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Abstract

We investigate Monte Carlo based algorithms for solving stochastic control problems with probabilistic constraints. Our motivation comes from microgrid management, where the controller tries to optimally dispatch a diesel generator while maintaining low probability of blackouts. The key question we investigate are empirical simulation procedures for learning the admissible control set that is specified implicitly through a probability constraint on the system state. We propose a variety of relevant statistical tools including logistic regression, Gaussian process regression, quantile regression and support vector machines, which we then incorporate into an overall Regression Monte Carlo (RMC) framework for approximate dynamic programming. Our results indicate that using logistic or Gaussian process regression to estimate the admissibility probability outperforms the other options. Our algorithms offer an efficient and reliable extension of RMC to probability-constrained control. We illustrate our findings with two case studies for the microgrid problem.
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1 Introduction

Stochastic control with probabilistic constraints is a natural relaxation of deterministic restrictions which tend to generate high costs forcing the avoidance of extreme events no matter their likelihood of occurrence. In contrast, with probabilistic constraints, constraint violation is tolerated up to a certain level offering a better trade-off between admissibility and cost. We refer to
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Geletu et al. (2013) for an overview of probability constrained problems and list below some of our motivating settings and references:

1. **Microgrid management**: An electric power microgrid is a collection of intermittent renewable generator units, a conventional dispatchable diesel generator (or grid interconnection), and a battery energy storage system. The microgrid aims to supply electricity to a community in islanded mode, balancing fluctuating demand and supply. The microgrid operator achieves this by optimizing the use of the battery storage and the back-up dispatchable generator. Since perfect balancing is very expensive, it is common to allow for a small frequency of black-outs, i.e. occurrences where demand outstrips supply. A standard approach is to use mixed-integer linear programming by approximating the non-linear and non-convex probability constraints with more conservative convex constraints as in Liu et al. (2017). A more detailed description of different convex approximations of probabilistic constrained problems are given in Nemirovski and Shapiro (2007). In a more recent work, Ravichandran et al. (2018) extend the standard micro-grid model to incorporate a fleet of electric-vehicles and find optimal decisions for charging and discharging of electric vehicles with probability constraints.

2. **Hydro-power optimization**: control of a hydro-power dam with probabilistic constraints was discussed in Alais et al. (2017). Within this setup, the controller observes random inflows from precipitation, as well as fluctuating electricity prices. Her objective is to control the downstream outflow from the dam to maximize profit from power sales, while ensuring a minimum dam capacity with high probability. Other related works are van Ackooij et al. (2014); Andrieu et al. (2010).

3. **Motion planning**: finding the minimum-cost path for a robot from one location to another while avoiding colliding with objects that obstruct its path. Stochasticity in the environment implies that the robot motion is only partially controlled. Robust optimization that guarantees obstacle avoidance might be infeasible, making probabilistic constraints a viable alternative. Dynamic programming methods for unmanned aerial vehicles were introduced in Quintero et al. (2016) and the probabilistic-constrained motion of a robot was solved in Janson et al. (2017).

**Contribution.** In sum, in the stochastic context it is common and natural to impose probabilistic constraints. In contrast to deterministic constraints that are often simple to verify, probabilistic constraints are much harder to handle since admissibility of the control can generally only be estimated. Therefore, a numerical procedure to learn which actions are admissible is necessary in addition to the core optimization routine. In this paper, we consider continuous-state, continuous-time models on infinite probability spaces. Therefore, probability constraints become a local expectation constraint at each system state. The canonical setup involves finite-horizon control of a stochastic process described through a stochastic differential equation of Itô type. The overarching solution paradigm involves the Bellman or Dynamic Programming equation, which works with discretized time-steps but with a smooth spatial variable. In this context, we develop algorithms to solve stochastic optimal control problems with probabilistic constraints using regression Monte Carlo (RMC). To make this highly nontrivial extension to RMC, we investigate tools from statistics and machine learning (including support vector machines (SVM), Gaussian process (GP) regression, parametric density estimation, logistic regression and quantile regression) to estimate the admissible set corresponding to the probability constraint and test them for a practical problem of energy management. Our algorithm allows us to estimate the two parts of the problem—the
constraint and the approximation of the conditional expectation—in parallel and with significantly lower simulation budget compared to a naive implementation.

After proposing several approaches and benchmarking them on two case-studies, our main finding is to recommend logistic regression and GP-smoothed probability estimation as the best procedures. These methods are stable, relatively fast and allow for a variety of further adjustments and speed-ups. In contrast, in our experience despite theoretical appeal, quantile regression and SVM are not well-suited for this task. On a higher level, our main take-away is that stochastic control with probabilistic constraints (SCPC) is well within reach of cutting-edge RMC methods. Thus, it is now computationally feasible to tackle such problems, opening the door for new SCPC models and applications.

**Solutions in literature.** Mixed-integer linear programming (MILP) is the standard tool used to solve SCPC (see [Ahmed and Shapiro 2014](#)) for an overview), however, there are several reasons why Regression Monte Carlo (RMC) or approximate dynamic programming methods may be a better choice. First, unlike MILP, RMC does not require any discretization of the state space, neither does it require linearizing the constraints. Approximating non-linear constraints by linearizing them can significantly affect the quality of the solution. Second, an important advantage of RMC is its ability to find optimal control dynamically for each time step and every state. This differs from MILP methods where the entire problem needs to be solved again for a new state. Third, MILP suffers from severe time-complexity constraints as the time horizon increases, RMC, on the other hand, has linear time complexity with respect to the horizon. In a recent work [Keerthisinghe et al. 2018](#), the authors also find that the approximate dynamic programming methods like RMC have better solution quality and better runtime as the horizon of the problem increases.

A dual dynamic programming based approach for SCPC has been discussed in [Ono et al. 2015](#); [Alais et al. 2017](#). The central idea is to incorporate the constraint in the objective function via Lagrange multiplier and iteratively solve for the optimal control and Lagrange multiplier. Although it is a popular approach, the final solution is sub-optimal due to the duality gap.

Another approach to SCPC is the *stochastic viability* framework for multi-period constraints developed in [Alais et al. 2017](#); [Doyen and Lara 2010](#). In these works, the goal is to maximize the probability of being admissible, which is defined both in terms of profit targets and satisfying constraints at every time step. Local probabilistic constraints of the type discussed in this paper have been recently also studied in [Jiao et al. 2017](#) to compute hedging price of a portfolio whose risk is defined in terms of its future value with respect to a set of stochastic benchmarks. Besides a local probabilistic constraint, authors also provide dynamic programming equations for multi-period constraints. However, their solution is driven by very specific loss functions and state processes. In contrast, we develop general purpose numerical schemes using statistical learning methods.

### 2 Problem formulation

We study numerical resolution of stochastic control problems on finite horizon $[0, T]$ with local implicit constraints, specifically we work with constraints defined through probabilistic conditions on the controlled state. Let $(X(t))_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous time controlled stochastic Markov process and $(u(t))_{t \geq 0}$, with $u(t) \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}$ for all $t$, be the corresponding control. We assume that the dynamics of the system at time $t$ is described by an Itô process $X(t)$:

$$
\mathrm{d}X(t) = b(t, X(t), u(t))\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(t, X(t), u(t))\mathrm{d}B(t),
$$

where \((B(t))\) is a \(m\)-dimensional Brownian motion and \(b: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d\) and \(\sigma: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}\) are measurable functions, such that a (weak) solution exists for admissible controls defined below. We further assume that control decisions are made at discrete epochs \(\{t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_N = T\}\) while, between time-steps, the value of \(u(t)\) remains constant. Thus, the control process is piecewise-wise constant and càdlàg (right-continuous with left limits). For the sake of brevity, we will sometimes write \(X(t_n) \equiv X_n\) and \(u(t_n) \equiv u_n\) at discrete epochs \(t_n\). At every other time-point \(s \in (t_n, t_{n+1})\) we continue to use the standard notation i.e. \(X(s), u(s)\). The general formulation of the stochastic control problem we are interested in this paper is of the form:

\[
V_n(X_n) = \inf_{(u_k)}_{k=n} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \pi_s(X(s), u_k)ds + W(X(t_N)) \Big| X_n \right] \right\}, \tag{2.1}
\]

where \(W(\cdot)\) represents the terminal penalty, \(\pi_t(\cdot, \cdot)\) the running cost and

\[
\mathcal{U}_{n:N}(X_n) = \left\{ (u_k)_{k=n}^N : P_k(X_k, u_k) \in A_k \forall k \in \{n, \ldots, N-1\} \right\}, \tag{2.2}
\]

with \(P_k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) and \(A_k \subset \mathbb{R}\). The admissible set \(\mathcal{U}\) restricts potential choices of controls given the current state \(X_n\). A key assumption is that admissibility is defined implicitly, i.e. \(a \ priori\) it is not clear which control choices satisfy constraints and which do not. Thus, the controller must carry out the optimization while simultaneously learning the feasibility of proposed actions. In other words, the mapping \(P_k(\cdot, \cdot)\) is only given implicitly and inverting it to obtain \(\mathcal{U}_{n:N}(X_n)\) is numerically nontrivial. We will assume in the following that an admissible control always exists at any state, so that we may define \(\mathcal{U}_n(X_n) = \mathcal{U}_{n:n}(X_n)\) to be the set of admissible controls satisfying the constraints at a single decision epoch \(t_n\) conditional on \(X_n\). We re-write (2.1) in terms of the corresponding dynamic programming equation at step \(n\):

\[
V_n(X_n) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_n(X_n)} \left\{ C_n(X_n, u) \right\}, \tag{2.3}
\]

where

\[
C_n(X_n, u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \pi_s(X(s), u)ds + V_{n+1}(X(t_{n+1})) \Big| X_n, u \right].
\]

Above \(C_n(X_n, u)\) is the continuation value, i.e. reward-to-go plus expectation of future rewards, from using the control \(u\) over \([t_n, t_{n+1})\). Moreover, given the state \(X_n\), we say that \(u^* \in \mathcal{U}_n(X_n)\) is an optimal control if \(V_n(X_n) = C_n(X_n, u^*)\). Since the admissible set \(\mathcal{U}_n(X_n)\) is both time and state dependent, we need to estimate the continuation value \(C_n(\cdot, \cdot)\) and the admissible control set \(\mathcal{U}_n(\cdot)\) at every time step.

Through the rest of the article we will assume \(P_n(X_n, u_n)\) and \(A_n\) in (2.2) to be

\[
P_n(X_n, u_n) \equiv p_n(X_n, u_n) := \mathbb{P} \left( G((X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}])} > 0 \big| X_n, u_n \right) \quad \text{and} \quad A_n := [0, p]. \tag{2.4}
\]

In other words, we target the set of controls such that the conditional probability of the functional \(G(\cdot)\) of \(X\) being greater than zero is bounded by a threshold \(p\), i.e.

\[
\mathcal{U}_n(X_n) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{W} : p_n(X_n, u_n) < p \right\}. \tag{2.5}
\]

For simplicity of notation, we define \(G_n(X_n, u_n)\) as the regular conditional distribution of the
functional $G(\cdot)$ given $(X_n, u_n)$:

$$G_n(X_n, u_n) := \mathbb{L}\left(G((X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]}|X_n, u_n) \right). \quad (2.6)$$

When writing $\mathbb{P}(G_n(X_n, u_n) > z)$ or $\mathbb{E}[g(G_n(X_n, u_n))]$ we mean the probability or the expectation with respect to this conditional distribution. The parameter $p$ in equation $[2.5]$ is interpreted as relaxing the strong constraint $G \leq 0$ which may not be appropriate in a stochastic environment. The random variable $G_n(X_n, u_n)$ quantifies the riskiness of the controlled trajectory, and the controller is required to keep the former below some pre-specified level, taken without loss of generality to be zero. Typical values of $p$ would generally be small.

**Remark 1.** We may rewrite $[2.4]$ through the corresponding $(1-p)^{th}$ quantile $q(X_n, u_n)$ of $G_n(X_n, u_n)$:

$$q_n(X_n, u_n) : (X_n, u_n) \mapsto \inf_z \left\{ \mathbb{P}\left(G_n(X_n, u_n) > z\right) \leq p \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Then using

$$U_n(X_n) := \left\{ u : p_n(X_n, u) < p \right\} = \left\{ u : q_n(X_n, u) < 0 \right\}, \quad (2.8)$$

we can set $P'_n := q_n$ and $\tilde{A} = (-\infty, 0)$ in $[2.2]$. We will exploit this equivalence to propose quantile-based methods (Section 1) for the admissible set.

**Remark 2.** Assuming a one dimensional control $u_n \in W \subset \mathbb{R}$, and the probability $p_n(X_n, u_n)$ monotonically decreasing in $u_n$, estimating the admissible set $U_n(X_n)$ is equivalent to estimating the *minimum* admissible control

$$u_n^{\text{min}}(X_n) := \inf_{u \in W} \left\{ u : p_n(X_n, u) < p \right\}. \quad (2.9)$$

The corresponding admissible set will be $U_n(X_n) = \{ u \in W : u \geq u_n^{\text{min}}(X_n) \}$.

