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Abstract—We present a data-driven model predictive control (MPC) scheme for chance-constrained Markov jump systems with unknown switching probabilities. Using samples of the underlying Markov chain, ambiguity sets of transition probabilities are estimated which include the true conditional probability distributions with high probability. These sets are updated online and used to formulate a time-varying, risk-averse optimal control problem. We prove recursive feasibility of the resulting MPC scheme and show that the original chance constraints remain satisfied at every time step. Furthermore, we show that under sufficient decrease of the confidence levels, the resulting MPC scheme renders the closed-loop system mean-square stable with respect to the true-but-unknown distributions, while remaining less conservative than a fully robust approach. Finally, we show that the data-driven value function converges to its nominal counterpart as the sample size grows to infinity. We illustrate our approach on a numerical example.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background, motivation and related work

Due to the ubiquitous nature of stochastic uncertainty in processes arising in virtually all branches of science and engineering, control of dynamical systems perturbed by stochastic processes is a long standing topic of research. Model predictive control (MPC) – stochastic MPC in particular – has been a popular and successful tool in this endeavour, due to its ability to naturally include probabilistic information directly into the control design via the cost, the dynamics and the constraints [2]–[4]. In classical stochastic MPC, however, it is typically assumed that the distribution of the underlying stochastic process is known, although in practice, this is mostly not the case. If the disturbance takes values on a bounded set, the absence of full distributional knowledge can be taken into account by designing the controller under the worst-case realization of the stochastic disturbance. This approach is commonly referred to as robust MPC [2], [4].

An obvious drawback of robust approaches is that the complete disregard of the probabilistic nature of the disturbance can be rather crude, resulting in a tendency for overly conservative decisions. As an alternative approach, one may simply compute an empirical estimate of the disturbance distribution and replace the true value by this estimate in the optimal control problem. Although this is a reasonable approach, given a sufficient amount of data, for more moderate sample sizes, there may be a significant misestimation of the underlying distributions — often referred to as ambiguity. It is well known that this is likely to cause degradation of the resulting performance when evaluated on new samples from the true distribution. This phenomenon is known as the optimizer’s curse [5]. To account for this ambiguity, one could, instead of a point estimate, construct a set of distributions (an ambiguity set) that is in some sense consistent with the data. By accounting for the worst-case distribution within this set, the decision maker is protected against the limitations of the finite sample size.

This approach, known as distributionally robust (DR) optimization [6], addresses the drawbacks of the above approaches by utilizing available data, but only to the extent that it is statistically meaningful. As more data is gathered online and ambiguity sets get updated accordingly, it is expected that these sets will shrink, so that the optimal decisions gradually become less conservative. This, among other desirable properties, has caused an increasing popularity of DR methods in recent years, initially mostly in stochastic programming and operations research communities [5], [7]–[10] and more recently in (optimal) control [11]–[15] as well. See also [16] for comprehensive review. Much of the earlier work focuses on the study of particular classes of ambiguity sets, each modelling certain structural assumptions on the underlying distribution. Our analysis, however, does not require a particular family of ambiguity sets. We illustrate this in Section III, by reviewing some commonly used ambiguity set classes and showing how they fit into our proposed framework.

As the focus of research in data-driven and learning-based control is gradually shifting towards real-life, safety-critical applications, there has been an increasing concern for safety guarantees of data-driven methods, which are valid in a finite data regime. This has led to a variety of different approaches besides distributionally robust methodologies, each valid under different assumptions on the data-generating process and the controlled systems. For instance, this has led to data-driven variants of tube-based MPC [17], [18], Gaussian-process based estimation with reachability-based safe set constraints [19], or Data-enabled predictive control (“DeePC”) [20] combining Willems’ fundamental lemma with MPC for linear systems. We refer to [21] for a recent survey.

In this work, we allow for general (possibly nonlinear) dynamics under stochastic disturbances with unknown distribution, and subject to chance constraints. However, we restrict our attention to finitely-supported stochastic disturbances. One of the advantages of this construction is that the predicted evolution of the system can be represented on a scenario tree, which allows us to explicitly (and without approximation) optimize over closed-loop control policies, rather than open-loop sequences. This property helps combat excessive conservatism due to accumulation of uncertainty over the prediction horizon [22]–[24]. Motivated by similar considerations, [25] and [26] utilize scenario trees to approximate the realizations of continuous disturbances. [26] then considers safety separately by projecting the computed control action onto a set of control actions that keep the state within safe robust control invariant (RCI) set, similarly to [19]. This projection requires the additional solution of a mixed-integer quadratic program (MIQP), whenever the used RCI set is polyhedral. In our setting, however, we consider the switching behavior inherent to the system, allowing us to provide safety guarantees directly through the application of MPC theory on the joint controller-learner system.

