

Node Awareness in Elastic Net

L3P3 Center for Open Middleware

Thursday, October 02, 2014

This document summarizes the work done in order to expand the elastic net regularized predictor to include node awareness. This first iteration separates the events data by the node they happened in and then tries to establish elastic net models for each event in each node. The whole process of model creation is described in the file “nen-analytics.R”, found in the private L3P3 Github repository. The models are exported in a variable called “node_separated_model_list”, which is a list of all the nodes in the system, containing each one a list of models for the events that happened on the system.

```
load('data.R')
head(summary(node_separated_model_list))
```

```
##                Length Class      Mode
## aswpeuib01.sceu.corp "24"    "-none-" "list"
## aswpeuib02.sceu.corp "28"    "-none-" "list"
## aswpeuib03.sceu.corp "24"    "-none-" "list"
## aswpeuib04.sceu.corp "26"    "-none-" "list"
## aswpeuid01.sceu.corp "28"    "-none-" "list"
## aswpeuid02.sceu.corp "31"    "-none-" "list"
```

Our objective is now to study the performance of this models. To do so, we're going to create a matrix where the rows are the system nodes and the columns are the events that happened on the system. The coefficients of the matrix will be the f-score of each model in each node.

```
events<-extract_unique_events(node_separated_model_list)
model_matrix<-matrix(nrow=length(node_separated_model_list),ncol=length(events))
colnames(model_matrix)<-events
rownames(model_matrix)<-names(node_separated_model_list)
for (i in 1:nrow(model_matrix)){
  for (j in 1:ncol(model_matrix)){
    model_index<-which(names(node_separated_model_list[[i]])==colnames(model_matrix)[j])
    if (length(model_index)==0){ #The event doesn't happen in that node
      model_matrix[i,j]<-NaN
    }
    else{
      model_matrix[i,j]<-node_separated_model_list[[i]][[model_index]]$fscore
    }
  }
}
model_matrix[1:5,1:5]
```

```
##                NO.EVENTS 66305  66306 68912  68918
## aswpeuib01.sceu.corp   0.4444    1    NaN   NaN   NaN
## aswpeuib02.sceu.corp   0.2000    1 1.0000    1 1.0000
## aswpeuib03.sceu.corp   0.5455   NaN 0.6667    1 0.6667
## aswpeuib04.sceu.corp   0.4000    1    NaN    1    NaN
## aswpeuid01.sceu.corp   0.6667    1    NaN   NaN   NaN
```

Let's now extract some insightful analytics.

- First, let's see how many models were correctly created out of the possible amount for each node and the average fscore for each node's models:

##	Events	Models	Percentage	Average	fscore
## aswpeuib01.sceu.corp	31	9	29.03%		0.8526
## aswpeuib02.sceu.corp	34	14	41.18%		0.8662
## aswpeuib03.sceu.corp	28	11	39.29%		0.8181
## aswpeuib04.sceu.corp	32	6	18.75%		0.8134
## aswpeuid01.sceu.corp	32	5	15.62%		0.9253
## aswpeuid02.sceu.corp	34	7	20.59%		0.8770
## aswpeuid03.sceu.corp	38	5	13.16%		0.8089
## aswpeuid04.sceu.corp	38	6	15.79%		0.7715
## aswpeuin01.sceu.corp	36	13	36.11%		0.8942
## aswpeuin02.sceu.corp	34	9	26.47%		0.8190
## aswpeuin03.sceu.corp	37	8	21.62%		0.8150
## aswpeuin04.sceu.corp	35	14	40%		0.8366
## aswpeuin05.sceu.corp	33	12	36.36%		0.8745
## aswpeuin06.sceu.corp	31	12	38.71%		0.8879
## aswpeuin07.sceu.corp	27	11	40.74%		0.8306
## aswpeuin08.sceu.corp	31	12	38.71%		0.8674
## aswpeuin09.sceu.corp	28	12	42.86%		0.8636
## aswpeuin10.sceu.corp	28	8	28.57%		0.7835
## aswpeuin11.sceu.corp	24	6	25%		0.7906
## aswpeuin12.sceu.corp	28	7	25%		0.7734
## ASWPEUIN13.sceu.corp	27	11	40.74%		0.8323
## ASWPEUIN14.sceu.corp	22	13	59.09%		0.8155
## ASWPEUIN15.sceu.corp	20	5	25%		0.7062
## ASWPEUIN16.sceu.corp	18	10	55.56%		0.8766
## ASWPEUIN17.sceu.corp	21	11	52.38%		0.8501
## ASWPEUIN18.sceu.corp	20	12	60%		0.8202
## ASWPEUIN19.sceu.corp	31	10	32.26%		0.9048
## ASWPEUIN20.sceu.corp	20	10	50%		0.8581
## dnsautpeuid01-adm.sceu.corp	8	1	12.5%		0.6667
## dnsautpeuid02-adm.sceu.corp	6	1	16.67%		0.5000
## dnsrespeuin01-adm.sceu.corp	11	1	9.09%		0.6667
## dnsrespeuin02-adm.sceu.corp	13	1	7.69%		0.8000
## dswpeuin01.sceu.corp	44	18	40.91%		0.8995
## dswpeuin02.sceu.corp	43	12	27.91%		0.8783
## dswpeuin03.sceu.corp	34	10	29.41%		0.7093
## dswpeuin04.sceu.corp	35	21	60%		0.8224
## dswpeuwt01.sceu.corp	45	9	20%		0.9431
## dswpeuwt02.sceu.corp	40	11	27.5%		0.7728
## dswpeuwt03.sceu.corp	39	5	12.82%		0.7631
## dswpeuwt04.sceu.corp	39	5	12.82%		0.6644
## fwpeuib01.sceu.corp	7	3	42.86%		0.8833
## fwpeuib02.sceu.corp	8	5	62.5%		0.8638
## fwpeuid01.sceu.corp	8	1	12.5%		0.7442
## fwpeuid02.sceu.corp	16	1	6.25%		0.6522
## FWPEUIN01	10	2	20%		0.7000
## FWPEUIN02	11	1	9.09%		1.0000
## lbpeuib01.sceu.corp	22	5	22.73%		0.7076
## lbpeuib02.sceu.corp	23	3	13.04%		0.8000
## lbpeuid01.sceu.corp	23	10	43.48%		0.6179
## lbpeuid02.sceu.corp	23	8	34.78%		0.5908