**Remark 3.** A more general version are implicit constraints of the form

$$\left\{ u \in W : \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(G_n(X_n, u)\right)\right] < p \right\},$$

for a function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, where of course the probability constraint $[2.5]$ above arises when $g$ is an indicator function. Also notice that in principle $\mathcal{C}$ is not monotone in $u$, and hence the admissibility set $\mathcal{U}$ might affect the optimal control even when $u_n^{\text{min}}(x) > u_n^{\text{min}}(x)$.

**Remark 4.** Equation $[2.8]$ describes admissible controls $u$ for a given state $x$. The “dual” perspective is to consider the set of states $X_n^a(u) \subset \mathcal{X}$ for which a given control $u$ is admissible:

$$X_n^a(u) := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : p_n(x, u) < p \right\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Often the cardinality of $\mathcal{X}$ is infinite, while the control space $\mathcal{W}$ is finite, so that enumerating $[2.9]$ over $u \in \mathcal{W}$ is considerably easier than enumerating the uncountable family of sets $x \mapsto U_n(x)$ in equation $[2.5]$. Furthermore, if $u \mapsto p_n(x, u)$ is decreasing for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then we obtain an ordering $X_n^a(u_1) \subseteq X_n^a(u_2)$ for $u_1 \leq u_2$. The latter nesting feature greatly helps to estimate the various $X_n^a$'s. In other words, frequently one may rank the controls in terms of their “riskiness” with respect to $G_n$, so that the safest control will have a very large $X_n^a(u)$ (possibly all of $\mathcal{X}$), while the riskiest
control will have a very small admissibility domain.

Remark 5. Notice that the reward between time $[t_n, t_{n+1})$, $\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \pi_s(X(s), u)ds$ is random at time $t_n$. As a result, we incorporate it in the definition of our continuation value $C_n(X_n, u)$.

2.1 Regression Monte Carlo

In this article we focus on simulation-based techniques to solve (2.1). The overall framework is based on solving equation (2.3) through backward induction on $n = N - 1, N - 2, \ldots$, replacing the true $V_n(x)$ with an estimate $\hat{V}_n(x)$. Since neither the conditional expectation, nor the admissibility constraint are generally available explicitly those terms must also be replaced with their estimated counterparts. As a result, we work with the approximate Dynamic Programming recursion

$$
\hat{V}_n(X_n) = \inf_{u_n \in \hat{U}_n(X_n)} \left\{ \hat{C}_n(X_n, u_n) \right\},
$$

where

$$
\hat{C}_n(X_n, u_n) := \hat{E} \left[ \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \pi_s(X(s), u_n)ds + \hat{V}_{n+1}(X(t_{n+1})) \mid X_n, u_n \right].
$$

(2.10)

Above, $\hat{E}$ is the approximate projection operator and the set of admissible controls $\hat{U}_n$ is also approximated via either $\hat{p}_n(\cdot, \cdot)$, i.e., $\hat{U}_n(X_n) := \{ u : \hat{p}_n(X_n, u) < p \}$, or $\hat{q}_n(\cdot, \cdot)$, i.e., $\hat{U}_n(X_n) = \{ u : \hat{q}_n(X_n, u) < 0 \}$, see (2.8). The estimated optimal control $\hat{u}_n \in \hat{U}_n(X_n)$ satisfies $\hat{V}_n(X_n) = \hat{C}_n(X_n, \hat{u}_n)$.

The key idea underlying our algorithm and defining the Regression Monte Carlo paradigm is that $\hat{E}$ and $\hat{U}$ are implemented through empirical regressions based on Monte Carlo simulations. In other words, we construct random, probabilistically defined approximations based on realized paths of $X$. This philosophy allows to simultaneously handle the numerical integration (against the stochastic shocks in $X$) and the numerical interpolation (defining $\hat{V}_n(x)$ for arbitrary $x$) necessary to solve (2.10).

To understand RMC, recall that specifying $\hat{E}$ is equivalent to approximating the conditional expectation map $(x, u) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\psi((X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}])} \mid X_n = x, u_n = u] = \hat{f}(x, u)$ where we will specifically substitute

$$
\hat{f}(x, u) = \hat{E}[\psi((X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}])} \mid X_n = x, u_n = u]
$$

To do so, we consider a dataset consisting of inputs $(x_n^1, u_n^1), \ldots, (x_n^{M_n}, u_n^{M_n})$ and the corresponding pathwise realizations $y^1, \ldots, y^{M_n}$ with $y^j = \psi((X(s))^{j}_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]}), \text{ where } (X(s))^{j}_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]}$ is an independent draw from the distribution of the process $(X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]}(x_n^j, u_n^j)$. Then we use the training set $\{x_n^j, u_n^j, y^j\}_{j=1}^{M_n}$ to learn $\hat{f}$, an estimator of $f$, via regression.

Similarly, estimating $\hat{U}_n$ is equivalent to learning the conditional probability map $p_n(x, u)$ (or the conditional quantile map $q_n(x, u)$ in (2.5)) and then comparing to the threshold value $p$ (zero, respectively). This statistical task, whose marriage with RMC is our central contribution, is discussed in Section 4.

The technique of using regressions for the approximation of the continuation value was developed in the celebrated work by Longstaff and Schwartz (2001) and Tsitsiklis and van Roy (2001) in the context of American option pricing and further enhanced in Bouchard and Warin (2012); Ludkovski (2018). This was extended for storage problems and controlled state process in Carmona and
Ludkovski (2010); Boogert and de Jong (2008, 2011); Balata and Palczewski (2017); Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019). Among the approaches for approximating $f$ we mention Warin (2012) and Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019) who exploit the structure of the problem to reduce the dimensionality of the regressions, Balata and Palczewski (2017, 2018) who harness the distribution of process to reduce the variance of $\hat{f}$ and Warin (2012); Langrené et al. (2015); Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019) who use non-parametric regression methods for $\hat{f}$.

In contrast to the above well-developed literature, we are not aware of any existing works to estimate the set of admissible controls $\hat{U}_n(X_n)$ which requires approximating $p(x, u)$ (or $q(x, u)$) in equation (2.5). A naive approach is to estimate $\hat{U}_n(X_n)$ for every state realized during the backward induction through nested Monte Carlo. Namely for each pair $(x, u)$ encountered, we may estimate the probability of violating the constraint by simulating $M_b$ samples from the conditional distribution $G_n(x, u)$ as $\{g^b_n(x, u)\}_{b=1}^{M_b}$. We then set $u \in \hat{U}_n(x)$ if $\bar{p}_n(x, u) < p$, where

$$\bar{p}_n(x, u) := \frac{1}{M_b} \sum_{b=1}^{M_b} 1_{g^b_n(x, u) > 0}$$

is the empirical probability. Although extremely easy to implement, this Nested Monte Carlo (NMC) method is computationally intractable for even the easiest problems. As an example, a typical RMC scheme employs $M_c \approx 100,000$ and assuming $M_b = 1000$ for inner simulations, which is necessary for good estimates of small probabilities $p \leq 0.1$, would require $10^8$ simulation budget at every time-step to implement NMC. Note furthermore that NMC returns only the local estimates $\bar{p}(x, u)$; no functional estimate of $U_n(x)$ or $X^*_a(u)$ is provided for an arbitrary $x$. As a result, any out-of-sample evaluation (i.e. on a future sample path of $X$.) requires further inner simulations, making this implementation even more computationally prohibitive.

An important challenge in using $\hat{U}$ is verifying admissibility. Since we are employing random Monte Carlo samples to decide whether $u$ is admissible at $x$, this is a probabilistic statement and admissibility can never be guaranteed. We may use statistical tools to quantify the accuracy of $U$, for example, by applying classical Central Limit Theorem tools for the estimator $\bar{p}(x, u)$ of the true $p(x, u)$. In particular, to provide better statistical guarantees regarding $\hat{U}$ we develop statistical tools in order to make statements (with asymptotic guarantee) such as $u \in U$ with 95% confidence (equivalent to $p(x, u) < p$ with 95% probability). As we show, without such “conservative” estimates based on confidence levels, estimates of $U$ might be highly unreliable, frequently causing decisions that are inadmissible with respect the imposed probability constraint. Thus, the related construction of $\hat{U}^{(\rho)}$ with specified confidence level $\rho$ is a running theme in Section 4, where we propose several statistical methods.

### 2.2 Motivation: controlling blackout probability in a microgrid

To make our presentation concrete, in this section we formalize the motivating example from microgrid management to illustrate the application of the framework (2.3). A microgrid comprises renewable and traditional generation sources, along with a medium of storage, designed and managed to provide electricity power to a community in a decentralized way. We consider a system composed of a dispatchable diesel generator, a renewable energy source and an electric battery storage. The microgrid topology is illustrated in the left panel of Figure 1 and is same as the example discussed in Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019).

In this context, the state variables are $X(t) = (L(t), I(t), C(t))$, where $L(t)$ is the net demand
Figure 1: Left panel: Microgrid topology: clockwise from bottom right corner the load, the diesel generator, the battery and the renewable generators. Right: Contour plot for minimum admissible diesel output \( u_{\min}(L, I, C) \) (see Remark 2). Generally for \( L < 0 \), the constraint is not binding and \( u_{\min}(L, I, C) = 0 \). As demand increases, the constraint becomes more stringent, i.e. \( u_{\min}(L, I, C) \) increases in \( L \). Red curve represents a path of the controlled demand-inventory pair \( (L_u^*, I_u^*, C_u^*) \) following a myopic strategy choosing the minimum admissible control \( u_n(L, I, C) = u_{\min}(L, I, C) \).

(demand net of renewable generation), \( I(t) \in [0, I_{\max}] \) is the state of charge of the battery, referred to as “the inventory”, and \( C(t) \in \{0, 1\} \) is the state of the diesel generator. \( C(t) = 0 \) refers to diesel being OFF and \( C(t) = 1 \) implies ON. The controller is in charge of the diesel through the control \( u(t) \), which indicates the power output of the unit. Simultaneously, she faces the constraint of avoiding blackouts, whereby demand is not met. We assume, for clarity of exposition, that the net demand \( L(t) \) is an exogenous process, while \( I(t) \) is controlled. We reiterate that the control decisions are made at discrete epochs \( \{t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_{N-1}\} \), however these decisions affect the state of the system continuously. As a result, choosing the control \( u(t_n) \equiv u_n \) at time \( t_n \) involves minimizing the cost of running the microgrid, as well as controlling the probability of blackout (i.e. controller fails to match the net demand) at intermediate intervals \( [t_n, t_{n+1}) \). The blackout is described through the imbalance process \( S(s) := L(s) - u_n - B(s), \forall s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}) \), representing the difference between the demand and supply, while the diesel output is held constant (“zero-order-hold”) over the time step. The power output from the battery is a deterministic function of net-demand, inventory and the control \( B(s) = \varphi(L(s), I(s), u_n) \) constrained by the physical limitations of the battery. Furthermore, \( B(s) > 0 \) implies supply of power from the battery and \( B(s) < 0 \) implies charging of the battery. The set of admissible controls is thus defined as:

\[
\mathcal{U}_n(L_n, I_n, C_n) := \left\{ u : \mathbb{P}\left( \sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1})} S(s) > 0 \right| (L_n, I_n, C_n, u) < 0 \right\}.
\]

(2.12)

Thus in the context of microgrid, the conditional distribution \( G_n \) of equation (2.6) and the corresponding \( p_n(L_n, I_n, C_n) \) are:

\[
G_n(L_n, I_n, C_n, u_n) = \mathcal{L}\left( \sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1})} S(s) \right| (L_n, I_n, C_n, u_n)),
\]

\[
p_n(L_n, I_n, C_n, u_n) = \mathbb{P}(G_n(L_n, I_n, C_n, u_n) > 0).
\]

(2.13)
Because $p_n$ is not (in general) available analytically, the admissibility condition $p_n(L_n, I_n, C_n) < p$ is implicit. Recall that we denote by $W = 0 \cup \{\bar{u}, \tilde{u}\}$ the unconstrained control set. We assume that $u(t) = 0$ means that the diesel is OFF, while $u(t) > 0$ means that it is ON, and at output level $u(t)$. Thus, we define $C(s) = 1_{\{u_n>0\}} \forall s \in (t_n, t_{n+1})$ with the time interval left-open in order to allow for identification of switching on and off of the diesel generator at times $t_n$. Notice also that the process $C(t)$ does not satisfy the controlled diffusive dynamics, but this slight extension of the framework does not impact on the methods and results presented. We then look at the following formulation of the general problem:

$$
V_n(L_n, I_n, C_n) = \min_{\{u_k\}_{k=n}^{N-1}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} 1_{\{C_k=0,u_k>0\}} K + \rho(u_k) \Delta t_k \right] + W(L_N, I_N, C_N) \right\} \left( L_n, I_n, C_n \right),
$$

subject to

$$
\mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} S(s) > 0 \right] | (L_n, I_n, C_n) \right) < p \quad \forall n
$$

where $\Delta t_k = t_{k+1} - t_k$, $\rho(u_k)$ is the instantaneous cost of running the diesel generator to produce power output $u_k$ and $K$ is the cost of switching on the diesel generator. We assume zero cost to turn off the generator. The DPE corresponding to (2.14) is the same as in (2.3) with the integral running cost $\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \pi_s(X(s), u_n) \, ds$ replaced by

$$
1_{\{C_n=0,u_n>0\}} K + \rho(u_n) \Delta t_n.
$$

**Remark 6.** The admissible set $U \subseteq W$ for this problem has the special structure of being an interval: if $u \in U(x)$, then $\forall \tilde{u} > u, \bar{u} \in U(x)$. Hence, we may represent $U(x) = [u_n^{\text{min}}(x), \bar{u}]$ in terms of the minimal admissible diesel output $u_n^{\text{min}}(x)$. Conversely, the admissibility domains for a fixed $u \in W$ are nested: if $u_1 \leq u_2$ then $X_n^a(u_1) \subseteq X_n^a(u_2)$. This suggests to compute $X_n^a(u)$ sequentially as $u$ is increased and then invert to get $U(x)$.

