

Deissenberg, Christophe

Working Paper

Optimal stabilization policy with delayed controls and imperfect state measurements

Diskussionsbeiträge - Serie A, No. 133

Provided in Cooperation with:

Department of Economics, University of Konstanz

Suggested Citation: Deissenberg, Christophe (1979) : Optimal stabilization policy with delayed controls and imperfect state measurements, Diskussionsbeiträge - Serie A, No. 133, Universität Konstanz, Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften und Statistik, Konstanz

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/78160>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

FAKULTÄT FÜR
WIRTSCHAFTSWISSENSCHAFTEN UND STATISTIK
UNIVERSITÄT KONSTANZ

OPTIMAL STABILIZATION POLICY
WITH DELAYED CONTROLS AND
IMPERFECT STATE MEASUREMENTS

Christophe Deissenberg

Serie A - Nr. 133

DISKUSSIONSBEITRÄGE

AG 872 80 Weltwirtschaft
Kiel

D-7750 Konstanz
Postfach 5560

C 93831

Serie A

Volkswirtschaftliche Beiträge

Nr. 133

OPTIMAL STABILIZATION POLICY
WITH DELAYED CONTROLS AND
IMPERFECT STATE MEASUREMENTS

Christophe Deissenberg

Serie A - Nr. 133

November 1979

Ag 872 80 Weltwirtschaft
K. K. K.

Abstract

The standard optimal control solutions of the macroeconomic stabilization problem - i.e. essentially: the open- and closed-loop solution - are not necessarily implementable or optimal in real-life situations. This is because they do not take into account the time necessary to measure the economy's state and to realize the policy measures physically. In this paper, Dynamic Programming is used to derive the "best implementable" solution to the optimisation of a quadratic welfare loss-functional subject to a linear econometric model when there are such delays. Two cases are considered:

- a) Perfect, but delayed state measurements are possible;
- b) Only imperfect, delayed measurements are available.

In both cases, the analytical characterization of the solution immediately suggests practical schemes for the numerical computation of the optimal policy sequence.

Acknowledgements

This paper was written as the author was Visiting Fellow at the Econometric Research Program, Princeton University, and Visiting Scholar at the London School of Economics. Financial support by the German Research Foundation, and helpful comments by Philip Klein and George Morton are gratefully acknowledged.

I. Introduction

One of the foremost tasks in quantitative macro-economic policy-making is the determination of the values of the monetary and fiscal policy-variables (such as tax rates, government expenditures, discount rates ...), which ensures that some bundle of macroeconomic goals (like low inflation and unemployment rates, equilibrated trade balance, etc) is optimised, not only in single periods, but dynamically over time. In order to provide a methodological basis to help answer these and similar questions, several authors have addressed themselves in recent years to the problem of minimising a quadratic welfare loss-functional

$$(1) \quad W = E \left[\sum_{t=1}^N \frac{1}{2} (x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) \right] \rightarrow \min_{u_1, \dots, u_N}$$

subject to a linear or linearised econometric model in state-variable form

$$(2a) \quad x_t = A_t x_{t-1} + B_t u_t + C_t z_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, N,$$

$$(2b) \quad x_0 = \hat{x},$$

see e.g. PINDYCK [1973], CHOW [1975]. This problem is known as the linear-quadratic-Gaussian tracking problem (short: LQG).

In the above equations as in the remainder of this article $E[\cdot]$ is the expectation operator and \cdot^T denotes transposition. $E[\cdot/\cdot\cdot]$ is the expectation of \cdot conditional on $\cdot\cdot$. The $(n \times 1)$ vector x_t describes the state of the economy at period t , \bar{x}_t being an exogenously specified target vector of desired

values for x_t , and \hat{x} being the given initial state. (This approach can easily be extended to the case when x_0 is known only probabilistically, see section IV.). The matrix K_t , which weights the squared and cross-termed deviations of x_t from its desired value \bar{x}_t , is non-negative definite. u_t is a $(m \times 1)$ vector of policy or control variables whose value is freely set by the policy-maker. z_t is a $(p \times 1)$ vector of exogeneous variables. ε_t is a $(n \times 1)$ vector of stochastic disturbance which are normal-distributed with mean 0 and known covariance matrix and which are serially uncorrelated. The parameter matrices A_t , B_t and C_t are assumed to be known exactly.