We will in particular assume that the underlying disturbance
process is a Markov chain, leading to a system class commonly referred to as Markov jump systems. Control of this class of systems has been widely studied and has been used to model systems stemming from a wide range of applications [23], [27], [28]. In the known distribution case, stability analysis of nonlinear stochastic MPC for this system class has been performed from a worst-case perspective [29], in mean-square sense [28] and in the more general risk-square sense [30], [31]. Recently, data-driven methods have been proposed to design controllers for unknown transition probabilities [32], [33], but relatively little attention has gone to providing a priori guarantees on stability and constraint satisfaction with respect to the true distributions, which is the objective of this work. By the dual interpretation of risk measures [34, Thm. 6.4], the notion of risk-square stability in [30] guarantees mean-square stability with respect to all the distributions within some set of distributions induced by the used risk measure. We show that by careful design of a data-driven ambiguity set over subsequent time steps – which only contain the true distributions with high probability – this concept can be extended to show mean-square stability with respect to the true distribution, under some additional assumptions.

We finally study the convergence of the optimal value function of our data-driven controller to the nominal counterpart. This property, known as asymptotic consistency, has recently been studied in the stochastic optimization literature for (static) distributionally robust optimization problems under Wasserstein ambiguity [5], [35]. A common assumption in this line of work is Lipschitz continuity of the cost/constraint functions with respect to the random variable. This assumption is not suitable for our purposes, since we consider discrete choices for the ambiguity set. This idea, which is closely related to that of sufficient statistics [39, Ch. 5] and information states in partially-observed Markov decision processes [40] allows us to formulate the otherwise time-varying optimal control problem as a dynamic programming recursion, facilitating stability analysis of the original control system and the learning system jointly, (iii) We provide sufficient conditions under which the value of the DR problem converges from above to that of the nominal optimal control problem. Extending existing results in stochastic optimization to the multi-stage, dynamic setting.

C. Notation

Let \( \mathbb{N} \) denote the set of natural numbers and \( \mathbb{N}_{>0} := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \). For two naturals \( a, b \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( a \leq b \), we denote \( \mathbb{N}_{[a,b]} := \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid a \leq n \leq b \} \) and similarly, we introduce the shorthand \( w_{[a,b]} := (w_k)_{k=a}^b \) to denote a sequence of variables indexed from \( a \) to \( b \). We denote the extended real line by \( \mathbb{R} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\} \) and the set of nonnegative (extended) real numbers by \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) (and \( \mathbb{R}_+^\infty \)). The cardinality of a (finite) set \( W \) is denoted by \( |W| \). We write \( f : X \rightarrow Y \) to denote that \( f \) is a set-valued mapping from \( X \) to \( Y \). A function is lower semicontinuous (lsc) if its epigraph is closed. Given a matrix \( P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \), we denote its \((i,j)\)’th element by \( P_{ij} \) and its \( i \)‘th row as \( P_i \). We define the function \( 1_{x=y} = 1 \) if \( x = y \) and \( 0 \) otherwise. The indicator function \( \delta_X : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) of a set \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) is defined by \( \delta_X(x) = 0 \) if \( x \in X \) and \( \infty \) otherwise. The level set of a function \( V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is denoted \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid V(x) \leq \epsilon \} \). The interior of a set \( A \) is denoted \( \text{int} A \).

II. Problem statement and structural assumptions

Let \( w := (w_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \) denote a discrete-time, time-homogeneous Markov chain defined on some probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) and taking values on \( W := \mathbb{N}_{[1,d]} \). The transition kernel governing the Markov chain is denoted by \( \mathbb{P} = (P_{ij})_{i,j \in W} \), where \( P_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(w_t = j \mid w_{t-1} = i) \). As such, the sample space and \( \sigma \)-algebra can be identified with \( \Omega = \mathbb{R}^W \) and \( \mathcal{F} = 2^W \), respectively, and correspondingly, for any \( (w_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Omega \), \( \mathbb{P}([w_t]_{t \in \mathbb{N}}) = p_0 \prod_{t=0}^{d} P_i w_{t+1} \), where \( p_0 \in \Delta_d \) is the initial distribution. We refer to \( w_t \) as the mode of the chain at time \( t \). For simplicity, we will assume that the initial mode is known to be \( i \), so \( p_0 = (1_{w_0 = i})_{i \in W} \). As such, the Markov chain will be fully characterized by its transition kernel. Finally, we will assume that the Markov chain is ergodic.

Assumption II.1 (Ergodicity). The Markov chain \((w_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) is ergodic, i.e., there exists a value \( k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \), such that \( P^k \geq 0 \) elementwise, for some \( k \geq 1 \).

This assumption, which states that there every mode is reachable from any other mode in \( k \) steps, ensures that every mode of the chain gets visited infinitely often [41, Ex. 8.7]. This will allow us to guarantee convergence of the proposed data-driven MPC scheme to its nominal counterpart. (See Section VI.)