To visualize the minimum admissible control $u_n^{\text{min}}(x)$, the right panel of Figure 1 presents the map $x \rightarrow u_n^{\text{min}}(x)$ under a constraint of $p = 0.01$ probability of blackout. We also present a path for $(L(t), I(t), C(t))_{t \geq 0}$ using a myopic strategy where the controller employs the minimum admissible control at each point, $u_n := u_n^{\text{min}}(L_n, I_n, C_n) \forall n$. Notice how for the most part, $u_n^{\text{min}} = 0$ is trivially admissible so that $U(x) = [0, \bar{u}]$ and the blackout constraint is not binding. This is not surprising, as blackouts are only possible when $L(t) \gg 0$ is strongly positive and the battery is close to empty, $I(t) \approx 0$. Thus, except for the lower-right corner, any control is admissible. As a result, only a small subset of the domain $X$ actually requires additional effort to estimate the admissible set $U(x)$. In our experience this structure, where the constraint is not necessarily binding and where we mostly perform unconstrained optimization, is quite common in applications.

### 3 Dynamic emulation algorithm

In this section we present our Dynamic emulation algorithm which provides approximation for the admissible set $U_n(\cdot)$ and the continuation value function $\hat{C}_n(\cdot, \cdot)$. The main steps of the algorithm
can be summarized using the following two steps, implemented in parallel at every time-step:

Generate design → Generate one-step paths & statistic for admissibility → Estimate admissible set

Generate design → Generate one-step paths & pathwise profits → Estimate continuation function

To estimate \( \hat{C}_n(\cdot, \cdot) \)'s and \( \hat{U}_n(\cdot) \)'s, we proceed iteratively backward in time starting with known

terminal condition \( W(X) \) and sequentially estimate \( \hat{U}_n \) and \( \hat{C}_n \) for \( n = N - 1, \ldots, 0 \). Assuming

we have estimated \( \hat{U}_{n+1}, \ldots, \hat{U}_{N-1} \) and \( \hat{C}_{n+1}, \ldots, \hat{C}_{N-1} \), we first explain the estimation procedure for

\( \hat{U}_n \) and \( \hat{C}_n \). This corresponds to a fit task. In the subsequent backward recursion at step \( n - 1 \) we also need the predict task to actually evaluate \( \hat{V}_n(X_n) \) which requires evaluating \( \hat{C}_n(\cdot) \) at new (“out-of-sample”) inputs \( X_n, u_n \) which of course do not coincide with the training inputs \( (x_n^1, u_n^1), \ldots, (x_n^M, u_n^M) \).

3.1 Estimating the set of admissible controls

To estimate the set of admissible controls \( \hat{U}_n(\cdot) \) at time-step \( n \), we choose design \( \mathcal{D}_n^a := (x_n^i, u_n^i, i = 1, \ldots, M_n) \) and simulate trajectories of the state process \( (X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} \) starting from \( X^i(t_n) = x_n^i \) and driven by control \( u_n^i \). To evaluate the functional \( G((X(s))_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]}), \) we discretize the time interval \([t_n, t_{n+1}]\) into \( K \) finer sub-steps with \( \Delta n_k := t_{n(k+1)} - t_{nk} \) and define the discrete trajectory \( x_n^i = x_n^{i0}, x_n^{i1}, \ldots, x_n^{i(K-1)}, x_n^{iK} \). We then record

\[
    w_n^i := \mathbb{I}\left(G((x_n^{i_k})_{k \in \{0, \ldots, K-1}\}) > 0\right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, M_n, \tag{3.2}
\]

where, formally, we extend \( (x_n^{i_k})_{k \in \{0, \ldots, K-1\}} \) to a piecewise constant trajectory on \([t_n, t_{n+1}]\).

Analogous to standard RMC, we now select an approximation space \( \mathcal{H}_n^a \) to estimate the probability \( \hat{p}_n \) or the quantile \( \hat{q}_n \), using the loss function \( \mathcal{L}_n^a \) and apply empirical projection:

\[
    \hat{p}_n := \arg \min_{f_n \in \mathcal{H}_n^a} \sum_{i=1}^{M_n} \mathcal{L}_n^a(f_n, w_n^i, x_n^i, u_n^i). \tag{3.3}
\]

See Section 4 for concrete examples of \( \mathcal{H}_n^a \) and \( \mathcal{L}_n^a \). Note that the approximations \( \hat{p}_n \) and \( \hat{q}_n \) must be trained on joint state-control datasets \( \{x_n^i, u_n^i, w_n^i\}_{i=1}^{M_n} \) with \( w_n^i \) dependent on the method of choice and moreover yield random estimators (\( \hat{p}_n \) is a random variable).

Using the distribution of \( \hat{p}_n(x, u) \) we may obtain a more conservative estimator that provides better guarantees on the ultimate admissibility of \( (x, u) \). As a motivation, recall the NMC estimator \( \bar{p}_n(x, u) \) from (2.11): for reasonably large \( M_b \gg 20 \), the distribution of \( \bar{p}_n(x, u) \) is approximately Gaussian with mean \( p_n(x, u) \) and variance \( \sqrt{p_n(x, u)(1 - p_n(x, u))} / M_b \). Defining

\[
    \bar{p}_n^{(p)}(x, u) := \bar{p}_n(x, u) + \xi_n^{(p)}(x, u) \tag{3.4}
\]

\[
    := \bar{p}_n(x, u) + z_p \sqrt{p_n(x, u)(1 - p_n(x, u)) / M_b}, \tag{3.5}
\]

where \( z_p \) is the standard normal quantile at level \( \rho \) and \( \xi_n^{(p)}(x, u) \) represents a “safe” margin of
error for $\tilde{p}_n$ at confidence level $\rho$. The corresponding admissible set with confidence $\rho$ is

$$\hat{U}^{(\rho)}(x) := \tilde{U}^{(\rho)}(x) = \left\{ u : \tilde{p}_n(x, u) + \xi_n(x, u) < p \right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

More generally, we set the admissible set for a site $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to

$$\hat{U}^\xi(x) = \{ u : \tilde{p}_n(x, u) + \xi_n(x, u) < p \}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\xi_n(x, u)$ ensures “stronger” guarantee for the admissibility of $u$ at $x$. The margin of estimation error can also be fixed, $\xi_n(x, u) = c \forall (x, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W}$, which can be applied when the sampling distribution of $\tilde{p}_n(x, u)$ is unknown or cannot be approximated using a Gaussian distribution. The corresponding admissible set

$$\hat{U}^\xi = c(x) = \{ u : \tilde{p}_n(x, u) + c < p \}. \quad (3.8)$$

is equivalent to estimating $\hat{U}^\xi = 0(x)$ with a shifted lower probability threshold $p - c$. For simplicity of notation, throughout this article we use $\hat{U}_n(x)$ to denote the unadjusted admissible set,

$$\hat{U}_n(x) := \hat{U}^\xi = 0(x)$$

in the context of NMC. As mentioned in Remark 1, equations (3.2)-(3.3) based on learning the quantile $q_n(x, u)$ could also be adjusted analogously to (3.7) to add a margin of error, $\hat{U}^\xi_n(x) = \{ u : \tilde{q}_n(x, u) + \xi_n(x, u) < 0 \}$.

### 3.2 Estimating the continuation value

To estimate the continuation value $C_n(\cdot, \cdot)$, we choose a simulation design $\mathcal{D}_n := (x^i_n, u^i_n, j = 1 \ldots, M_c)$ (which could be independent or equivalent to $\mathcal{D}^n$) and generate one-step paths for the state process $(X(s))^j_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]}$ starting from $X^j(t_n) = x^i_n$ and driven by control $u^j_n$, comprising again of finer sub-steps $x^j_k = x^j_{n0}, x^j_{n1}, \ldots, x^j_{nK_k}, x^j_{nk}$. (in principle the sub-steps could differ from the time discretization for $\hat{U}_n$). Next, we compute the pathwise cost $y^j_n$:

$$y^j_n = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \pi_{nk}(x^j_{nk}, u^j_n) \Delta n_k + v^j_{n+1}, \quad \text{where} \quad v^j_{n+1} = \inf_{u \in \hat{U}_n(x^j_{nk})} \hat{C}_{n+1}(x^j_{nk}, u), \quad j = 1 \ldots, M_c, \quad (3.9)$$

and we replace the time integral in (2.3) with a discrete sum over $t_n$'s. At the key step, we project $\{y^j_n\}_{j=1}^{M_c}$ onto an approximation space $\mathcal{H}_n$ to evaluate the continuation value $C_n(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$\hat{C}_n(\cdot, \cdot) := \arg \min_{f_n \in \mathcal{H}_n} \sum_{n=1}^{M_c} \sum_{j=1}^{M_c} |f_n(x^j_n, u^j_n) - y^j_n|^2. \quad (3.10)$$

The design sites $\{x^j_n, u^j_n\}_{j=1}^{M_c}$ could be same or different from those used for learning the admissible sets in the previous subsection. Two standard approximation spaces $\mathcal{H}_n$ used in this context are: global polynomial approximation and piecewise continuous approximation.

**Remark 7.** In the microgrid example of Section 2.2 the running cost over $[n, n+1]$ is known once the control $u_n$ is chosen. Thus it can be taken outside the conditional expectation and the data to
be regressed is simply $y^j = v^j_{n+1}$.

**Global polynomial approximation:** This is a classical regression framework where $\hat{C}_n^\alpha(x, u) := \sum_k \alpha_k \phi_k(x, u)$, where $\phi_k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a polynomial basis and the coefficients $\alpha$ are fitted via

$$\hat{\alpha} := \arg \min_{\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^{M_s} \left| \sum_k \alpha_k \phi_k(x^j, u^j) - y^j \right|^2.$$  

(3.11)

As an illustration, for the microgrid example of Section 2.2 we construct a quadratic polynomial approximation when diesel generator is ON, $u > 0$, using 10 bases $\{1, L, I, u, L^2, I^2, u^2, LI, Iu, LI\}$ and a separate quadratic approximation with the 6 basis functions $\{1, L, I, L^2, I^2, LI, LI\}$ when diesel generator is OFF, $u = 0$. Polynomial approximation is easy to implement but typically requires many degrees of freedom (lots of $\phi$’s) to properly capture the shape of $C$ and can be empirically unstable, especially if there are sharp changes in the underlying function (see for example Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019); Langrené et al. (2015)).

**Piecewise continuous approximation:** This is a state-of-art tool in low dimensions, $d \leq 3$. The main idea is to employ polynomial regression in a single dimension and extend to the other dimensions via linear interpolation. As an example, for the microgrid with diesel generator ON, we have three dimensions ($L, I, u$). We discretize inventory $I$ as $\{I_0, I_1, \ldots, I_{M_I}\}$ and control $u$ as $\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{M_u}\}$ and fit independent cubic polynomials in $L$ for each pair $(I_l, u_e)$ with $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, M_I\}$ and $e \in \{0, 1, \ldots, M_u\}$, i.e., $f_{n}^{l,e}(L) = \sum_k \phi_k(L)$. For any $(I, u) \in [I^l, I^{l+1}] \times [u^e, u^{e+1}]$ we then provide the interpolated approximation $\hat{C}_n(L, I, u)$ as

$$\hat{C}_n(L, I, u) = \frac{[I^{l+1} - I] [I - I^l]}{(u^{e+1} - u^e)(I^{l+1} - I^l)} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} f_{n}^{l,e}(L) & f_{n}^{l+1,e}(L) \\ f_{n}^{l+1,e}(L) & f_{n}^{l+1,e+1}(L) \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} u^{e+1} - u \\ u - u^e \end{array} \right].$$  

(3.12)

**Nonparametric approximation:** Further alternatives for $\mathcal{H}_n^c$ can be found in Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019) who used Gaussian process regression and Langrené et al. (2015); Langrené and Warin (2019) who used local polynomial regression. For semi-parametric approximation, Bouchard and Warin (2012) developed piecewise multivariate linear regression.