## lbpeuin01.sceu.corp	26	10	38.46%	0.8712
## lbpeuin02.sceu.corp	26	7	26.92%	0.8548

Even though most of the events are not captured, the ones that are modelled show good performance.

- Now, we'll study the number of nodes an event appears in, the amount of models created for that certain event and the average fscore for that model:

Critical Severity

##	Total.Nodes	Created.Models	Percentage	Average.fscore
## 96731154	2	1	50%	0.6667
## 68917	26	0	0%	NaN
## 69481	24	3	12.5%	0.8974

Major Severity

##	Total.Nodes	Created.Models	Percentage	Average.fscore
## 62324754	6	4	66.67%	0.5876
## 12845059	2	0	0%	NaN
## 2228225	24	12	50%	0.7762
## 69379	7	0	0%	NaN
## 96731153	30	2	6.67%	1.0000
## 69034	1	0	0%	NaN
## 4293918809	3	1	33.33%	1.0000
## 69489	36	19	52.78%	0.9087
## 4293918944	6	0	0%	NaN

Minor Severity

##	Total.Nodes	Created.Models	Percentage	Average.fscore
## 62324756	6	4	66.67%	0.5661

Blank Severity

##	Total.Nodes	Created.Models	Percentage	Average.fscore
## 62324755	6	5	83.33%	0.6027
## 62324757	6	6	100%	0.7652
## 62324754	6	4	66.67%	0.5876
## 1116676	38	0	0%	NaN
## 1116675	52	0	0%	NaN
## 2228482	21	10	47.62%	0.8511
## 2228226	24	12	50%	0.8860
## 8523866	22	2	9.09%	0.9000
## 8523849	23	1	4.35%	0.8000
## 2162726	31	6	19.35%	0.9792
## 8523870	22	11	50%	1.0000
## 8523803	22	10	45.45%	1.0000
## 8523778	22	3	13.64%	1.0000
## 2162714	23	1	4.35%	0.7619

## 8523816	20	0	0%	NaN
## 8523812	22	0	0%	NaN
## 8523798	36	0	0%	NaN
## 62324771	6	2	33.33%	0.9000
## 2162711	34	26	76.47%	0.8037
## 851970	15	7	46.67%	0.8336
## 2163911	28	20	71.43%	0.8658
## 2228481	10	4	40%	0.8731
## 69378	8	0	0%	NaN
## 96731145	32	2	6.25%	0.7857
## 67335	6	0	0%	NaN
## 68876	6	0	0%	NaN
## 68864	6	0	0%	NaN
## 39714818	4	0	0%	NaN
## 4293918944	6	0	0%	NaN
## 69382	6	1	16.67%	1.0000
## 66305	52	16	30.77%	0.9688
## 69386	6	1	16.67%	1.0000
## 69128	36	1	2.78%	1.0000
## 67348	14	1	7.14%	0.6667
## 88211715	3	0	0%	NaN
## 88211714	3	1	33.33%	1.0000
## 12845061	12	1	8.33%	0.9474
## 65565	11	1	9.09%	1.0000
## 73137	2	0	0%	NaN
## 68912	47	27	57.45%	0.9333
## 66306	47	15	31.91%	0.8778
## 96731154	2	1	50%	0.6667
## 2162715	4	0	0%	NaN
## 62324759	6	0	0%	NaN
## 62324758	6	0	0%	NaN
## 69547	3	0	0%	NaN
## 12845059	2	0	0%	NaN
## 62324756	6	4	66.67%	0.5661
## 65872	1	0	0%	NaN
## 65564	1	0	0%	NaN
## 8523811	1	0	0%	NaN
## 8523799	1	0	0%	NaN
## 18613386	4	4	100%	0.9819
## 69448	36	31	86.11%	0.8094
## 69450	34	30	88.24%	0.7459
## 69449	24	8	33.33%	0.9722
## 69447	24	11	45.83%	0.9710
## 68918	40	21	52.5%	0.8748
## 69489	36	19	52.78%	0.9087
## 69482	30	16	53.33%	0.9151
## 69490	9	0	0%	NaN
## 69480	9	2	22.22%	1.0000
## 67349	12	1	8.33%	1.0000
## 1116678	28	0	0%	NaN
## 8523864	28	0	0%	NaN
## 66049	28	0	0%	NaN
## 8523827	28	0	0%	NaN
## 66075	28	0	0%	NaN

## 8523824	1	0	0%	NaN
## 8523823	1	0	0%	NaN
## 65539	1	0	0%	NaN
## 2228225	24	12	50%	0.7762
## 39714820	1	0	0%	NaN
## 67329	14	7	50%	0.7821
## 67330	14	5	35.71%	0.9170
## 67334	4	0	0%	NaN

Again, it looks like the performance here follows an “all-or-nothing” pattern: there are a lot of nodes where patterns were not captured, but when they are the performance is really high.

The total possible models are 1378, whereas the amount of created models is 420, making a percentage of 30.48% modelled events.

Taking into account the performance of the created models, most of them could be incorporated into our predictor proof of concept black box.