In general it is appropriate to define (2a) so that x_t includes u_t as a subvector, thus making u_t an argument of W without complicating the notation unnecessarily, see CHOW [1975] (The weighting of u_t in W can express the technical or political costs of using macroeconomic instruments. It may also be used to keep the fluctuation of u_t within reasonable bounds without explicitly introducing restrictions on these fluctuations).

For every initial state \hat{x} , (2a) describes the possible behaviour of the economy over time as a function of the policy variables u_t , of the uncontrollable events z_t and of the random phenomena ε_t . Because of the disturbances ε_t , this behaviour is only probabilistically known. The optimal policy problem is to determine the control sequence u_1^*, \dots, u_N^* which minimizes the expected welfare loss (1) subject to the economic constraints (2).

In the formulation (1)-(2) of the macroeconomic policy-making problem, neither the time needed to measure the economy's state x_t (i.e., the measurement lag) nor the time needed to decide upon and physically realise a control u_t (i.e., the realisation lag) are taken into consideration. However, it will be shown in section II that when the control lag as sum of measurement and realisation lag is longer than one period, failure to take it into account explicitly in the problem constraints results in a solution which cannot be implemented. Thus the so-called closed-loop solution of LQG, which traditionally has been used in the optimisation of econometric models, may be meaningless in numerous real-life situations.

In this paper we derive the "best implementable" solution to the macroeconomic policy-making problem when there is a control lag. First, in section II, we present the "classical" solutions of LQG, i.e., the closed-loop and the open-loop solutions. As previously stated, we show that these solutions are not implementable or optimal when there is a non-trivial control lag. In the following sections, two cases of macroeconomic policy-making with control lag are considered:

- a) The state of the economy is measured exactly (section III);
- b) Only a linear transformation of the state is measured, corrupted by additive stochastic disturbances (section IV).

In both cases analytical expressions for the solution of the delayed control problem, for the state variance/covariance and for the minimum expected welfare loss are given, which define easily realisable numerical solution schemes. Finally, section V is devoted to some conclusions.

II. Closed-loop and open-loop solutions

In optimal stochastic control there exists a well-defined correspondence between some characteristics of the optimal solution and the problem's assumptions on which information is used for determining the optimal control in any period. It is therefore usual to speak of the different solutions of a problem - meaning the solutions of the different problems derived one from the other by varying only the constraints on information availability. Two different solutions of LQG are generally considered in the literature:

- The closed-loop solution defines the optimal control in any period t as a function of the current state and of time, i.e. in the form,

$$(3) \quad u_t^* = u^*(x_{t-1}, t) \quad , \quad t = 1, \dots, N.$$

- The open-loop solution defines the optimal control as a function of the initial state and of time alone,

$$(4) \quad u_t^{**} = u^{**}(x_0, t) \quad , \quad t = 1, \dots, N.$$

The other major types of solution discussed in the literature for the general stochastic control problem, see e.g. BAR-SHALOM and TSE [1976], reduce to these two types in the special case of LQG.

Whatever assumptions are made on information availability the corresponding solution of LQG can be derived using Dynamic Programming, see CHOW [1975]. According to Bellman's Principle

of Optimality (BELLMAN [1957]), the optimal control for the period t , u_t^* , $t = 1, \dots, N$, can be obtained as the solution of the one-period optimisation problem:

$$(5) \quad V_t = E \left[\frac{1}{2} (x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) / \sigma_t \right] + V_{t+1}^* \rightarrow \min_{u_t},$$

where $V_{t+1}^* = \min V_{t+1}$ and σ_t describes the information available on the past process behaviour when determining u_t^* . Thus, loosely speaking, $\sigma_t = \{x_0, u_1, \dots, u_{t-1}\}$ in the open-loop case and $\sigma_t = \{x_0, \dots, x_{t-1}, u_1, \dots, u_{t-1}\}$ in the closed-loop case. It can easily be shown that $V_\tau^* = V^*(x_{\tau-1}, \tau)$ is the minimum expected welfare loss over $t = \tau, \dots, N$.

Since the ε_t are serially uncorrelated and independent of x_τ and u_τ , $\tau = 1, \dots, N$,

(5) can be rewritten in the closed-loop case in the form

$$(6) \quad V_t = \frac{1}{2} x_t^T K_t x_t - x_t^T K_t \bar{x}_t + \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_t^T K_t \bar{x}_t + E \left[\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_t^T K_t \varepsilon_t \right] + V_{t+1}^*.$$

This last equation is the starting point for deriving the closed-loop solution of LQG and will be referred to in later parts of this paper. The derivation of the optimal solution of LQG starting with (6) can be found in CHOW [1975] and will not be presented here.