### 3.3 Evaluation

We analyze the quality of the solution by computing three quantities on the out-of-sample dataset:

- estimate of the value function $V_0(x_0)$ at $t = 0$ and state $x_0$;
- empirical frequency of inadmissible decisions on the controlled trajectories $x^u$;
- statistical test for the realized number of constraint violations (blackouts for the microgrid).

Good solutions should minimize costs and not apply inadmissible controls. However, since we employ empirical estimators, $\mathcal{U}$ is never known with certainty and we must handle the possibility
that constraints are violated with probability more than $p$. In turn this leads to the trade-off between complying with (2.2) and optimizing costs. Similar treatment of constraints in the context of sample average approximation of probabilistic constrained optimization problems have been discussed in Nemirovski and Shapiro (2007), Luedtke and Ahmed (2008). Moreover, our framework implies that the whole algorithm is stochastic: multiple runs will lead to different results since both $\hat{p}$ and $\hat{C}$ are impacted by the random samples $y_i$ and $w_i$.

**Estimate of the value function:** We evaluate the value function $\hat{V}_0(x_0)$ at time $t_0 = 0$ and state $x_0$ using $M'$ out-of-sample paths $(x_{0,m'}^n)$, $m' = 1, \ldots, M'$. Each trajectory $(x_{0,m'}^n)$ is generated by applying the estimated optimal control $\hat{u}_{0,N-1}$ based on the realized pathwise cost

$$v_0(x_{0,N}^n) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \pi_{n_k}(\hat{x}_{n_k}^j, \hat{u}_{n_k}^j)\Delta n_k + W(\hat{x}_{N}^j).$$

The resulting empirical Monte Carlo estimate is

$$\hat{V}_0(x_0) \simeq \frac{1}{M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} v_0(x_{0,N}^m)$$

and represents an unbiased estimation of the value of the control policy and an upper bound estimation of the value function, provided all controls used are admissible.

**Empirical frequency of inadmissible decisions on the controlled trajectories:** For the $M'$ out-of-sample paths, we compare the estimated optimal control $\{\hat{u}_n(x_{n,m'})\}_{n=0}^{N-1,M'}$ against the minimum admissible control $\{u_{n}^{\min}(x_{n,m'})\}_{n=0}^{N-1,M'}$ assumed for a second to be known. Namely, for each path we compute the number of inadmissible decisions $w_0(x_{0,N}^m)$ and the empirical frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$ as:

$$w_0(x_{0,N}^m) := \sum_n \mathbb{I}_{\hat{u}_n(x_{n,m'}) < u_{n}^{\min}(x_{n,m'})} \text{ and } w_{freq} := \frac{1}{N \cdot M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} w_0(x_{0,N}^m),$$

respectively. We employ these metrics in Section 4 where a “gold standard” $\{u_n^{\min}(x_{n,m'})\}_{n=0}^{N-1,M'}$ is obtained by brute force, utilizing a simulation budget $10^5$ larger than for the actual methods we are comparing. Empirical gold standard is a common technique when analytical benchmark is unavailable, see e.g., Deisenroth et al. (2009). A good estimation method should yield $w_{freq} \simeq 0$.

**Statistical test:** Next we propose statistical tests using the controlled trajectories to validate different methods for admissible set estimation. Such a test is essential to affirm the use of a numerical scheme for $\mathcal{U}_n$ in the absence of a benchmark. As an example, in the context of microgrid we want to test the null hypothesis $H_0$ that the realized probability of blackouts is bounded to the required level against the alternative $H_1$ that their probability is too high. Let

$$B_{n}^{m'} = \mathbb{I}\{G(x_{0,N}^{n,m'}) > 0\}, \quad n = 0, \ldots, N-1 \text{ and } m' = 1, \ldots, M'.$$

Ignoring the correlation due to the temporal dependence in $x_n$, we assume that $B_{n}^{m'} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\tilde{p})$,
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i.i.d. We want to test:

\[ H_0 : \hat{p} \leq p \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_0 : \hat{p} > p. \]  

(3.16)

A common approach to such composite null hypothesis is to replace \( H_0 \) with a more conservative hypothesis \( \tilde{p} = p \) leading to the test statistic

\[ T := \frac{\sum_{m',n} (B_{m'}^n - p)}{\sqrt{M' \cdot N \cdot p \cdot (1 - p)}} \sim N(0, 1). \]  

(3.17)

Hence, \( H_0 \) is rejected at a confidence level \( \alpha \) if \( T > z_\alpha \) with \( z_\alpha = \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \), e.g. \( z_\alpha = 1.65 \) for \( \alpha = 95\% \).

Remark 8. The above test assumes independence and identical distribution of \( B_{m'}^n \)'s. In the context of the microgrid example, neither of the two assumptions are valid; \( B_{m'}^n \) have different distribution because the state of the system affects the probability of a blackout, thus \( \tilde{p} \) varies with \( n, m' \). Furthermore, \( B_{m'}^n \) are not independent as they are derived from a single, sequentially controlled trajectory.

Remark 9. In the microgrid setup, the blackout constraint is frequently not binding (the net demand is negative half of the time). Therefore, \( T \) as defined in equation (3.17) is most likely negative leading to accept the \( H_0 \) even when the method fails to choose the admissible control when the constraint is binding. We fix this by evaluating the sum only when the constraint is binding, i.e.

\[ \tilde{T} := \frac{\sum_{m',n} (B_{m'}^n - p) I_{u_{\min}(\tilde{x}_{m'}^n) > 0}}{\sqrt{p \cdot (1 - p) \cdot M' \cdot N \cdot w_{\text{bind}}}} \quad \text{where} \quad w_{\text{bind}} = \frac{\sum_{m',n} I_{u_{\min}(\tilde{x}_{m'}^n) > 0}}{M' \cdot N}. \]  

(3.18)

To wrap up this section, Algorithm 1 (dubbed Dynamic Emulation due to similarities with a related algorithm for unconstrained stochastic control from [Ludkovski and Maheshwari (2019)]) summarizes the overall sequence of steps. Lines 1-6 can be thought of as part of a stochastic simulator which generates designs and one-step paths for each design site. Line 8 (and again Line 18) computes pathwise one-step costs. Line 10 is the admissible set estimation. Line 11 is the estimation of the continuation value. Lines 12-17 call the stochastic simulator for generating new design and one-step paths.

Algorithm 1 carries several advantages. First and foremost it is very general, as the method does not assume any restriction on the distribution \( G_n(X_n, u) \) defining \( U_n \) or the form of the payoffs \( \pi(x, u) \). Hence it can be generically applied across a wide spectrum of SCPC problems. Second, the same template (in particular based on having two essentially independent sub-modules) accommodates a slew of potential techniques for learning \( C \) and \( U \) bringing plug-and-play functionality, such as straightforward switching from probability estimation to quantile estimation. Third, it allows for computational savings either through parallelizing the estimation of \( U \) and \( \hat{C} \), or by re-using the same design and simulations \( D_n \equiv D_{\tilde{n}} \) for the computation of the two sub-modules.

Remark 10. The challenge of RMC methods is that the errors recursively propagate backward. As a result, poor estimation at one step can affect the overall quality of the solution. In our algorithm, the errors at every step occur due to:

- Approximation architecture \( \mathcal{H}_n^x \) for \( U_n \Rightarrow \text{Projection error in admissible control set estimation} \);
- Approximation architecture \( \mathcal{H}_n^c \) for \( \hat{C}_n \Rightarrow \text{Projection error in estimating continuation value} \);
• Designs $D^a_n$ and $D^c_n \Rightarrow$ Finite-sample Monte Carlo errors (difference between empirical estimates and theoretical projection-based ones)

• Discretization of the time interval $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ using $\Delta n_k \Rightarrow$ Integration error in approximating the integral $\int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \pi_s(X(s), u) ds$ and the admissible set $U_n$.

• Numerical approximation of the solution of the controlled dynamics of $X(t)$.

• Optimization errors in maximizing for $\hat{u}$ over $\hat{U}$, especially when the control set $W$ is continuous.

### Algorithm 1: Dynamic Emulation Algorithm

**Data:** $N$ (time steps), $M_c$ (simulation budget for conditional expectation), $M_a$ (simulation budget for admissible set estimation)

1. Generate designs:
2. $D^a_{N-1} := (X^a_{N-1}, u^a_{N-1})$ of size $M_a$ for estimating $\hat{U}$.
3. $D^c_{N-1} := (X^c_{N-1}, u^c_{N-1})$ of size $M_c$ for estimating $\hat{C}$.

4. Generate one-step paths:
5. $x^i_{N-1} \mapsto x^i_{N}$ using $u^N_{N-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, M_a$
6. $x^j_{N-1} \mapsto x^j_{N}$ using $u^N_{N-1}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, M_c$

7. Terminal condition:
8. $y^j_{N-1} \leftarrow \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \pi_i(N-1)_k (x_i^{j,N-1}_k, u_i^{j,N-1}_k) + W(x_i^{j,N-1}_N) \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, M_c$

for $n = N - 1, \ldots, 1$ do

9. Estimate $\hat{U}_n(\cdot)$ using methods in Section 4 and paths $x^n_i \mapsto x^n_{i+1}$
10. $\hat{C}_n(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow \arg \min_{f_n \in H_n} \sum_{j=1}^{M_c} |f_n(x^n_j, u^n_j) - y^n_j|^2$

11. Generate designs:
12. $D^n_{n-1} := (X^n_{n-1}, u^n_{n-1})$ of size $M_a$ for estimating $\hat{U}$.
13. $D^n_{n-1} := (X^n_{n-1}, u^n_{n-1})$ of size $M_c$ for estimating $\hat{C}$.

14. Generate one-step paths:
15. $x^n_i \mapsto x^n_i$ using $u^n_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, M_a$
16. $x^n_i \mapsto x^n_i$ using $u^n_{i-1}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, M_c$

17. $y^n_{n-1} \leftarrow \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \pi_i(n-1)_k (x_i^{j,n-1}_k, u_i^{j,n-1}_k) + \max_{u \in \hat{U}_n(x_i^{j,n-1}, u)} \{ \hat{C}_n(x_i^{j,n-1}, u) \} \forall j$

18. return $\{ \hat{C}_n(\cdot, \cdot), \hat{U}_n(\cdot) \}_{n=1}^{N-1}$

### 4 Admissible set estimation

In this section we propose two different approaches to estimate the admissible set of controls $U_n$ in equation (2.5):
• **Probability estimation:** Given a state \( X_n = x \) and \( u \in \mathcal{W} \), we estimate, via simulation, the probability of violating the constraint

\[
\hat{p}_n(x, u) \simeq P(G_n(x, u) > 0).
\]

It follows that \( u \in \hat{U}_n(x) \iff \hat{p}_n(x, u) < p \). Particularly, to compute \( \hat{p}_n(x, u) \) we consider Gaussian process smoothing of empirical probabilities, logistic regression and parametric density fitting.

• **Quantile estimation:** We approximate the quantile \( q_n(x, u) \) of \( G_n(x, u) \) via empirical ranking, support vector machines and quantile regression methods. The admissible sets \( \hat{U}_n(x) \) and \( \hat{X}_n^a(u) \) are then defined as:

\[
\hat{U}_n(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{q}_n(x, u) < 0 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{X}_n^a(u) := \left\{ x : \hat{q}_n(x, u) < 0 \right\}.
\]

To implement all of the above techniques we use Monte Carlo simulation, specifying first the simulation design and then sampling (independently across draws) the \( G \)'s or \( Y \)'s to be used as training data. We work in a flexible framework where samples of \( G_n(x, u) \) are generated in batches of \( M_b \) simulations from each design site \( \{x_i, u_i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \). The case of \( M_b = 1 \) corresponds to a classical regression approach, while large \( M_b \gg 1 \) can be interpreted as nested Monte Carlo averaging along \( M_b \) inner samples.

**Remark 11.** In section 3.2 we parameterized the elements of the approximation space \( \mathcal{H}_a^c_n \) for estimation of the continuation value function \( \hat{C}(\cdot, \cdot) \) via vectors \( \alpha \), i.e. \( f_c^a_n(x, u) \equiv f_c^a_n(x, u; \alpha) \) (see equations (3.10) and (3.11)). To maintain distinct notations, in the following sections we will use \( \beta \) to generically parameterize the elements of the approximation space \( \mathcal{H}_a^c_n \) for estimation of the admissible set, so that \( f_a^a_n(x, u) \equiv f_a^a_n(x, u; \beta) \) in equation (3.3). The meaning and dimension of \( \beta \) will vary from method to method.

