIN, G. C. (1977). *Dynamic System Identification: Experiment Design and Data Analysis*. Academic Press, New York. [MR0499203](#)
- GRANT, M. and BOYD, S. (2009). CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming (web page and software). Available at <http://stanford.edu/~boyd/cvx>.
- HARVEY, A. C. (1990). *Forecasting, Structural Time Series Models and the Kalman Filter*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. [MR1085719](#)
- LOBO, M. S., VANDENBERGHE, L., BOYD, S. and LEBRET, H. (1998). Applications of second-order cone programming. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **284** 193–228. [MR1655138](#)
- PARK, K. and WILLINGER, W. (2000). *Self-Similar Network Traffic and Performance Evaluation*. Wiley, New York.
- PETERSON, L. L. and DAVIE, B. S. (2003). *Computer Networks: A Systems Approach*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco.
- SOULE, A., LAKHINA, A., TAFT, N., PAPAGIANNAKI, K., SALAMATIAN, K., NUCCI, A., CROVELLA, M. and DIOT, C. (2005). Traffic matrices: Balancing measurements, inference and modeling. In *Proceedings of the Joint International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*. ACM Press, New York.

- TITTERINGTON, D. M. (1980). Aspects of optimal design in dynamic systems. *Technometrics* **22** 287–299. [MR0585632](#)
- UHLIG, S., QUOITIN, B., BALON, S. and LEPROPRE, J. (2006). Providing public intradomain traffic matrices to the research community. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* **36** 83–86.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
439 WEST HALL
1085 SOUTH UNIVERSITY
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48109
USA
E-MAIL: singhal@umich.edu
gmichail@umich.edu