We will consider discrete time dynamical systems with dynamics of the form

\[
x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, w_{t+1}),
\]
where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ are the state and control action at time $t$, respectively. We will assume that the state $x_t$ and mode $w_t$ are observable at time $t$. This is equivalent to the more common notation $x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, w_t)$, assuming $w_{t-1}$ is observable. However, as we will consider $w_t$ to be part of the system state at time $t$, the notation of (1) will be more convenient. Since $w_t$ is drawn from a Markov chain, such systems are commonly referred to as Markov jump systems. Whenever $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is a linear function, (1) describes a Markov jump linear system [27]. Since the state $x_t$ and mode $w_t$ are observable at time $t$, the distribution of $x_{t+1}$ depends solely on the conditional switching distribution $P_{w_{t+1}}$, for a given control action $u_t$.

For a given state mode pair $(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times W$, we impose $n_g$ chance constraints of the form

$$P(g_{\alpha}(x, u, w, v) > 0 \mid x, w) \leq \alpha_i, \forall i \in [1, n_g],$$

(2)

where $v \sim P_w$, is randomly drawn from the Markov chain $w$ in mode $w$, and $g_{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are constraint functions with corresponding constraint violation rates $\alpha_i$. By appropriate choices of $\alpha_i$ and $g_{\alpha}$ constraint (2) can be used to encode robust constraints ($\alpha_i = 0$) or chance constraints ($0 < \alpha_i < 1$) on the state, the control action, or both. Note that the formulation (2) additionally covers chance constraints on the successor state $f(x, u, v)$ under input $u$, conditioned on the current values $x$ and $w$. To ease notation, we will without loss of generality assume that $n_g = 1$. In their standard form, chance constraints lead to nonconvex, nonsmooth (even discontinuous) constraints. For this reason, they are commonly approximated using risk measures [37]. Particularly, the (conditional) average value-at-risk (at level $\alpha \in [0, 1]$) and with reference distribution $p \in \Delta_d$ of the random variable $\xi : W^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$AV\ominus R_{\alpha}^p[\xi(w, v) \mid w] = \begin{cases} \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} t + 1/\alpha E_p\{[\xi(w, v) - t]^+ \mid w\}, & \alpha \neq 0 \\ \max_{w \in W} \{\xi(w, v)\}, & \alpha = 0. \end{cases}$$

(3)

It can be shown that if $p = P_w$, then the following implication holds tightly [34, sec. 6.2.4]

$$AV\ominus R_{\alpha}^{P_{w}}[\xi(w, v) \mid w] \leq 0 \Rightarrow P[\xi(w, v) \leq 0 \mid w] \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

(4)

By exploiting the dual risk representation [34, Thm 6.5], the left-hand inequality in (4) can be formulated in terms of only linear constraints [38]. As such, it can be used as a tractable surrogate for the original chance constraints. Consequently, the set of feasible control actions as a function of $x$ and $w$ can be written as

$$U(x, w) := \{u \in U : AV\ominus R_{\alpha}^{P_{w}}[g(x, u, w, v) \mid x, w] \leq 0\},$$

(5)

where $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is a nonempty, closed set.

Ideally, our goal is to synthesize – by means of a stochastic MPC scheme – a stabilizing control strategy $\Xi_N : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, such that for the closed loop system $x_{t+1} = f(x_t, \Xi_N(x_t, w_t), w_{t+1})$, it holds almost surely that $\kappa_N(x_t, w_t) \in U(x_t, w_t)$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider a sequence of $N$ control laws $\pi = \{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^{N-1}$, referred to as a policy of length $N$. Given a stage cost $l : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, and a terminal cost $V_N : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and corresponding terminal set $\mathcal{X}_T$:

$$V_N(x, w) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}_T} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} l(x_k, u_k, w_k) + \nu(x_N, w_N) \right\},$$

(6)

where $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k, w_{k+1})$, $u_k = \pi_k(x_k, w_k)$ and $(x_0, w_0) = (x, w)$, for $k \in [0, N-1]$. This defines the following stochastic optimal control problem (OCP).

**Definition II.2** (Stochastic OCP). For a given state mode pair $(x, w)$, the optimal cost of the stochastic OCP is

$$V_N(x, w) = \min_{\pi} V_N^\pi(x, w)$$

subject to

$$x_0 = x, w_0 = w, \pi = \{\pi_k\}_{k=0}^{N-1},$$

$$x_{k+1} = f(x_k, \pi_k(x_k, w_k), w_{k+1}),$$

$$\pi_k(x_k, w_k) \in \mathcal{U}(x_k, w_k), \forall k \in [0, N-1]$$

(7a, 7b, 7c, 7d)

We denote by $\Pi_N(x, w)$ the corresponding set of minimizers.