### 4.1 Probability estimation

#### 4.1.1 Interpolated nested Monte Carlo (INMC)

Recall the NMC method from Section 2.1 where we select \( M_a \) design sites of state-action pairs and simulate multiple paths from each site to locally assess the probability of \( G_n(x, u) > 0 \) (in what follows, we suppress in the notation the dependence on \( n \)). Specifically, for each design site \( (x^i, u^i) \), \( i = 1, \ldots, M_a \), we simulate \( M_b \) batched samples from the distribution \( G(x^i, u^i) \) as \( \{g_b^b(x^i, u^i)\}_{b=1}^{M_b} \). The unbiased point estimator of \( p(x^i, u^i) \) is:

\[
\tilde{p}(x^i, u^i) := \frac{M_b}{\sum_{b=1}^{M_b} 1_{g_b^b(x^i, u^i) > 0}}.
\]

Since (4.1) only yields \( M_b \) local estimates \( \tilde{p}(x^i, u^i) \), for Algorithm 1 we have to extend them to an arbitrary state-action \( (x, u) \mapsto \hat{p}_{\text{INMC}}(x, u) \). This is achieved by interpolating \( \tilde{p}(x^i, u^i) \)'s, e.g. linearly.
The admissible set with confidence level $\rho$ becomes:

$$\hat{U}^{(\rho)}_{\text{INMC}}(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{p}_{\text{INMC}}(x, u) \leq p - z_\rho \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_{\text{INMC}}(x, u)(1 - \hat{p}_{\text{INMC}}(x, u))}{M_b}} \right\}.$$  

However, especially for $M_b$ small, interpolation performs poorly because the underlying point estimates $\hat{p}(x^i, u^i)$ are noisy. Therefore, smoothing should be applied leading to consideration of statistical regression models. Regression allows to borrow information cross-sectionally to remove the above estimation noise and hence lower both the bias and variance of $\hat{p}$.

### 4.1.2 Gaussian process regression (GPR)

One flexible non-parametric regression method we propose is Gaussian process regression (GPR). GPR assumes that the map $(x, u) \rightarrow p(x, u)$ is a realization of a Gaussian random field so that \{p(x, u) | (x, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W}\} is a collection of random variables with any finite subset being multivariate Gaussian. For any $n$ design sites $\{(x^i, u^i)\}_{i=1}^n$, GPR posits that

$$p(x^i, u^i), \ldots, p(x^n, u^n) \sim \mathcal{N}(\vec{m}_u, K_n)$$

with mean vector $\vec{m}_u := [m(x^1, u^1; \beta), \ldots, m(x^n, u^n; \beta)]$ and $n \times n$ covariance matrix $K_n$ comprised of $\kappa(x^i, u^i, x^{i'}, u^{i'}; \beta)$, for $1 \leq i, i' \leq n$. The vector $\beta$ represents all the hyperparameters for this model.

Given the training dataset \{(x^i, u^i), \vec{p}^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a}$ (where $\vec{p}^i$ is a shorthand for $\hat{p}(x^i, u^i)$), GPR infers the posterior of $p(\cdot, \cdot)$ by assuming an observation model of the form $\hat{p}(x, u) = p(x, u) + \epsilon$ with a Gaussian noise term $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_p^2)$. Conditioning equations for multivariate normal vectors imply that the posterior predictive distribution $p(x, u) | \{(x^i, u^i), \vec{p}^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a}$ at any arbitrary site $(x, u)$ is also Gaussian with the posterior mean $\hat{p}_{\text{GPR}}(x, u)$ that is the proposed estimator of $p(x, u)$:

$$\hat{p}_{\text{GPR}}(x, u) := m(x, u) + K^T(K + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}(\vec{p} - \vec{m}) = \mathbb{E}[p(x, u) | \vec{x}, \vec{u}, \vec{p}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

where $\vec{x} = [x^1, \ldots, x^{M_a}]^T$, $\vec{u} = [u^1, \ldots, u^{M_a}]^T$, $\vec{p} = [\vec{p}^1, \ldots, \vec{p}^{M_a}]^T$, $K^T = [\kappa(x, u, x^1, u^1; \beta), \ldots, \kappa(x, u, x^{M_a}, u^{M_a}; \beta)]$, $\vec{m} = [m(x^1, u^1; \beta), \ldots, m(x^{M_a}, u^{M_a}; \beta)]$,  \hspace{1cm} (4.3)

and $K$ is $M_a \times M_a$ covariance matrix described through the kernel function $\kappa(\cdot, \cdot; \beta)$.

The mean function is often assumed to be constant $m(x, u; \beta) = \beta_0$ or described using a linear model $m(x, u; \beta) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_k \phi(x^i, u^i)$ with $\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ representing a polynomial basis. A popular choice for the kernel $\kappa(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot)$ is squared exponential (see equation (4.4)) with $\{\beta_{\text{len}, k}\}_{k=1}^{d}$, $\beta_{\text{len}, u}$ termed the lengthscales and $\sigma_p^2$ the process variance of $p(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$\kappa(x^i, u^i, x^{i'}, u^{i'}) = \sigma_p^2 \exp \left(-\sum_{k=1}^{d} \frac{(x^{i,k} - x^{i',k})^2}{\beta_{\text{len}, k}} - \frac{(u^i - u^{i'})^2}{\beta_{\text{len}, u}} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

The set of the hyperparameters $\beta := \{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^{K}, \{\beta_{\text{len}, k}\}_{k=1}^{d}, \beta_{\text{len}, u}, \sigma_p^2, \sigma_e^2$ is estimated by maximizing the log-likelihood function using the dataset $\{(x^i, u^i), \vec{p}^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a}$. Besides squared exponential
kernel described above, other popular kernels include Matern-3/2 and Matern-5/2 (Roustant et al., 2012). A conservative estimate \( \hat{p}_{\text{GPR}}(x, u) \) at confidence level \( \rho \) is obtained by explicitly incorporating the (estimated) standard error of \( \hat{p}(x^i, u^i) \) into the GPR smoothing. Namely, we adjust the training dataset to \( \{(x^i, u^i), \tilde{p}_p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{M} \), where \( \tilde{p}_p := \hat{p}(x^i, u^i) + z_p \sqrt{\hat{\text{Var}}(\hat{p}(x^i, u^i))} \). The resulting \( \hat{p}_{\text{GPR}}^{(i)}(x, u) \) is the counterpart of (4.2) using \( \{(x^i, u^i), \tilde{p}_p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{M} \).

In Figure 2a, we present the dataset \( \{L^i, I^i, 0, \tilde{p}_p^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{M} \) (background colormap) for the microgrid case study. The thick red line indicates the contour \( \{\hat{p}_{\text{GPR}} = 5\%\} \), dividing the state space \( \mathcal{X} \) for \( u = 0 \) into admissible \( \mathcal{X}^a(0) \) (left of red line) and inadmissible region \( (\mathcal{X}^a(0))^c \) (right of red line).

### 4.1.3 Logistic regression (LR)

In the previous section, we first created local batches to estimate \( p(x^i, u^i) \) pointwise and then regressed these estimates to build a global approximator. A classical alternative is to directly learn the probability of \( G(x, u) > 0 \) using a logistic regression model. This setup uses a single sample \( g(x^i, u^i) \) from \( G(x^i, u^i) \) from each design site \( (x^i, u^i) \) and transforms it to a binary variable \( y^i = 1_{g(x^i, u^i) > 0} \). The probability \( \hat{p}(x, u) \) can then be directly modeled as a generalized linear model with a logit link function

\[
\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|x, u) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\phi(x, u)}} =: \hat{p}_{\text{LR}}(x, u; \beta). \tag{4.5}
\]

The basis functions \( \phi(x, u) \) could be polynomials, e.g. quadratic or cubic in coordinates of \( (x, u) \). The regression coefficients \( \beta \) are fitted using the dataset \( \{(x^i, u^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^{M} \), as the solution to

\[
\arg\max_\beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \{y^i \log p_{\text{LR}}(x^i, u^i; \beta) + (1 - y^i) \log(1 - p_{\text{LR}}(x^i, u^i; \beta))\}. \tag{4.6}
\]

We may again create a more conservative estimate \( \hat{U}_{\text{LR}}^{(\rho)}(x) := \hat{U}_{\text{LR}}(x) \) at confidence level \( \rho \) by utilizing the standard error for \( \hat{p}_{\text{LR}} \) using the Delta method (Xu and Long, 2005):

\[
\hat{U}_{\text{LR}}^{(\rho)}(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{p}_{\text{LR}}(x, u, \beta) \leq p - z_p \sqrt{\hat{\text{Var}}(\hat{p}_{\text{LR}}(x, u))} \right\}. \tag{4.6}
\]

In Figure 2a, we present the original realizations \( y^i \in \{0, 1\} \) (in blue) for a design in the input subspace \( (L, I, u = 0) \) of the microgrid case study. The figure indicates the resulting logistic regression fit \( \hat{p}_{\text{LR}}(L, I, 0) \) at levels 1%, 5% and 10% (i.e. contour lines of \( \hat{p}_{\text{LR}}(\beta) \in \{0.01, 0.05, 0.1\} \)). The admissibility set for \( u = 0 \), \( \mathcal{X}^a(0) \) is the region to the left of the thick red contour.

**Remark 12.** Similar to Section 4.1, we can simulate batched samples from each design site for the logistic regression, leading to “binomial” observation likelihood rather than the likelihood function in equation (4.6).

**Remark 13.** A non-parametric variant of equation (4.5) is kernel logistic regression, where the basis functions are \( \phi_j(x, u) = k(x, u, x^j, u^j) \) for a kernel function \( k \) centered at \( (x^j, u^j) \). One common choice are radial basis functions (RBF) where \( k(x, u, x^j, u^j) = \exp(-\gamma_1\|x - x^j\|^2 - \gamma_2\|u - u^j\|^2) \). RBF can be interpreted as the squared-exponential kernel for a logistic Gaussian Process model,
with a fixed bandwidth parameter \( \gamma_i \). In contrast, in GPR the bandwidths are estimated through MLE.

### 4.1.4 Parametric density fitting (PF)

This approach aims to fit the distribution \( G(x, u) \), and then analytically infer the probability \( P(G(x, u) > 0) \) from the corresponding cumulative distribution function. This is done by proposing a parametric family \( \{f(\cdot; \Theta)\} \) of densities, fitting the underlying parameters \( \Theta \) based on an empirical sample from \( G \) and then evaluating the resulting analytical probability \( \tilde{p}_{PF}(x, u) := \int_0^\infty f_{G(x,u)}(z)|\tilde{\Theta}(x,u)|dz \). This approach yields a “universal” solution across a range of constraint levels \( p \).

At a design site \((x, u)\), the probability \( p(x, u) \) is estimated in a two-step procedure: first estimated locally over a design \( \mathcal{D} = \{x^i, u^i\} \) and then regress/interpolated over the full input domain \( X \times \mathcal{W} \). For the first step, we apply nested Monte Carlo to generate a collection of realized \( \{g^b(x^i, u^i)\}_{b=1}^{M_b} \) that is used to construct a parametric density via the maximum likelihood estimate:

\[
\tilde{\Theta}^i := \arg\max_{\Theta} \sum_{b=1}^{M_b} \log f_{G}(g^b(x_i, u_i)|\Theta).
\] (4.7)

In the second step, we evaluate \( \tilde{p}_{PF}(x^i, u^i) := \int_0^\infty f_{G}(z|\tilde{\Theta}(x^i, u^i)) \) and extend it to the full domain \( X \times \mathcal{W} \) based on the computed \( \{x^i, u^i, \tilde{p}_{PF}(x^i, u^i)\}_{i=1}^{M_i} \) using \( \mathcal{L}_2 \) projection:

\[
\hat{p}_{PF} = \arg\min_{\tilde{p} \in \mathcal{M}_T} \| \tilde{p}(x^i, u^i) - \tilde{p}_{PF}(x^i, u^i) \|^2,
\] (4.8)

where \( \mathcal{M}_T \) is an approximation space chosen for regression. The admissible set \( \mathcal{U}(x) \) is estimated as:

\[
\mathcal{U}_{PF}(x) := \{u : \hat{p}_{PF}(x, u) \leq p\}.
\]