The closed-loop solution of LQG always exists. It is unique and given by the deterministic, linear feedback rule

$$(7) \quad u_t^* = G_t x_{t-1} + g_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, N,$$

with

$$(8a) \quad G_t = -(B_t^T H_t B_t)^{-1} B_t^T H_t A_t ,$$

$$(8b) \quad g_t = -(B_t^T H_t B_t)^{-1} B_t^T (H_t C_t z_t - h_t) ,$$

$$(9a) \quad H_{t-1} = K_{t-1} + (A_t + B_t G_t)^T H_t (A_t + B_t G_t) , \quad H_N = K_N ,$$

$$(9b) \quad h_{t-1} = K_{t-1} \bar{x}_{t-1} + (A_t + B_t G_t)^T (h_t - H_t C_t z_t) , \quad h_N = K_N \bar{x}_N ,$$

provided $B_t^T H_t B_t$ is not singular. When this matrix is singular, the solution is no longer unique. However, a well defined optimal feedback rule (out of several possible) is easily obtained by replacing $(B_t^T H_t B_t)^{-1}$ in (8) with the corresponding Moore-Penrose generalised inverse, which is always uniquely defined. See GARBADE [1976], PRESTON [1977] for details.

The system (7)-(9) not only analytically characterises the optimal solution of (1)-(2), but offers computational schemes for numerical solutions as well. Using alternatively (8) and (9) for $t = N, N-1, \dots, 1$ together with the initial condition $H_N = K_N$, $h_N = K_N \bar{x}_N$, the matrices and vectors G_N, g_N ; H_{N-1}, h_{N-1} ; G_{N-1}, g_{N-1} ; \dots , G_1, g_1 , can be determined backward in time. As previously noted, the feedback matrices G_t and forcing vectors g_t are independent of the values taken by x and u over $t = 0, \dots, \bar{N}$; therefore, they can be predetermined before even x_0 is known. Given G_t and g_t , the optimal control u_t^* is determined by (7) as a linear, deterministic function of the current state of the economy, x_t .

The closed-loop solution (7)-(9) is the optimal solution of (1)-(2) in the absence of any restriction on information

availability. Accordingly, it makes "maximal" use of information. (In fact, (7)-(9) shows that this "maximal use" of information consists in using the actual value of x_{t-1} - and this value alone - to determine u_t^* . This reflects the independence and Markovian properties of the different sequences defined by LQG). No other solution to LQG yields a smaller expected minimum welfare loss. For these and other reasons, systematic use of the closed-loop solution has been advocated for use within the macroeconomic policy-making framework, see e.g. CHOW [1972].

However, practical implementation of the closed-loop solution puts stringent requirements on the length of the measurement and realisation lags. Although the optimal decision-rule (7) can be predetermined, the corresponding optimal controls u_t^* cannot be computed before the state x_{t-1} is known.

By (2a) x_{t-1} is a random variable. Its value can therefore only be determined by measuring it after it has been realised, i.e., at the earliest in $t-1$. Thus the closed-loop solution (7)-(9) can only be implemented if x_{t-1} is measured without delay ("on line" or "real time" measurement). Furthermore, this solution requires that the control u_t^* can be physically realised immediately after its value has been computed. To put it more precisely: implementation of the closed-loop solution is impossible if the control lag as the sum of measurement lag and of realisation lag is longer than one time period.

In actual macroeconomic policy-making, measurement lag and control lag are indeed far from trivial. (The measurement lag corresponds largely to the recognition lag of the theory of economic policy. The realisation lag covers, among

others, the so-called legislative and administrative lags. For a detailed discussion of the different kinds of delay in macroeconomic policy-making and of their relative and absolute importance, see e.g. FRIEDMAN [1948].) These lags will often amount to more than one period, particularly if the econometric model used has short sampling intervals (quarterly, monthly, or weekly models). If so, the solution (7)-(9) has no practical significance and cannot be used as a decision-help.