To ensure existence of a solution to (7) (and its DR counterpart, defined in Section IV), we will impose the following (standard) regularity conditions [4, 30].

**Assumption II.3** (Problem regularity). The following are satisfied for all $w, v \in W$:

(i) Functions $l(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $V_N(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$, and $g(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot), i \in [1, n_g]$ are continuous;

(ii) $U$ and $\mathcal{X}_T$ are closed;

(iii) $f(0, 0, 0) = 0, f(0, 0, 0) = 0, 0 \in U(0, w), \mathcal{X}_N(0, w) = 0$;

(iv) One of the following is satisfied:

1) $U$ is compact;

2) $\ell(x, w, w) \geq c(||u||)$ with $c \in K_{\infty}$, for all $(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times U$.

Let $(\pi^*_N(x, w))_{k=0}^{N-1} = \Pi_N(x, w)$, so that the stochastic MPC control law is given by $\Xi_N(x, w) = \pi^*_N(x, w)$. Sufficient conditions on the terminal cost $V_N$ and its effective domain $\mathcal{D}_V$ to ensure mean-square stability of the closed-loop system, have been studied for a similar problem set-up in [28], among others.

Both designing and computing such a stochastic MPC law requires knowledge of the probability distribution governing the state dynamics (1), or equivalently, of the transition kernel $P$. In the absence of this knowledge, these probabilities are to be estimated from a finitely-sized data set and therefore subject to some level of ambiguity. Our goal is to devise an MPC scheme which uses the available data in a principled manner, while explicitly taking this ambiguity into account.

To this end, we introduce the notion of a *learner state*, which is very similar in spirit to the concept of an information state, commonly used in control of partially observed Markov decision processes [40], where – in contrast to our approach – it is typically adopted in a Bayesian setting. In both cases, however, it can be regarded as an internal state of the controller that stores all the information required to build (a set of) conditional distributions over the next state, given the observed data. We formalize this in the following assumption.

**Assumption II.4** (Learning state). Given a sequence $w_{[0]}$ sampled from the Markov chain $w$, we can compute (i) a statistic $s_t : W^{t+1} \rightarrow S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, with $S$ compact, accompanied by a vector of confidence parameters $\beta_t = \{\beta_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^{N+1} \in \mathbb{I} := [0, 1]^{N+1}$, which admit recursive update rules $s_{t+1} = L(s_t, \beta_{t,i}, w_{t+1})$ and $\beta_{t+1} = C(\beta_t)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$; and (ii) an ambiguity set $A : S \times W \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Delta_d : (s, w, \beta) \rightarrow A_{\beta}(s, w)$, mapping $s_t, w_t$ and the component $\beta_{t,i}$ to a convex subset of the $d$-dimensional probability simplex $\Delta_d$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $i \in \{1, n_g\}$:

$$P[P_{w:t} \in A_{\beta_{t,i}}(s_t, w_t)] \geq 1 - \beta_{t,i}.$$
single value. This is motivated by the fact that one would often wish to assign separate confidence levels to ambiguity sets corresponding to the cost function on the one hand; and to those corresponding to the $n_g$ chance constraints on the other hand (see Definition IV.3). Accordingly, we will assume that $n_g = n_g + 1$.

Second, the confidence levels are completely exogenous to the system dynamics and can in principle be chosen to be any time-varying sequence satisfying the technical conditions discussed further (see Proposition IV.1 and Assumption II.7). The requirement that the sequence $(\beta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be written as the trajectory of a time-invariant dynamical system serves to facilitate theoretical analysis of the proposed scheme through dynamic programming.

We will furthermore require the following restrictions on the choice of the learning dynamics the confidence levels.

**Assumption II.6.** There exists a stationary learner state $s^* \in \mathcal{L}(s^*, \beta, w, v)$, for all $(\beta, w, v) \in \mathcal{I} \times W^2$, such that from any initial state $s_0$, $\lim_{t \to \infty} s_t = s^*$, a.s.

**Assumption II.7.** The confidence dynamics $\beta_{t+1} = C(\beta_t)$ is chosen such that $\sum_{i=0}^{t} \beta_i < \infty$, element-wise.

Assumption II.6 imposes that asymptotically, the learner settles down to some value which is no longer modified by additional data. It is natural to assume that in such a state, the learner unambiguously models the underlying distribution, as demonstrated, for instance, in Example III.6. However, without further assumptions, one could also consider the trivial case where $\mathcal{S} = \{s^*\}$ and e.g., $A_2(s, w) = \Delta_2$, in which case, no learning occurs and, in fact, a robust MPC scheme is recovered. In Section VI-D, we will pose an additional constraint on the learning system, which excludes this case, but allows us to show consistency of the data-driven controller. Assumption II.7 states that the probability of obtaining an ambiguity set that contains the true conditional distribution (expressed by (8)) increases sufficiently fast. This assumption will be of crucial importance in showing stability (see Section VI-C). To fix ideas, we keep the following example in mind as a suitable choice for the confidence dynamics throughout the article.