A transformation of the distribution \( G(x, u) \) might be important for above distribution fitting. For example, in the context of microgrid, in Section 2.2, \( G = \mathcal{L}(\sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} S(s)) \) has a point mass at 0 and thus, any continuous distribution will lead to poor statistical estimation. Using a transformation that preserves the probability of the target event,

\[
P\left( \sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} S(s) > 0 | F_n \right) = P\left( \sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} [L(s) - u_n - \frac{I(s)}{\delta s} \wedge B_{\text{max}}] > 0 | F_n \right),
\] (4.9)

we work with \( G'(L_n, I_n, u_n) := \mathcal{L}(\sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} [L(s) - u_n - \frac{I(s)}{\delta s} \wedge B_{\text{max}}]) \). In Figure 2c we present the empirical and estimated probability \( z \mapsto \mathbb{P}(G'(L_n, I_n, u_n) > z) \) when \( L_n = 5.5, I_n = 1.48 \) and \( u_n \in \{0, 1\} \) for the microgrid example. We model the distribution \( G' \) using a truncated normal distribution, \( \mathbb{P}(G' \leq g) = \Phi\left( \frac{g - \Theta_3}{\delta \Theta_3} \right) \mathbb{I}_{g \geq \Theta_3} \), with parameters \( \Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \Theta_3) \) representing the location of censoring, the mean and the standard deviation respectively. At \( L_n = 5.5, I_n = 1.48, u_n = 1.0 \) and inner simulation budget \( M_b = 100 \), the estimated parameters \( (\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3) = (-1.5, -1.12, 0.53) \) result in probability \( \hat{p}_{PF}(5.5, 1.48, 1.0) = 0.016 \). The corresponding probability after \( \mathcal{L}_2 \) projection (equation (4.8)) is \( \tilde{p}_{PF}(5.5, 1.48, 1.0) = 0.017 \). Thus at \( p = 0.05 \), the control \( u = 1.0 \in \mathcal{U}_n \) is admissible. However, at \( u_n = 0, (\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3) = (-0.5, -0.12, 0.55), \tilde{p}_{PF}(5.5, 1.48, 0.0) = 0.414 \) and
\( \hat{p}_{PF}(5.5, 1.48, 0.0) = 0.429 \), thus the control \( u = 0 \notin \hat{U}_a \) is inadmissible.
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Figure 2: Training data and fitted models for the methods of Section 4 at \( u = 0 \). Top row: methods using probability estimation, bottom row: methods using quantile estimation. Top row, left panel: Training set \( \{L^i, I^i, y^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) for the LR model, color-coded according to the value of \( y^i \in \{0, 1\} \), along with the estimated contour lines for \( \hat{p}_{LR}(L, I) \) at levels \( \{1\%, 5\%, 10\%\} \). Top row, center panel: Training set \( \{L^i, I^i, \hat{p}^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) color coded according to \( \hat{p}^i \) for the GPR model along with estimated contour line \( \{\hat{p}_{GPR}(L, I) = 5\%\} \). Top row, right panel: parametric density fitting at \( L_0 = 5.5, I_0 = 1.48 \) and \( u \in \{0, 1\} \). We show the empirical and estimated inverse cdf \( \mathbb{P}(G' > g) \) based on fitting a truncated Gaussian distribution. Bottom row, left panel: Training set \( \{L^i, I^i, y^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) for the SVM model (color-coded according to \( y^i \in \{-1, 1\} \)) and the estimated decision boundary in red. Bottom row, center panel: Training set \( \{L^i, I^i, q^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) color coded according to \( q^i \) for the EP model along with estimated contour line \( \{q = 0\} \). Bottom row, right panel: Training set \( \{L^i, I^i, q^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) color coded according to \( q^i \) for the QR model along with estimated contour line \( \{\hat{q}_{QR}(L, I) = 0\} \). Except for the top-right panel, LR, GPR, SVM, EP, QR models share the same ground truth, so the red contours are identical up to model-specific estimation errors.

### 4.2 Quantile estimation

In this section we consider methods for modeling and estimating \( q(x^i, u^i) \), the \((1-p)\)-th quantile of the distribution \( G(x^i, u^i) \). Admissibility corresponds to the quantile being negative.

#### 4.2.1 Empirical percentiles (EP)

As before, we start by choosing \( M_a \) design sites of state-action pairs and generate batched samples \( \{g^b(x^i, u^i)\}_{b=1}^{M_a} \) from each design site \( (x^i, u^i) \). The empirical estimate of \( q(x^i, u^i) \) is simply
the \((1 - p)^{th}\) percentile of the realized \(\{g^b\}_{b=1}^{M_b}\) (which requires \(M_b > p^{-1}\)):

\[
\hat{q}(x^i, u^i) = \text{percentile } \left( \{g^b\}_{b=1}^{M_b}, 100(1 - p)\% \right).
\]

Similar to previous methods, we extend to arbitrary \((x, u) \mapsto \hat{q}(x, u)\) using regression on the dataset \(\{x^i, u^i, \hat{q}(x^i, u^i)\}_{i=1}^{M_b}\) and an approximation space \(\mathcal{M}_q\). The set of admissible controls for \(x\) is:

\[
\hat{U}_{EP}(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{q}(x, u) < 0 \right\}.
\]

**Remark 14.** This approach is similar to the INMC approach discussed in Section 4.1, however, here we model the quantile rather than the probability of exceeding zero. Furthermore, we can use the regression standard error of \(\hat{q}(\cdot, \cdot)\) to construct a more conservative estimate of the admissible set \(U_{EP}(x)\).

In Figure 2e we show the estimated \(\hat{q}(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\) indicated via the background colormap. The thick red line indicates the zero-contour \(\hat{q} = 0\), so that the admissibility set for \(u = 0\), \(X_n^a(0)\), is the region to the left of the contour.

A popular alternative to adjusting \(\bar{p}'s\) via regression standard errors is to replace the empirical percentile with the empirical conditional tail expectation (CTE):

\[
\hat{\text{CTE}}(x^i, u^i) := \frac{\sum_{b=1}^{M_b} g^b \mathbf{1}_{g^b \geq \hat{q}(x^i, u^i)}}{\sum_{b=1}^{M_b} \mathbf{1}_{g^b \geq \hat{q}(x^i, u^i)}},
\]

\[
\hat{U}_{CTE}(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{\text{CTE}}(x, u) < 0 \right\},
\]

where \(\hat{\text{CTE}}(x, u)\) is the CTE surface fitted via a regression on the training set \((x^i, u^i, \hat{\text{CTE}}(x^i, u^i))\). This idea is similar to regularizing the Value-at-Risk estimation with the Conditional VaR.

### 4.2.2 Support Vector Machines (SVM)

For a fixed control \(u\), finding the admissible set \(X_n^a(u)\) in (2.9) can be interpreted as classifying each input \(x\) as being in \(X_n^a(u)\) or not. Therefore, we consider the use of classification techniques, specifically support vector machines (SVM). This approach does not estimate the \((1 - p)\)-quantile \(q(x, u)\), but rather its 0-level set with respect to \((x, u)\). The starting point is to use the nested Monte Carlo simulations to compute \(\bar{p}(x^i, u^i)\) with much smaller batch size \(M_b\) compared to Section 4.1.

Next, we construct a binary classification objective with a training dataset \(\{x^i, u^i, y^i\}_{i=1}^{M_n}\) where the \(\pm 1\)-labels are

\[
y^i := \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } \bar{p}(x^i, u^i) < p; \\
-1, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

The boundary separating the two classes is evaluated by solving the optimization problem:

\[
\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^K} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{M_n} \left( 1 - y^i [\beta^T \phi(x^i, u^i) + \beta_0] \right)_+ + \frac{C}{2M_n} ||\beta||^2 \right\},
\]

(4.11)
where \( \phi(x, u) = [\phi_1(x, u), \phi_2(x, u), \ldots, \phi_K(x, u)]^T \) are the \( K \) basis functions and \( C \) is the penalty parameter. We estimate the set of admissible controls corresponding to \( x \) as:

\[
\hat{U}_{SV M}(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{\beta}^T \phi(x, u) + \hat{\beta}_0 > 0 \right\}.
\]

Figure 2d displays the estimated \( \hat{X}_a^n(u) \) and the corresponding dataset \( (L^i, I^i, 0, y^i) \) \((u = 0\) is fixed). The region where \( u = 0 \) is admissible is to the left of the decision boundary (represented through the thick red line).

Remark 15. A conservative estimate \( \hat{U}_{SV M}^{(\rho)} \) of \( \hat{U}_{SV M} \) is obtained by re-labeling the training points in (4.10) via:

\[
y^i = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } \bar{p}(x^i, u^i) + z \rho \sqrt{\phi(x^i, u^i)(1 - \bar{p}(x^i, u^i))} < p \\
-1, & \text{otherwise}, 
\end{cases} 
\]

i.e. biasing the decision boundary to the left.

4.2.3 Quantile Regression (QR)

Quantile regression directly constructs a parametric model for \( q(x, u) \):

\[
\hat{q}(x, u; \beta) := \sum_k \beta_k \phi_k(x, u).
\]

To estimate the coefficients \( \beta \in \mathbb{R}^K \), we use the dataset \( \{x^i, u^i, g^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) (where \( g^i \) is a sample from the distribution \( G(x^i, u^i) \)) to maximize the negative log likelihood:

\[
\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^K} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{M_a} L^{(p)} \left( g^i - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_k \phi_k(x^i, u^i) \right) \right\},
\]

with \( L^{(p)}(y) = y(p - 1_{(y < 0)}) = py + (1 - p)y_- \).

As for the parametric density fitting, a transformation of \( G(x, u) \) might be beneficial when applying quantile regression. Figure 2f presents the dataset \( \{L^i, I^i, 0, g^i\}_{i=1}^{M_a} \) in the background colormap and the estimated contour line \( \{\hat{q}_{QR}(L, I) = 0\} \) with thick red line. The region to the left of the red line is the estimate of the admissible set \( \hat{X}^a(0) \).

Relying on the Delta method again to compute the variance of the estimated quantile \( \hat{q}(x, u; \hat{\beta}) \) as \( \phi(x, u)^T Var(\hat{\beta}) \phi(x, u) \), the admissible set at \( x \) at confidence level \( \rho \) is:

\[
\hat{U}^{(\rho)}_{QR}(x) := \left\{ u : \hat{q}(x, u; \hat{\beta}) + z \rho \sqrt{\phi(x, u)^T Var(\hat{\beta}) \phi(x, u)} < 0 \right\}.
\]

5 Case Studies

Recall the problem introduced in Section 2.2 where we aim to control the operations of a diesel generator in order to supply power to match demand at minimal cost maintaining the probability of blackout between each decision epoch below a given threshold \( p \). In this section, we will discuss
two variants of such microgrid control. In the first example, we assume a time-homogeneous net-demand process which reduces the problem of estimating admissible set to a pre-processing step. In the second example, we use time-dependent net demand process calibrated to data obtained from a microgrid in Huatacondo, Chile. Time-inhomogeneity requires to estimate the admissible set at every step. The microgrid features a perfectly efficient battery directly connected to it, so that the respective power output at \( t_n \) (recall \( t_n \) is a generic time instance on the finely discretized time grid) is given by:

\[
B_n = \max \left( \min \left( L_n - u_n, \frac{I_n}{\Delta n} \right), -I_{\text{max}} - \frac{I_n}{\Delta n} \right).
\]

Table 1 lists other microgrid parameters, i.e. capacity of the battery \( I_{\text{max}} \), maximum charging rate \( B_{\text{min}} \), maximum discharging rate \( B_{\text{max}} \) and diesel switching cost \( K \).

### 5.1 Implementation details

**Numerical Gold Standard:** In the absence of analytic benchmark, we use empirical gold standard to compare the output from the models discussed in Section 4. For each fixed time-step \( t_n \) we discretize the domain \( X = (L, I) \) into 10,000 design sites over a grid of 100 \times 100. For each design site \( (L^i, I^j) \), \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, 100\} \) and \( u^k \in 0 \cup \{1 = u_1, \ldots, u_{101} = 10\} \), we evaluate \( \hat{p}(L^i, I^j, u^k) \) using (4.1) with batch size \( M_b = 10,000 \). Thus, the total simulation budget is \( 100 \times 100 \times 100 \approx 10^{10} \). We then evaluate the local minimal admissible control

\[
u_n^{\text{min}}(L^i, I^j) = \min \left\{ u : \hat{p}(L^i, I^j, u) < p \right\}.
\]

To evaluate \( u_n^{\text{min}}(L, I) \) at new sites we employ linear interpolation on the dataset \( \{L^i, I^j, u_n^{\text{min}}(L^i, I^j)\}_{i,j=1}^{100} \). Finally, to estimate the continuation function, we use piecewise continuous approximation of Section 3.2 with \( M_I = 15, M_u = 15 \) and 1500 sites in \( L \).

**Low budget policies:** We approximate the continuation value function \( C \) using a piecewise continuous approximation with three degrees in \( (L) \) combined with interpolation in other dimensions (with discretizations \( M_I = 10, M_u = 10 \)). For the estimation of the admissible set \( \mathcal{U} \), we approximate it using the methods described in Section 4. We discretize the control space \([1, 10]\) into 51 values. We compare the performance of each method by using a fixed set of \( M' = 20,000 \) out-of-sample simulations.

To address the discontinuity in \( \mathcal{W} = 0 \cup [y, \overline{y}] \), we implement two separate statistical models to learn \( \mathcal{U}_n(\cdot) \). As an example, with logistic regression of Section 4.1.1 we estimate two sets of parameters in equation (4.5): the first one uses one-step paths generated from \( u = 0 \) and a two-dimensional regression of \( y^{(1)} \) in terms of \( (L^i, I^j) \). The second one uses design sites in the three-dimensional space \( (L, I, u) \) where \( u \in [1, 10] \) and a 3-D regression of \( y^{(2)} \) against \( (L^i, I^j, u^i) \).