The open-loop solution, on the other hand, is the solution of the problem (1)-(2) augmented with the constraint (4) which excludes any use of state measurements for $t > 0$. It is given by (7)-(9) with x_{t-1} replaced in (7) with its minimum variance prediction conditional on x_0 . (This result can be obtained by trivially modifying the analysis of section III). Although in attenuated form, real-life implementations of this solution are still restricted by eventual measurement and realisation lags: the initial state x_0 (or, in the case of a random x_0 , its distribution) must be known at $t = 0$; the realisation lag for u_t^{**} cannot be longer than t periods. Within the context of macroeconomic policy-making, however, it is another characteristic of the open-loop solution which appears to be its major shortcoming. This solution disregards any measurement of the economy's state in periods $t > 0$ which might (and as a rule will) become available between $t = 0$ and $t = N$. This results in an unnecessarily large uncertainty about the real economy's state in $t > 0$ and in an accordingly unnecessarily large

minimum expected welfare loss. In other words, the open-loop solution as a rule is not the best implementable solution to the concrete macroeconomic problem. Note, however, that for the deterministic linear-quadratic problem, knowledge of the deterministic equivalent of (2) is sufficient to make a perfect, costless prediction of x_t , $t = 1, \dots, N$. Therefore, there is no advantage in using direct state measurements and both the open-loop and closed-loop solution determine the same optimal control sequence and the same minimum loss.

Summarising it can be said that both closed-loop and open-loop solutions are attractively clear-cut. They permit adequate treatment of the kind of problems most often encountered in engineering, see BRYSON and HO [1975]. However, they do not appear to be generally appropriate as solutions of the optimisation of econometric models for macroeconomic policy-making. The closed-loop solution will often not be implementable. The open-loop solution, too, may not be implementable; in any case, it unnecessarily restricts the use of the delayed measurements of the economy's state which are continuously available in policy-making. The purpose of section III is thus to derive the solution to LQG which will make the best possible use of available information while remaining implementable despite the given control delays.

It is important to note that we are exclusively concerned with the delays in determining and realising the optimal economic measures u_t^* . These delays take place out-

side of the economic structure described by (2a). They are not to be confused with the "transmission lags" within the economy. These express the fact that economic measures possibly do not influence the economy at once after they are realised and/or exert an influence over several periods. Such transmission lags will normally be explicitly taken into account in the econometric model - although their existence may be "hidden" in the state variable form (2a), which expresses the original model as a system of first-order difference equations.

III. Delayed controls

For simplicity's sake we assume in this section that measurement lag and realisation lag are constant and equal to α and β periods respectively, with $\alpha + \beta = \gamma$. At this point it is crucial to recognize that the conceptual differentiation between measurement lag and realisation lag is irrelevant for the solution of the delayed optimal control problem. According to our previous discussion of the delayed problem, the controls u_t we are concerned with are to be interpreted as "effective in period t , decided upon in period $t - \beta$, when the most recent state measurement is $x_{t-\gamma-1}$ ". The information that can be used in the determination of the optimal u_t is given by a) the deterministic knowledge of $x_{t-\gamma-1}$; b) the deterministic knowledge of the previous controls u_τ , $\tau < t$; and c), as we will show in detail, a probabilistic knowledge (a prediction) of the states $x_{t-\gamma}, \dots, x_{t-1}$; this prediction is based on the knowledge of the a priori system (2a), of $x_{t-\gamma-1}$, and of $u_{t-\gamma}, \dots, u_{t-1}$. The information a)-c) does not depend on when exactly within $[t-\gamma-1, t]$ the value of u_t is decided upon. It is already physically available in $t-\gamma$. Thus the absolute and relative values of α and β are unimportant. Only the value of γ is relevant, i.e. the length of the control lag.

Summarising, the control problem can be expressed as:

$$(10) \quad W = E \left[\sum_{t=\gamma}^N \frac{1}{2} (x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) \right] \rightarrow u_\gamma, \dots, u_N \min$$

subject to

$$(11a) \quad x_t = A_t x_{t-1} + B_t u_t + C_t z_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, N,$$

$$(11b) \quad x_0 = \hat{x},$$

$$(12a) \quad u_t^* = u^*(u_\mu, u_\nu, t), \quad \mu < t - \gamma, \quad \nu < t,$$

$$(12b) \quad u_1 = \hat{u}_1, \dots, u_{\gamma-1} = \hat{u}_{\gamma-1},$$

where \hat{u}_t , $0 < t < \gamma$, are the known historical values of u_t . The constraints (12) express exactly the minimum requirements necessary to ensure implementability of the solution when there is a control lag of γ periods. Since by (12b) the values of $u_1, \dots, u_{\gamma-1}$ are fixed, the delayed problem is concerned only with the determination of the optimal controls over $t = \gamma, \gamma+1, \dots, N$, see (10). (Alternatively one can, for example, define the problem over $t = 1, 2, \dots, N$. In this case (11a) must be extended to cover the periods $t = -\gamma, -\gamma+1, \dots, N$; the initial conditions (11b) and (12b) must define $x_{(-\gamma)}$ instead of x_0 and $u_{(-\gamma+1)}, \dots, u_0$ instead of $u_1, \dots, u_{\gamma-1}$.) The constraints (11) are identical to the constraints (2) in the standard LQG problem.