**Example II.8 (Confidence dynamics).** A suitable family of sequences for the confidence levels satisfying Assumption II.7 (assuming $n_\beta = 1$ for simplicity) is obtained as $\beta_t = b(1 + t)^{-q}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, with parameters $0 \leq b \leq 1$, $q > 1$. This sequence can be described by the recursion $\beta_{t+1} = C(\beta_t) = b\beta_t(\beta_t^{1/qs} + b^{1/qs})^{-q}$, $\beta_0 = b$. Thus, it additionally satisfies the requirements of Assumption II.4.

The learner state $s_t$ will in most practical cases be composed of a sufficient statistic for the transition kernel and some parameter calibrating the size of the ambiguity set, based on statistical information. See Section III-A for some concrete examples.

Equipped with a generic learning system of this form, our aim is to find a data-driven approximation to the stochastic OCP defined by (7), which asymptotically attains the optimal cost while preserving stability and constraint satisfaction during closed-loop operation.

The remainder of this work is organized as follows. Section III presents and compares several classes of ambiguity sets found in the literature, and discusses how they fit in the framework of Assumption II.4. In Section IV, we construct a distributionally robust counterpart to the optimal control problem in terms of the ingredients introduced above. Section VI contains a theoretical analysis of the proposed scheme; and in Section VII, we illustrate the approach on a numerical example.

### III. CONSTRUCTION OF AMBIGUITY SETS

To exemplify how a learning system of the form proposed in Assumption II.4 can be constructed in practice, we will now review some particular classes of ambiguity sets that have been proposed in the literature, and how they fit into the present framework. In many cases, ambiguity sets are defined as the set of distributions that lie within some radius from an empirical estimate using a particular distance metric or divergence. We will refer to such ambiguity sets as divergence-based ambiguity sets. For general, continuous distributions, popular choices for the distance metric/divergence include the Wasserstein distance [5], [13] or moment-based ambiguity sets [12], [42], where the first two moments of the distributions are confined to a ball around the empirical estimate.

For the setting involving finitely supported distributions, [43] proposes likelihood regions: ambiguity sets containing all distributions with respect to which the likelihood of observed data is larger than some threshold $\alpha$. [43] provides a data-driven estimate for $\alpha$ to satisfy a condition similar to (8) using asymptotic results. However, a modification to provide finite sample guarantees is straightforward. Closely related to this family of ambiguity sets are defined by considering distributions that are close to the empirical distribution as measured by the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence. Depending on the ordering of the arguments in the KL divergence one either obtains the ambiguity set proposed in [7] or the ambiguity set corresponding to the entropic value-at-risk [44].

Furthermore, ambiguity sets defined as balls in the total variation (TV) metric are quite commonly used [11], [45], [46]. More generally, [47], [48] provide tractable formulations of linear programs under ambiguity, considering the broad class of $\phi$-divergences, which include the KL divergence and TV distance as special cases. However, the parameters controlling the size of the ambiguity sets are calibrated on data using asymptotic results.

In what follows, we will focus on the KL and TV ambiguity sets and show how they satisfy Assumption II.4.

#### A. Divergence-based ambiguity sets

Our goal is to obtain for each mode $w$ of the Markov chain, a data-driven subset of the probability simplex, containing the $n_t$th row of the transition kernel $P$ with high probability. Given a sequence $\hat{w}_{[1,t]} \in W^t$ of $t \in \mathbb{N}$ samples drawn from the Markov chain $w$, $d$ individual datasets $\hat{w}_{t,i} := \{\hat{w}_{k+1} \mid \hat{w}_{k} = i, k \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,t]}\}, i \in W$ can be obtained by partitioning the set of observed transitions by the mode they originated in. As such, each $\hat{w}_{t,i}$ contains $t_i$ i.i.d. draws from the distribution $P_i$. Ambiguity sets can now be constructed for each individual row $i$, using concentration inequalities based on the data in $\hat{w}_{t,i}$. See, for instance, [49], [50] for more details on related techniques.

With this set-up, we now consider the following broad class of ambiguity sets. In the remainder of this section, we will for ease of notation consider a scalar confidence level $\beta_t \in [0, 1]$.

**Definition III.1** (Divergence-based ambiguity set). Let the learner state be composed as $s_t = (\text{vec} \hat{P}_t, R_t) \in \Delta_d^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\hat{P}_t$ denotes the empirical transition probability matrix at time $t$, that is, $\hat{P}_{t,i,j} = \frac{1}{t_i} \sum_{w \in \hat{w}_{t,i}} 1_{w = j}$. We say that an ambiguity set $A_{\beta_t}(s_t, w)$ is a divergence-based ambiguity set if it can be expressed in the form $A_{\beta_t}(s_t, w) := \{p \in \Delta_d \mid D(\hat{P}_t ; w, p) \leq R_{t,w}, \forall w \in W\}$, where $D : \Delta_d \times \Delta_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is some statistical divergence.