Additional parameters used for each method are specified in Table 2. We found that Matern-3/2 kernels work better than (4.4) for smoothing \( \hat{p}(L, I, u) \) (GPR) and \( \tilde{p}(L, I, u) \) (PF) because the respective input-output maps feature steep transitions as a function of \( (L, i, u) \). It is known that
Table 2: Parameters for the estimation of the admissible sets for each method. We use total simulation budget of $10^5$ for all models except the Gold Standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Budget ($M_a \times M_b$)</th>
<th>Further parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian Process (GPR)</td>
<td>$2000 \times 50$</td>
<td>Matern-3/2 kernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistic Regression (LR)</td>
<td>$10^5 \times 1$</td>
<td>Degree-2 polynomials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parametric Density Fitting (PF)</td>
<td>$2000 \times 50$</td>
<td>Truncated Gaussian, Matern-3/2 kernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Percentile (EP)</td>
<td>$1000 \times 100$</td>
<td>Squared exponential kernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Tail Expectation (CTE)</td>
<td>$1000 \times 100$</td>
<td>Squared exponential kernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantile Regression (QR)</td>
<td>$10^5 \times 1$</td>
<td>Degree-4 polynomials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Vector Machine (SVM)</td>
<td>$2000 \times 50$</td>
<td>$C = 1$, RBF kernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Standard (GS)</td>
<td>$10^6 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>budget $= 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“rougher” kernels are better suited for such learning tasks compared to the $C^\infty$-smooth squared exponential kernel [4.4] by allowing the fitted $\hat{p}$ to have more “wiggle room”. On the other hand, in the context of EP and CTE the input observations of $\hat{q}(L, I, u)$ and $\text{CTE}(L, I, u)$ are quite smooth in $(L, I, u)$ and both GP kernel families perform equally well. The algorithms are implemented in python 2.7. We used “GaussianProcessRegressor” and “SVM.SVC” functions from sklearn library for GPR and SVM respectively. For LR and QR we used “Logit” and “quantile_-regression” functions from statsmodels library.

5.2 Example 1: Microgrid with Stationary Net Demand

In this subsection, we assume time-homogeneous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck dynamics of the net demand process

$$dL(t) = -\lambda L(t)dt + \sigma dB(t) \implies L(t) = L(0)e^{-\lambda t} + \sigma \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)}dB(s), \quad (5.1)$$

where $(B(t))$ is a standard Brownian motion. This scenario reduces the complexity of learning the probability constraints since we need to estimate the admissible set $U_0(\cdot)$ only once as a preprocessing step before starting the ADP estimation scheme for the continuation values. The simplified setting offers a good testbed to evaluate the performance of different admissible set estimation methods of Section 4; we show that the relative performance remains similar as we extend to more realistic dynamics in Section 5.3. For this example, we assume the mean reversion parameter $\lambda = 0.5$ and volatility $\sigma = 2$.

Figure 3a plots the resulting costs $\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$ versus the frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$ for different methods of Section 4. We show the result both for the original setting of $p = 0.05$ (dark blue) as well as for $p = 0.01$ (light grey). In both cases we benchmark each scheme against the numerical gold standard (indicated by diamonds). Since the probabilistic constraints form the crux of the problem, we require schemes to maintain $\hat{u} \in U_n$ as much as possible, i.e., $w_{freq} \approx 0$. At $p = 5\%$, we observe 0.09\%, 0.54\% and 1.36\% estimated frequency of inadmissible decisions with logistic regression (LR), Gaussian process regression (GPR) and parametric density fitting (PF), respectively. The corresponding frequency jumps up to 5.9\% for quantile regression (QR), 7.8\% for conditional tail expectation (CTE), 8.4\% for empirical percentiles (EP) and 5.3\% for support
vector machines (SVM). While all the methods are a priori consistent, admissible set estimation via probability-based methods clearly seems to outperform quantile-based ones. Our experiments suggest that at low simulation budget, estimators of \( p(x, u) \) have significantly lower bias compared to estimators of \( q(x, u) \), thus partially explaining the difference. For a more conservative probability threshold \( p = 1\% \), we find the cost of all the methods to increase, without significant difference in the frequency of inadmissible decisions \( w_{freq} \). Indeed, Figure 3 illustrates the trade-off between lower costs and lower \( w_{freq} \) (i.e. more conservative estimate of the constraints).

Table 3 expands Figure 3 by also reporting the corresponding \( T \) statistic, the average inadmissibility margin \( w_{avm} \) and realized frequency of violations (i.e. blackouts) \( w_{rlzd} \) defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
  w_{avm} := & \frac{1}{N \cdot M'} \sum_{n,m} |\hat{u}_n(X_n, m') - u_n^{\min}(X_n, m')| I_{\hat{u}_n(X_n, m') = u_n^{\min}(X_n, m')} < 0; \\
  w_{rlzd} := & \frac{1}{N \cdot M'} \sum_{n,m} I_{\sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1})} S_m'(s) > 0}.
\end{align*}
\]

We find the realized frequency of violations \( w_{rlzd} \) to be lowest for LR, GPR and PF. The average inadmissibility margin \( w_{avm} \) is also lowest for GPR and PF (the large value of \( w_{avm} \) for LR is attained in very small region as evident from \( w_{freq} \approx 0 \)). The \( T \) statistic is negative for LR, GPR and PF and positive for the rest, meaning that all other methods fail to statistically respect the probability constraints when binding. Due to small frequency of inadmissible decisions \( w_{freq} \), cost \( V_0(0.5) \) similar to the numerical gold standard and negative test statistic \( T \), we recommend LR, GP and PF methods for the problem at hand.

Next, we test the sensitivity of the cost in terms of the probability threshold \( p \) (employing logistic regression \( \hat{U}_{LR} \)) in Figure 3b. Increasing the probability threshold \( p \) decreases \( V \) as the set of admissible controls \( U \) monotonically increases in \( p \). For example, any admissible control at \( p = 1\% \) threshold is also feasible for \( p > 1\% \), thus the cost at \( 1\% \) threshold should be greater than or equal to cost at, say, \( 10\% \) threshold.

As previously discussed, the constraint is binding for only approximately \( 10\% \) of time-steps. In fact, that probability varies across the methods which happens because the estimate of \( \hat{U} \) affects the choice of \( \hat{u}_n \) and ultimately the distribution of \( \hat{X}_n \). Intuitively, the realized system states are driven by the estimates of the probabilistic constraints. Typically, more conservative estimates of \( \hat{U} \) will push \( \hat{X}_{0:N} \) away from the “risky” regions. This is also confirmed in Figure 3 where as \( p \to 1 \), \( w_{rlzd} \to 20\% = w_{bind} \) while in Table 3 \( w_{bind} \approx 10\% \).

The variables \( w_{freq} \) (equation (3.14)), \( w_{bind} \) (equation (3.18)), \( w_{rlzd} \) (equation (5.3)) are closely related to each other. As the inadmissible decisions can occur only when the constraint is binding, \( w^{\min} > 0 \), we expect \( w_{freq} \leq w_{bind} \) and \( w_{freq} \approx w_{bind} \) for a method with a bias in overestimating the admissible set (e.g. \( \hat{X}^{a,EP}(u) \supset \hat{X}^{a,G2}(u) \forall u \in \mathcal{W} \)). The realized violations (blackouts) \( w_{rlzd} \) can be represented as a sum of three:

\[
w_{rlzd} = p_1 w_{freq} + p_2 (w_{bind} - w_{freq}) + p_3 (1 - w_{bind}), \quad p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1,
\]

where the weights \( p_1, p_2, p_3 \) depend on the distribution of the controlled trajectories. The first term represents the instances when the constraint is binding but the controller chooses an inadmissible control (i.e. mis-estimates \( \hat{U} \)). The second term represents instances when the constraint is binding and correctly estimated, but due to random shocks violations take place (with a conditional frequency below the specified \( p = 0.05 \)). The last term represents instances when the constraint
Table 3: Cost of running the microgrid $V_0(0,5)$, frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$, average inadmissibility margin $w_{avm}$, realized frequency of violations (i.e. blackouts) $w_{rlzd}$, test statistic $\tilde{T}$ and frequency of binding constraint $w_{bind}$ for the example in Section 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$\tilde{V}_0(0,5)$ ($$$)</th>
<th>$w_{freq}$ (%)</th>
<th>$w_{avm}$ (kW)</th>
<th>$w_{rlzd}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\tilde{T}$</th>
<th>$w_{bind}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is not binding but some violations still occur with the intrinsic conditional frequency strictly less than $p$. Note that due to $w_{bind} \ll 1$, most of the violations are of the latter type, i.e. take place when $u^* = 0$ and the conditional violation probability is below $p$. We illustrate these scenarios in Figure 3c using the LR model. The red triangles represent the $(L, I)$-location of realized violations, circles represent the locations of inadmissible decisions (with color representing the inadmissibility margin) and the grey region represents when the constraint is not binding. Thus, the first term counts the instances when violations occur at the same time as controller makes an inadmissible decision (circle encircling the triangle), the second term counts the triangles when $I \approx 0$, and the third term the triangles in the grey region (violations when $u_{min} = 0$).

Although we observed poor performance of quantile based methods, asymptotically (with respect to the simulation budget) we expect them to perform similar to the probability based methods. As an example, in Appendix A Table 6, we present the performance of SVM for thresholds $p = 5\%$ and $p = 1\%$ with increasing budget. For $p = 5\%$ and by increasing the simulation budget from $10^5$ to $10^8$, we find the frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$ to drop from 5.93$\%$ to 1.5$\%$, average inadmissibility amount $w_{avm}$ from 0.78 kV to 0.27 kW, frequency of realized blackouts $w_{rlzd}$ from 2.80$\%$ to 0.30$\%$ and the test statistic which rejected the method at $10^5$ simulation budget ($\tilde{T} \gg 0$) suggests to accept it ($\tilde{T} \ll 0$) at $10^8$ simulation budget. We observe similar behavior at $p = 1\%$.

**Conservative estimators for $U$.** Algorithms for SCPC are expected to respect the probabilistic constraints, so that it is critical to minimize the occurrence of inadmissible decisions. As discussed in Section 4, one way to raise the statistical guarantee for admissibility of all controls in $\hat{U}$ is by adding a margin of error $\xi(x,u)$. The margin of error yields a more conservative (i.e. smaller) $\hat{U}$ and hence lowers $w_{freq}$. In Table 4 we examine three scenarios for $\xi(x,u)$ sorted from least to most conservative (in all cases we keep the probability constraint at $p = 5\%$):

- **Scenario 1**: unadjusted $\xi = 0\%$ (same as Table 3);
- **Scenario 2**: $\xi^{(\rho)}(x,u)$ at 95\% confidence level, $z_{\rho} = 1.96$;
- **Scenario 3**: fixed $\xi = 4\%$, which is equivalent to lowering the violation threshold to $p - \xi = 1\%$.

Table 4 confirms the intuition that the frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$ should be decreasing from scenario 1 to 3. This is further illustrated in Figure 4 that shows how the minimum
Figure 3: Left panel: Trade-off between cost $\hat{V}_0(0,5)$ and frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{\text{freq}}$ for the stationary model. Dark (blue colored) dots correspond to $p = 5\%$ probability constraint threshold and light (grey colored) dots to $p = 1\%$. Center panel: Total cost $\hat{V}_0(0,5)$ (left axis, line with stars) and realized frequency of violations $w_{\text{rlzd}}$ (right axis, line with circles) as functions of $p$ employing the LR model. Right panel: Locations $(L, I)$ of realized violations $\sup_{s \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]} S^m(s) > 0$ (red triangles), inadmissible decisions $\hat{u}(n, x_n, m') - u_{\text{min}}(x_n, m') < 0$ (circles with color representing the inadmissibility margin) on 5000 out-of-sample simulations using LR model. The constraint is binding in the white region and is not binding in the grey region.
admissible control is affected by $\xi(x, u)$. Although adding a margin of error does lower $w_{freq}$ we note that this mechanism does not really alter the relative performance of the different methods. Thus, for all three scenarios, we find SVM, CTE and EP to be performing poorly (unreliable estimation of $\mathcal{U}$ since $\hat{T} \gg 0$). An exception is QR which yields high $w_{freq}$ for $\xi = 0$ but does become acceptable ($\hat{T} < 0$) in scenario 3. In contrast, LR, GPR and PF perform well throughout. Table 7 in Appendix B lists further comparison as we set the confidence level to $\rho = 90\%$, $99\%$ and $99.95\%$, with the same general conclusions. (Observe that driving $w_{freq}$ all the way to zero might be non-ideal since it likely implies that $\hat{U} \subset \mathcal{U}$ is strictly smaller so the controller is overly conservative and rules out some admissible actions.)