As before, it follows from Bellman's Principle of Optimality that the optimal control u_t^* can be obtained by solving the problem

$$(13) \quad V_t = E \left[\frac{1}{2} (x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) / x_\mu, u_\nu, \mu < t - \gamma, \nu < t \right] + \\ + V_{t+1}^* \rightarrow \min_{u_t}$$

We will show that the optimal solution of (13) can be expressed in the form of a linear-feedback rule acting on a minimum variance estimate of x_t . We first analyse the prediction process

$$(14) \quad \tilde{x}_t = E[x_t/x_\mu, u_\nu, \mu < t - \gamma, \nu < t] .$$

Let $k = t - \gamma - 1$. By successively eliminating x_t from (2a) for $t = t-1, \dots, k+1$, one sees that x_t can be decomposed into a deterministic part x_t^d and in a stochastic part η_t ,

$$(15) \quad x_t = (S_{t/\gamma} x_k + s_{t/\gamma}) + (\eta_t) := (x_t^d) + (\eta_t)$$

with

$$(16a) \quad S_{t/\gamma} = \prod_{\tau=0}^{\gamma} A_{t-\tau} ,$$

$$(16b) \quad s_{t/\gamma} = B_t u_t + C_t z_t + \sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau} \right) \cdot (B_{t-\theta-1} u_{t-\theta-1} + C_{t-\theta-1} z_{t-\theta-1}) ,$$

$$(17) \quad \eta_t = \varepsilon_t + \sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau} \right) \varepsilon_{t-\theta-1} .$$

By (17) η_t is a linear-combination of normal-distributed variables with mean 0. It is also independent of x_t and u_t for all t . Therefore

$$(18) \quad \tilde{x}_t = E[x_t^d + \eta_t] = E[x_t^d] + E[\eta_t] = x_t^d ,$$

i.e., x_t^d is the least mean-squared prediction of x_t , with prediction error $\eta_t = x_t - \tilde{x}_t = x_t - x_t^d$.

Let us now turn back to the optimisation problem (13).

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (19) \quad V_t &= E\left[\frac{1}{2}(x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) / x_\mu, u_\nu, \mu < t - \gamma, \nu < t\right] + V_{t+1}^* = \\
 &= E\left[\frac{1}{2}(x_t^d + \eta_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t^d + \eta_t - \bar{x}_t) / x_\mu, u_\nu, \mu < t - \gamma, \nu < t\right] + V_{t+1}^* = \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} x_t^{dT} K_t x_t^d - x_t^{dT} K_t \bar{x}_t + \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_t^T K_t \bar{x}_t + E\left[\frac{1}{2} \eta_t^T K_t \eta_t\right] + V_{t+1}^* .
 \end{aligned}$$

This last expression is of the same type as (6). Since the derivation of (7)-(9) from (6) together with (2a) is independent of the particular values taken by x_t , it follows immediately that the optimal solution of (13) is given by (7)-(9) with x_{t-1} replaced in (7) by the least mean-squared prediction x_{t-1}^d according to (15)-(17).

Thus, the optimal feedback rule remains the same in the case of arbitrarily long control lags as in the case of no lags. However, in the former case the feedback rule in t is acting on the best prediction x_{t-1}^d of x_{t-1} available in the period when u_t^* is to be decided upon, and not, as in the latter case, on actual deterministic knowledge of x_{t-1} . Furthermore, the minimum expected welfare loss increases with the length of the control lags. To recognize this, consider first the problem without delays, (1)-(2). From (6) in conjunction with (7) one can see that the direct contribution of every period t

to the expected minimum total welfare loss, $V_t^* - V_{t+1}^*$, can be interpreted as the sum of the following two components:

a) the minimum period loss in t for the deterministic problem obtained by neglecting the stochastic disturbances ε_t in (2); and b) a "stochastic part" $E\left[\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_t^T K_t \varepsilon_t\right] = \frac{1}{2} \text{trace } \Sigma K_t$. The stochastic part expresses the expected welfare loss which is caused by the uncertainty over the economy's dynamic behaviour expressed in the ε_t . This part is independent of x_0 and of the target values \bar{x}_t .