Statistically meaningful values for the radii $R_{t,w}$ under different choices of divergences can be obtained using the following standard results.
Proposition III.2 (Concentration inequalities). Let $p \in \Delta_d$ denote a distribution on the probability simplex and $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (1, w_i - 1)_{i=1}^{d}$ the empirical distribution based on $m$ i.i.d. draws $w_i \sim p$. Then, \[ P \left[ \frac{1}{m} \| \hat{p} - p \|_2^2 > r_{TV}(m, \beta) \right] \leq \beta, \] with \[ r_{TV}(m, \beta) = \frac{d \log 2 - \log \beta}{2m}. \] Similarly, it holds that \[ P \left[ D_{KL}(\hat{p}, p) > r_{KL}(m, \beta) \right] \leq \beta, \] with \[ r_{KL}(m, \beta) = \frac{d \log m - \log \beta}{m}, \] \[ \text{where } D_{KL}(p, q) := \sum_{i=1}^{d} p_i \log \frac{p_i}{q_i} \text{ denotes the KL divergence from } q \text{ to } p. \]

The bound on the TV distance (9) is known as the Bretagnolle-Huber-Carol inequality [51, Thm. A.6.6].

Remark III.3. Expression (10) for the KL divergence is a well-known result from the field of information theory, obtained through the so-called method-of-types [52], [53]. A slight improvement can be obtained by replacing $d \log m$ by $\log \left( \frac{m^d - 1}{d} \right)$. Moreover, in [54], an even sharper result for (10) is derived. In fact, this improved concentration bound in the KL divergence was used in the same work to improve upon the TV concentration bound (9) for $\frac{m}{d} \ll 1$, using Pinsker’s inequality [55], which relates the TV distance between distributions $p, q \in \Delta_d$ to the KL divergence as $\| p - q \|_2^2 \leq 2D_{KL}(p, q)$. These improvements remain compatible with the framework but would complicate notations in subsequent analysis. For this reason, we will define the following divergence-based ambiguity sets using Proposition III.2.

Definition III.4 (TV ambiguity set). The TV ambiguity set $A_{\beta}^{TV}(s, w)$ is a divergence-based ambiguity set with divergence $D = D_{TV}$ and radius $R_{t, w} = r_{TV}(t, \beta)$ for every $w \in W$.

Since the radius $r_{TV}(\cdot, \beta)$ is a monotone decreasing function, one can uniquely recover the corresponding sample size mode-specific sample sizes $t_i(s, \beta)$ as a function of the current learner state $s_t$ by inverting the function. Using this fact, one can construct a time-invariant, recursive update rule for the transition probabilities and ambiguity radii by means of straightforward manipulations.

Example III.6 (Learning dynamics for the TV ambiguity set). Maintaining $n = 1$ here for simplicity, recall that $C : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denotes the dynamics for the confidence levels.

Consider a TV ambiguity set as defined in Definition III.4, so that the learner state is represented as $s_t = (\text{vec } \hat{P}, R)$. Let $\eta(\beta) := d \log 2 - \log \beta$. Then, using (9) to solve for the mode-specific sample sizes, it is easy to verify that the dynamics for empirical transition probabilities from mode $i$ to $j$ can be written recursively as

\[ \hat{P}_{i,j}(s, \beta, w, v) \begin{cases} \eta(\beta) \hat{P}_{i,j} + 2R_i 1_{w_i = \hat{P}_{i,j}} & \text{if } \beta > 0 \\ \hat{P}_{i,j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \] if $\beta > 0
\]

Similarly, an update rule for the radii is given by

\[ R_i^+(s, \beta, w, v) = \frac{R_i \eta(C(\beta))}{\eta(\beta) + 2R_i 1_{w_i = \hat{P}_{i,j}}}, \quad i \in W \] if $C$ is chosen to satisfy $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\beta} \log C(\beta) = c$ for some constant $c \geq 0$ (which, for instance, is the case in Example II.8), then the limit of (12) as $\beta$ tends to 0 exists, and its domain can again be continuously extended to the full interval $[0, 1]$. Note that if all modes are visited infinitely often, then by construction, $\hat{P}$ converges to $P$ and $R$ converges to 0, which form fixed points for dynamics (11)–(12), and hence Assumption II.4 is satisfied. Combining the update rules (11) and (12), we obtain a continuous function $L$ representing the learner dynamics.