We generally expect the ultimate cost $\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$ to increase as $\hat{U}$ becomes more conservative, see the estimated $\hat{V}$’s across each row of Table 4. The increase in costs arises due to two factors: when the diesel generator is started sooner (due to $u = 0$ becoming inadmissible as $\xi$ is raised) and the higher level of $\hat{u}$ once the diesel is ON. This can be seen in Figure 4 where in Scenarios 2 and 3 the controller switches the diesel generator at a lower net demand and once the diesel is running picks a higher power output ($\hat{u}_{\min}(\cdot, I; p = 5\%, \xi) - \hat{u}_{\min}(\cdot, I; p = 5\%, \xi = 0) > 0$). It is important to note however that the link between $\hat{U}$ and $\hat{V}$ is complicated by the fact that as $\hat{U}$ changes, so does the distribution of the controlled paths. So for example in Table 4 the cost for QR falls in Scenario 2, although it remains within two Monte Carlo standard errors.

Take-aways. Our experiments demonstrate the following: (i) Admissible sets of the form (2.5) are more accurately estimated via LR, GPR and PF which all model the underlying probability of violations $p(x, u)$. Although asymptotically equivalent, the approach of quantile estimation leads to poor estimation of the admissible sets for practical budgets. Thus LR, GPR and PF are our recommended choices. (ii) Frequency of inadmissible decisions can be controlled by using a more conservative estimate of the admissible sets. Such conservatism will tend to raise costs. We find that even a conservative $\hat{U}^\xi$ fails to make quantile-based methods acceptable, except for QR. (iii) For a new application, our suggested approach is to first evaluate the test statistic $\hat{T}$ at $\xi = 0\%$ using one of the recommended methods. Depending on how close is $\hat{T}$ to zero, one can then adjust $\hat{U}$’s by adding in $\xi$ (or $\xi(\rho)$) to improve the statistical guarantees on the frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$.

Table 4: Impact of margin of error $\xi$ on the estimated cost of running the microgrid $\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$, frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$, and test statistic $\hat{T}$ from (3.17). The probabilistic constraint is $p = 5\%$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$</th>
<th>$w_{freq}$</th>
<th>$\hat{T}$</th>
<th>$\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$</th>
<th>$w_{freq}$</th>
<th>$\hat{T}$</th>
<th>$\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$</th>
<th>$w_{freq}$</th>
<th>$\hat{T}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-124</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>28.44</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>28.44</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Example 2: Microgrid with seasonal demand

Unlike the previous example, where we assumed time-homogeneous net demand, in practice there is seasonality: during the day renewable generation is high and net demand is often negative; during morning/evening demand exceeds supply making \( L(t) > 0 \). To incorporate this seasonality we use time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (see Heymann et al. (2016) for a similar microgrid control problem):

\[
dL(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial t}(t) + \lambda(\mu(t) - L(t)) \right] dt + \sigma(t)dB(t).
\]

(5.4)

Here, \( \lambda \) represents the speed of mean reversion towards the seasonal mean \( \mu(t) \), while \( \sigma(t) \) represents the time-varying volatility. Using the transformation \( L(t)e^{\lambda t} \) followed by Ito’s lemma and integration by parts one can prove that

\[
L(t) = \mu(t) + e^{-\lambda t} \left( L(0) - \mu(0) \right) + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \sigma(s)dB(s).
\]

Thus,

\[
E[L(t)] = \mu(t) + e^{-\lambda t} (L(0) - \mu(0)).
\]

We calibrate \( \mu(t) \) and \( \sigma(t) \) in (5.4) using iterative methodology described in Heymann et al. (2016) and the data from a solar-powered microgrid in Huatacondo, Chile. Specifically, we compute the mean and variance of the residual demand over 24 hours at 15-minute intervals using data from Spring 2014, i.e. compute \( \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_{96}\} \) and \( \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_{96}\} \). The estimated \( \mu(t) \) can be seen in the left panel of Figure 5 that plots the empirical average of \( L(t) \). As expected, during the day, i.e., \( t \in [12, 20] \) (noon-8:00 pm), the expected net-demand is negative (\( \mu(t) < 0 \)) while it is positive
Figure 5: Model parameters, average trajectory of the state variables, control and their variance. Left panel: Average values of net demand $\frac{1}{M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} L_{n}^{u,m'}$, inventory $\frac{1}{M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} I_{n}^{u,m'}$ and optimal control (diesel) $\frac{1}{M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} \hat{u}_{n}^{m'}$ processes using the gold standard strategy. Right panel: 95% confidence bands for net demand $\hat{L}_{n}$ and realized optimal diesel control $\hat{u}_{n}$.

$(\mu(t) > 0)$ in the morning and during the night. The volatility $\sigma(t)$ is higher during the day due to the intermittent and unpredictable nature of solar irradiance. The mean reversion parameter was estimated to be $\lambda = 0.3416$.

To visualize the interplay of the net demand, inventory and optimal control, the left panel of Figure 5 presents the average trajectories of the three processes over 48 hours. During the morning hours when the demand $L(t)$ is high and the battery is empty, the controller uses the diesel generator. Similarly, during the day when the renewable output is high and $L(t)$ is negative, the controller switches off the diesel generator and the battery charges itself. However, the non-trivial region is when the average net-demand changes sign, either from positive to negative around noon or negative to positive in the evening. During the former time-interval, the optimal control process is in $\{0, 1\}$ (recall that minimum diesel output is 1). Similarly, during the evening when the net demand becomes positive (as the renewable output declines), the controller quickly ramps up the diesel output to match $L(t) \gg 0$. The right panel of Figure 5 repeats the average control and inventory curves, but also shows their 2-standard deviation bands (in terms of the out-of-sample trajectories of $\hat{L}_{n,T}$). As expected, the time periods around ramp-up or ramp-down of the diesel generator is when $\hat{u}_{n}$ experiences the greatest path-dependency and dispersion and differs most from the demand curve.

Comparing Table 5, which lists the estimated cost $\hat{V}_0(\mu(0), 5)$ along with related statistics, with Figure 3 indicates that incorporating seasonal net-demand process does not change the relative order of performance between the methods. The cost goes up as the diesel generator has to be used throughout the mornings and the evenings to match demand.

As in the previous example, the performance of LR, GPR and PF almost matches the gold standard despite significantly lower simulation budget. In this setting the constraint is binding approximately 45% of the time (except for GPR and PF where it is 30% and 25% of the time). Frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$ is 0.03% for LR, 1.17% for GPR, and 0.02% for PF. In contrast $w_{freq}$ is 43% for QR, 22% for EP, 43% for SVM and 22% for CTE, implying that all
Table 5: Cost of running the microgrid $\hat{V}_0(\mu(0), 5)$, frequency of inadmissible decisions $w_{freq}$, average inadmissibility margin $w_{avm}$, realized frequency of violations $w_{rlzd}$ and frequency of the constraint being binding $w_{bind}$ for the case study in Section 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$\hat{V}_0(\mu(0), 5)$</th>
<th>$w_{freq}$ (%)</th>
<th>$w_{avm}$ (kW)</th>
<th>$w_{rlzd}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\hat{T}$</th>
<th>$w_{bind}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>53.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>53.78</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-301</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-220</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-226</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>52.56</td>
<td>42.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>53.02</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>52.82</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Average control $\text{Ave}(\hat{u}_n)$ for LR, GPR and SVM and the average minimum admissible control $\text{Ave}(u_{n}^{\text{min}})$ using Gold Standard across forward controlled trajectories.

these schemes are highly unreliable for learning $\hat{U}$. The average inadmissibility margin $w_{avm}$ is also significantly lower for GPR (0.14 kW) and PF (0.26 kW) compared to the rest of the methods. Here again we observe larger inadmissibility margin and very low frequency of inadmissible decisions for logistic regression. Similar behavior is also evident for the test statistic $\hat{T}$ and realized frequency of violations $w_{rlzd}$.

To illustrate the typical behavior over a trajectory, Figure 6 plots the average control $\text{Ave}(\hat{u}_n) := \frac{1}{M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} \hat{u}_n(x^{\hat{u},m'}_n)$ corresponding to different methods and the average minimum admissible control $\text{Ave}(u_{n}^{\text{min}}) := \frac{1}{M'} \sum_{m'=1}^{M'} u_{n}^{\text{min}}(x^{\hat{u},m'}_n)$ computed using the gold standard. Notice that the latter is dependent upon the controlled trajectories $x^{\hat{u}}_n$ derived for each method, resulting in a different trajectory of $\text{Ave}(u_{n}^{\text{min}})$ across methods. We expect $\text{Ave}(\hat{u}_n)$ above $\text{Ave}(u_{n}^{\text{min}})$ if a given method does not violate the constraint most of the time. This is true for LR and GPR, but SVM quite obviously fails, as the dashed line (Figure 6c) is significantly higher than the solid line at numerous time steps. Furthermore, the conservative nature of GPR is also evident via the large difference between the average minimum admissible control and the average optimal control. This is also evident through $w_{bind} \approx 30\%$ for GPR compared to approximately 45\% for the rest of the methods.
6 Conclusion

We developed a statistical learning framework to solve stochastic optimal control with local probabilistic constraints. The key objective of our algorithm is to efficiently estimate the set of admissible controls $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ and the continuation value function $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ covering a general formulation regarding the state process dynamics and rewards. Since stochastic control problems require estimating the admissible set repeatedly during the backward induction, we use regression based functional representation of $x \mapsto \mathcal{U}(x)$. This perspective also provides a natural way of uncertainty quantification for admissibility, in particular offering conservative estimates that bring statistical guarantees regarding $\hat{U}$. At the same time, our dynamic emulation algorithm allows parallel computation of $\mathcal{U}$ and $C$ for additional computational efficiency.

Thanks to the plug-and-play functionality of the dynamic emulation algorithm, it was straightforward to test a large variety of schemes for learning $\mathcal{U}$. Our numerical results suggest that estimating probabilistic constraints via logistic regression, Gaussian process smoothing and parametric density fitting is more accurate than estimating the corresponding quantile (empirical ranking, SVM or quantile regression). A future line of research would be to additionally parametrize (e.g. using another GP model) the optimal control map $x \mapsto \hat{u}_n(x)$ [Deisenroth et al., 2009] which would speed-up the algorithm in the context of continuous action spaces.
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A Effect of Simulation Budget ($M_b \times M_a$)

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{$p$} & \textbf{Budget} & $\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$ ($) & $w_{freq}$ (%) & $w_{avm}$ (kW) & $w_{rlzd}$ (%) & $\hat{T}$ & $w_{bind}$ (%) \\
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{5\%} & & & & & & \\
$10^5$ & 26.38 & 5.93 & 0.78 & 2.80 & 665 & 9.73 \\
$10^6$ & 26.55 & 5.28 & 0.55 & 1.84 & 386 & 9.77 \\
$10^7$ & 26.68 & 4.96 & 0.53 & 1.64 & 330 & 9.75 \\
$10^8$ & 26.79 & 1.50 & 0.27 & 0.30 & -51 & 9.22 \\
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{1\%} & & & & & & \\
$10^5$ & 28.32 & 6.63 & 0.93 & 2.43 & 1,460 & 9.87 \\
$10^6$ & 28.26 & 5.17 & 0.66 & 1.09 & 631 & 9.56 \\
$10^7$ & 28.52 & 0.55 & 0.24 & 0.03 & -39 & 8.78 \\
$10^8$ & 28.41 & 0.15 & 0.22 & 0.01 & -51 & 8.82 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Impact of simulation budget on performance of SVM for the case study in Section 5.2 and probability thresholds $p = 5\%$ and $p = 1\%$. The reported values are averages over 10 runs of each scheme. The total simulation budget is divided into batch size $M_b$ and number of design sites $M_a$. For total budget $10^5$: $(M_b, M_a) = (100, 1000)$; for $10^6$: $(M_b, M_a) = (500, 2000)$; for $10^7$: $(M_b, M_a) = (2000, 5000)$; for $10^8$: $(M_b, M_a) = (10000, 10000)$.}
\end{table}

B Effect of Adaptive Margin of Error Level $\rho$

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Method} & $\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$ & $w_{freq}$ & $w_{rlzd}$ & $\hat{V}_0(0, 5)$ & $w_{freq}$ & $w_{rlzd}$ \\
\hline
LR & 26.74 & 0.090 & 0.034 & 26.87 & 0.085 & 0.032 \\
GPR & 27.34 & 0.012 & 0.055 & 28.06 & 0.007 & 0.037 \\
SVM & 27.35 & 4.975 & 1.732 & 29.20 & 3.481 & 1.117 \\
QR & 27.20 & 5.373 & 0.793 & 27.18 & 4.880 & 0.676 \\
CTE & 27.93 & 7.158 & 1.153 & 28.31 & 6.766 & 0.888 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Impact of conservative $\mathcal{U}^{(\rho)}$ estimators for the case study in Section 5.2. The probabilistic constraint is set at $p = 5\%$.}
\end{table}