The same distinction can immediately be made for the problem with delayed controls (10)-(12). By (19) together with (15)-(16) it is evident that the deterministic part of the period loss is the same in the delayed case as in the case when there is no control lag. However, the stochastic part now takes the value $E\left[\frac{1}{2}\eta_t^T K_t \eta_t\right]$, i.e. by (17),

$$\begin{aligned}
 (20) \quad E\left[\frac{1}{2}\eta_t^T K_t \eta_t\right] &= E\left[\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_t^T K_t \varepsilon_t\right] + E\left[\frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau}\right)\varepsilon_{\theta-1}\right]^T K_t\right. \\
 &\quad \left.\cdot \left[\sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau}\right)\varepsilon_{\theta-1}\right]\right] = \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \text{trace } \phi_t K_t,
 \end{aligned}$$

with ϕ_t , the covariance matrix of η_t , given by

$$(21) \quad \phi_t = \Sigma + \left[\sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau}\right)\right] \Sigma \left[\sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau}\right)\right]^T.$$

(Of course ϕ_t is also the covariance matrix of the state x_t .)

Since K_t is non-negative definite a) $E\left[n_t^T K_t n_t\right] \geq E\left[\varepsilon_t^T K_t \varepsilon_t\right]$ for all t ; strict inequality will normally hold;

b) $E\left[n_t^T K_t n_t\right]$ is a non-decreasing, in general increasing, function of the control lag γ . In other words, the larger the control lag, the lower is the expected level of goal achievement. An increase in the control lag is exactly equivalent to an increase in the system's uncertainty. As previously noted, in the deterministic case ($\varepsilon_t = 0$ for all t) future states can be exactly predicated; control lags have no influence on the minimum loss.

IV. Optimal delayed controls with imperfect state information

In the real world, perfect measurements of the economy's state in any given period are not available. The first ex post estimate of a state is a mixture of imperfect measurements, complemented and modified by judgemental opinions, statistical inferences and forecasts. As more or better data become available, this first estimate is revised until eventually some "final" estimate is obtained. Even the final estimate, however, represents only a very imperfect measurement of the state considered.

In order to take this into account, we reformulate the problem (10)-(12) in the form

$$(22) \quad W = E \left[\sum_{t=\gamma}^N \frac{1}{2} (x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) \right] \rightarrow \min_{u_\gamma, \dots, u_N}$$

subject to

$$(23a) \quad x_t = A_t x_{t-1} + B_t u_t + C_t z_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, N,$$

$$(23b) \quad x_0 = \hat{x} + \varepsilon_0, \quad \varepsilon_0 \text{ is } N(0, \Sigma),$$

$$(24a) \quad u_t^* = u^*(y_\mu, u_\nu, t), \quad \mu < t - \gamma, \nu < t,$$

$$(24b) \quad u_1 = \hat{u}_1, \dots, u_{\gamma-1} = \hat{u}_{\gamma-1},$$

$$(25a) \quad y_t = M_t x_t + e_t, \quad t = 0, \dots, N,$$

$$(25b) \quad e_t \text{ is } N(0, \theta), \quad E \left[(e_t) (e_\tau)^T \right] = 0, \quad \tau \neq t,$$

$$(25c) \quad E \left[(e_t) (\varepsilon_\tau)^T \right] = 0, \quad t, \tau = 0, \dots, N,$$

where $N(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the normal distribution with mean \cdot and covariance matrix $\cdot \cdot \cdot$. That is, we assume that x_t can be measured only indirectly through the stochastic vector y_t governed by (25). This way of modelling imperfect measurements is standard in engineering literature. For the macro-economic policy-making problem it should offer a reasonable compromise between mathematical tractability and realism. The assumption (23b), that x_0 is not known exactly and is only described by a Gaussian random variable, follows naturally from assumption (25a-b). (Note, however, that (23b) includes a deterministic $x_0 = \hat{x}$ as special case; alternatively, as previously noted, the results of the earlier section can be extended trivially to cover a random, normal-distributed x_0 .) Assumption (25c) can easily be relaxed to allow for correlated $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and $\{e_t\}$ processes. The measurement lag is now to be understood as the time needed to obtain the measurement y_t after x_t is realized. As before, we assume a total control lag (measurement + realization lag) of γ periods.