For the KL divergence, matters are slightly more complicated as the expression (10) is not invertible. It can be made compatible with the framework of Assumption II.4 for instance by upper-bounding $r_{KL}$ for very small sample sizes, such that the resulting function is invertible. In this case, a similar procedure as Example III.6 can be followed. In practice, however, the sample size can simply be stored, leading to simple to derive, but time-varying dynamics for the learner. The analysis of Section VI can be readily extended to this time-varying case, but for ease of exposition, we do not explicitly take this possibility into account here.

IV. Data-driven model predictive control

Given a learning system satisfying Assumption II.4, we define the augmented state $y_t = (x_t, s_t, \beta_t) \in Y := \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times S \times \mathcal{R}$, which evolves over time according to the dynamics

\[ y_{t+1} = \tilde{f}(y_t, w_t, u_t, w_{t+1}) := \left[ \begin{array}{c} f(x_t, u_t, w_{t+1}) \\ C(\beta_t) \end{array} \right], \]

with $w_t \sim P_{w_t}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, it will be convenient to define the process $z_t = (y_t, w_t) \in Z := Y \times W$. Consequently, the objective is now to obtain a feedback law $\kappa : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. To this end, we will formulate a DR counterpart to the stochastic OCP (7), in which the expectation operator in the cost and the conditional probabilities in the constraint will be replaced by operators that account for ambiguity in the involved distributions.

A. Ambiguity and risk

In order to reformulate the cost function (6), we first introduce an ambiguous conditional expectation operator, leading to a formulation akin to the Markovian risk measures utilized in [30], [56]. Consider a function $\zeta : Z \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defining a stochastic process $(\xi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (\zeta(z_t, w_{t+1}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and suppose that the augmented state $z_t = z = (x, s, \beta, w)$ is given. Let $\beta \in [0, 1]$ denote an arbitrary component of $\beta$. Theambiguous conditional expectation of $\xi(z, v)$, given $z$ is then

\[ \rho_{\beta, w}[\xi(z, v)] := \max_{p \in A_{\beta}(s, u)} \mathbb{E}_p[\xi(z, v) | z] \]

Trivially, it holds that if the $w$’th row of the transition matrix lies in the corresponding ambiguity set, i.e., $P_{w} \in A_{\beta}(s, w)$, then

\[ \rho_{\beta, w}[\xi(z, v)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{P_{w}}[\xi(z, v) | z] = \sum_{v \in W} P_{w,v}[\xi(z, v)]. \]

Note that the function $\rho_{\beta, w}$ defines a coherent risk measure [34, Sec. 6.3]. We say that $\rho_{\beta, w}$ is the risk measure induced by the ambiguity set $A_{\beta}(s, w)$.

A similar construction can be carried out for the chance constraints (5). We robustify the average value-at-risk with respect to the reference distribution, defining

\[ p_{\beta, w}[\xi(z, v)] := \max_{p \in A_{\beta}(s, w)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}, \beta} [\xi(z, v) | z] \leq 0. \]
The function \( \tilde{p}_{s,w}^\beta \) in turn defines a coherent risk measure. Note that we have replaced the AV\(\tilde{R}\) parameter \(\alpha\) by \(\hat{\alpha}\). The reason for this is that the ambiguity set only contains the true distribution with high probability. Considering this fact, it is natural to expect that the original chance constraint remains satisfied. We make this precise in the following result.

**Proposition IV.1.** Let \(\beta, \alpha \in [0,1]\), be given values with \(\beta < \alpha\). Consider the random variable \(s : \Omega \rightarrow S\), denoting an (a priori unknown) learner state satisfying Assumption II.4, i.e., \(P[w] \in \mathcal{A}_\beta(s,w)\) \(1 - \beta\). If the parameter \(\hat{\alpha}\) is chosen to satisfy \(0 \leq \hat{\alpha} < \frac{\alpha - \beta}{1 - \beta} \leq 1\), then, for an arbitrary function \(g : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) the following implication holds:

\[
\tilde{p}_{s,w}^\beta \sigma[g(z,v)] \leq 0, \text{ a.s. } \Rightarrow g[z,v] \leq 0 \mid x, w \geq 1 - \alpha. \tag{17}
\]

**Proof.** If \(\tilde{p}_{s,w}^\beta \sigma[g(z,v)] \leq 0\), a.s., then (4) and (16) imply that

\[
P[g(z,v), w \in A_{\beta}(s,w)] \geq 1 - \hat{\alpha}, \text{ a.s.}
\]

Therefore,

\[
P[g(z,v), w \in A_{\beta}(s,w)] \geq 1 - \hat{\alpha} \leq 1 - \alpha,
\]

Requiring that \((1 - \hat{\alpha})(1 - \beta) \geq (1 - \alpha)\) then immediately yields the sought condition. \(\Box\)