The functional equation of Dynamic Programming for this problem is given by

$$(26) \quad V_t = E \left[\frac{1}{2} (x_t - \bar{x}_t)^T K_t (x_t - \bar{x}_t) / Y_\mu, u_\nu, \mu < t - \gamma, \nu < t \right] + V_{t+1}^* .$$

Again let $k = t - \gamma - 1$. From section III we know that x_t can be expressed as a linear transformation of x_k and the stochastic disturbance η_t , which is independent of all control and states:

$$(27) \quad x_t = S_{t/\gamma} x_k + s_{t/\gamma} + \eta_t ,$$

with $S_{t/\gamma}$, $s_{t/\gamma}$ and η_t given by (16)-(17). In the present case x_k is not known. However, Optimal Filtering Theory tells us that the minimum variance estimate of x_k , conditional on the whole process history,

$$(28) \quad x_k^f = E\left[x_k / \sigma_\mu, \mu \leq k\right], \quad k = 0, \dots, N,$$

can be computed recursively as a linear-combination of a) the current measurement y_k ; and b) the minimum variance estimate of the previous state x_{k-1}^f . The weights of this linear-combination express the relative importance of the uncertainty in the measurement y_k and of the uncertainty in a minimum-variance prediction of x_k , conditional on x_{k-1} . The recursive rule leading to the estimates x_k allows also computation of the corresponding error covariance matrices $\Gamma_k = \text{cov}(\omega_k)$, with $\omega_k := x_k - x_k^f$, $k = 0, \dots, N$. This rule is called a Kalman-Filter, the estimates x_k^f are known as filtered estimates. For details see, for example, ANDERSON and MOORE [1979].

The important result for our purpose is that the estimate error ω_k associated with the estimate x_k is normal-distributed with mean 0 and known covariance Γ_k . Setting $(x_k^f + \omega_k)$ for x_k in (27), one sees immediately that in the present case as in the case of section III x_t can be expressed as the sum of a deterministic part x_t^g and of a zero-mean normal distributed disturbance δ_t :

$$(29) \quad x_t = x_t^g + \delta_t$$

with

$$(30a) \quad x_t^g = S_{t/\gamma} x_k + s_{t/\gamma} ,$$

$$(30b) \quad \delta_t = S_{t/\gamma} \omega_k + \eta_t ,$$

the covariance matrix of δ_t (i.e., of x_t) being given by

$$(31) \quad \Delta_t = S_{t/\gamma} \Gamma_k S_{t/\gamma}^T + \Sigma + \left[\sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau} \right) \right] \Sigma \left[\sum_{\tau=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau} \right) \right]^T = \\ = S_{t/\gamma} \Gamma_k S_{t/\gamma}^T + \phi_t .$$

By an argument similar to the one of section III it follows immediately that in the case of delayed controls and imperfect state measurements:

1) The optimal solution of (26) is given by (7)-(9) with x_{t-1} replaced in (7) with its minimum variance prediction conditional on the optimal (Kalman) filtering of $x_{t-\gamma-1}$. In other words, here again the optimal feedback rule is unchanged compared with the basic case (1)-(2), except that it is now acting on the best available state prediction and not, as previously, on the actual value of the state.

2) The "stochastic part" of period t 's contribution, $t = \gamma, \dots, N$, to the minimum expected welfare loss is increased by trace $S_{t/\gamma} \Gamma_k S_{t/\gamma}^T K_t$ compared with the case with delays but exact measurements. This stochastic part is now the sum of the three elements

$$\text{trace } \Sigma K_t, \text{ trace } \left[\sum_{\theta=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau} \right) \right] \Sigma \left[\sum_{\tau=0}^{\gamma-1} \left(\prod_{\tau=0}^{\theta} A_{t-\tau} \right) \right]^T K_t, \text{ and trace } S_{t/\gamma} \Gamma_k S_{t/\gamma}^T K_t$$

corresponding respectively to the irreducible uncertainty in the economy's behaviour, to the increased uncertainty caused by the control lag, and to the uncertainty caused by the measurement's inexactitude. The deterministic part of the loss is unchanged by the assumption of imperfect measurements.

It should be noted here that the problem with imperfect measurements and no control lag and its solution have long been extensively discussed in the literature, see, e.g. CHOW [1975]. The solution of this problem is a special case of the solution presented in this section and is, of course, given by (7)-(9) with x_t replaced in (7) by the corresponding Kalman-Filtering of x_t given the whole process history over $0, \dots, t$.

The difference between imperfect measurements and perfect, lagged measurements is that in the former case it is never possible to determine the exact values of the states while in the latter this information eventually becomes available, but too late to be of use in determining the optimal control.

As previously pointed out, estimates of the economy's state in any given period are in general revised several times. The policy-maker is therefore likely to have at his disposal several imperfect measurements y_t, y_t', \dots , of the past state x_t , corresponding to the different revised estimates. If the statisticians do their job properly, however, (y_t, y_t', \dots) should not yield any more information about the true state x_t than the most recent estimate, y_t . Thus the y_μ taken into consideration in the formulation of V_t , see (26), can be taken

without loss of generality as the "newest" estimates available at the moment when u_t is to be decided upon.

Finally, let us remark that the problems of sections III and IV can easily be extended to cover the case when different control variables are associated with different control lags. This extension allows, for example, the explicit modelling of the fact that monetary policy measures can in general be realized faster than fiscal ones, etc.

V. Conclusions

The preceding sections have revealed that in every case studied the optimal control in t , u_t^* , is to be determined as a function of the minimum variance estimate of x_{t-1} , conditional on whatever information is available when u_t is to be decided upon. Control lags and imperfect measurements do reduce the quality of this estimate and, accordingly, do decrease the expected level of goal achievement. However, they have no effect on the linear transformation which expresses u_t^* as a function of the available estimate for x_{t-1} , i.e. on the optimal feedback equation in t . This result, while hardly surprising considering the given linear-quadratic framework, is both satisfactory and disappointing. On the one hand, it shows that numerical optimisations of linear econometric models remain valid in their most important aspects even if they neglect considerable control lags. In particular, these optimisations use the correct feedback decision rules. On the other hand the extreme simplicity and handiness of our results demonstrate once again the extreme poverty of the stochastic structure underlying LQG. In fact, even after the introduction of delays, the control problem can barely be called stochastic. (However, stochastic aspects play a considerable role in the filtering problem, which was not explicitly developed here.)

Thus, in spite of extensive presentation and discussion of this problem, we only find that it can be easily solved with

very elementary mathematics, and that the simplest, most intuitive ideas for dealing with control lags are indeed optimal. Even more disturbing may be the fact that this paper's results depend crucially on the linearity assumption. However, since a proved method to optimise non-linear econometric models proceeds through successive local linearisation (see CHOW [1975]), the results retain some operational validity even in the non-linear case. The Gaussian assumption is less crucial and can be significantly relaxed.

Finally, our results provide an immediate way of determining numerically the influence of control lags on the minimum expected welfare loss. We believe that a study of this influence using existing econometric models, although necessarily subject to serious qualifications, could lead to instructive insights as to the extent of potential economic costs due to delays in data gathering, decision-making and policy-implementation.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. and Moore, J. [1979], Optimal Filtering (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.).
- Bar-Shalom, Y. and Tse, E. [1976], "Concepts and Methods in Stochastic Control," in C. Leondes (Ed.): Control and Dynamic Systems, Vol. 12, 99-172 (New York-San Francisco-London: Academic Press)
- Bellman, R.E. [1957], Dynamic Programming (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press).
- Bryson, A. and Ho, Y. [1975], Applied Optimal Control (New York - London-Sydney-Toronto: John Wiley and Sons).
- Chow, G. [1972] , "How Much Could be Gained by Optimal Stochastic Control Policies," in Annals of Economic and Social Measurement, 1,4,391-406.
- Chow, G. [1975], Analysis and Control of Dynamic Economic Systems (Now York-London-Sydney-Toronto: John Wiley and Sons).
- Friedman, M. [1948], "A Monetary and Fiscal Framework for Economic Stability," in American Economic Review XXXVIII,2, 245-264.
- Garbade, K. [1976], "On the Existence and Uniqueness of Solutions to Multi-Period Linear Quadratic Optimal Control Problems," in International Economic Review, 17,3,719-731.
- Pindyck, R. [1973], Optimal Planning for Economic Stabilization (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company).
- Preston, J. [1977], "Existence, Uniqueness, and Stability of Linear Optimal Stabilization Policies," in Pitchford and Turnovsky (Eds): Applications of Control Theory to Economic Analysis, 255-292, (Amsterdam-New York-Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company).