Notice that the implication (17) in Proposition IV.1 provides an a priori guarantee, since the learner state is considered to be random. In other words, the statement is made before the data is revealed. Indeed, for a given learner state \(s\) and mode \(w\), the ambiguity set \(A_{\beta}(s,w)\) is fixed and therefore, the outcome of the event \(\mathcal{E} = \{P[w] \in A_{\beta}(s,w)\}\) is determined. Whether (17) then holds for these fixed values, depends on the outcome of \(E\). This is naturally reflected through the above condition on \(\hat{\alpha}\), which implies that \(\hat{\alpha} \leq \alpha\), and thus tightens the chance constraints that are imposed conditioned on a fixed \(s\). Hence, the possibility that for this particular \(s\), the ambiguity set may not include the conditional distribution, is accounted for. This tightening can be mitigated by decreasing \(\beta\), at the cost of a larger ambiguity set. A more detailed study of this trade-off is left for future work.

**B. Distributionally robust model predictive control**

We are now ready to describe the DR counterpart to the OCP (7), which, when solved in receding horizon fashion, yields the proposed data-driven MPC scheme.

Consider a given augmented state \(z = (x, s, \beta, w) \in \mathcal{Z}\). Hereafter, we will assume that \(\beta = (\beta, \hat{\beta})\), where component \(\beta\) is related to the cost function and \(\hat{\beta}\) is reserved for the constraints.

We use (16) to define the DR set of feasible inputs \(\hat{U}(z)\) in correspondence to (5), as

\[
\hat{U}(z) = \left\{ u \in U \mid \tilde{p}_{s,w}^\sigma[g(x, u, w, v)] \leq 0 \right\}. \tag{18}
\]

**Remark IV.2.** The parameter \(\hat{\alpha}\) remains to be chosen in relation to the confidence levels \(\beta\) and the original violation rates \(\alpha\). In light of Proposition IV.1, \(\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha - \beta}{1 - \beta}\) yields the least conservative choice. This choice is valid as long as it is ensured that \(\beta < \alpha\).

Using (14), we express the DR cost of a policy \(\pi = \pi_k\) \(k = 0,1\) as

\[
\hat{V}^\pi_N(z) := \ell(x_0, u_0, w_0) + \rho_{00}[\ell(x_1, u_1, w_1)] + \rho_{1,1} \cdots + \rho_{N-2,N-1}[\ell(x_{N-1}, u_{N-1}, w_{N-1})] + \rho_{N-1,N}[\ell(x_N, s_N, \beta_N, w_N)], \tag{19}
\]

where \(z_0 = z, z_{k+1} = \hat{f}(z_k, u_k, w_{k+1})\) and \(u_k = \pi_k(z_k)\), for all \(k \in \{0, N - 1\}\). In Section VI, conditions on the terminal cost \(\hat{V}_T : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+: (x, s, \beta, w) \rightarrow \hat{V}_T(x, w) + \delta_{\mathcal{X}}(x, s, \beta, w)\) and its domain are provided in order to guarantee recursive feasibility and stability of the MPC scheme defined by the following OCP.

**Definition IV.3 (DR-OCP).** Given an augmented state \(z \in \mathcal{Z}\), the optimal cost of the distributionally robust optimal control problem (DR-OCP) is

\[
\hat{V}_N(z) = \min_\pi \hat{V}^\pi_N(z) \tag{20a}
\]

subject to

\[
(x_0, s_0, \beta_0, w_0) = z, \pi = (\pi_k)_{k=0}^{N-1}, \tag{20b}
\]

\[
z_{k+1} = (\hat{f}(z_k, \pi_k(z_k), w_{k+1}), w_{k+1}), \tag{20c}
\]

\[
\pi_k(z_k) \in \hat{U}(z_k), \forall w_{[0,k]} \in W, \tag{20d}
\]

for all \(k \in \{0, N - 1\}\). We denote by \(\hat{V}_N(z)\) the corresponding set of minimizers.

**Remark IV.4.** Note that the definition of \(\hat{V}_T\) implicitly imposes the terminal constraint \(z_N \in \mathcal{X}_T\), a.s.

We now define the data-driven MPC law analogously to the stochastic case as

\[
\hat{\beta}_N(z) = \hat{\beta}_0(z), \tag{21}
\]

where \((\hat{\beta}_k(z))_{k=0}^{N-1} \in \hat{\Pi}_N(z)\). At every time \(t\), the data-driven MPC scheme thus consists of repeatedly (i) solving (20) to obtain a control action \(u_t = \hat{\beta}_N(z_t)\) and applying it to the system (1); (ii) observing the outcome of \(w_{t+1} \in W^t\) and the corresponding next state \(x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, w_{t+1})\); and (iii) updating the learner state \(s_{t+1} = L(s_t, w_t, w_{t+1})\) and the confidence levels \(\beta_{t+1} = C(\beta_t)\), gradually decreasing the size of the ambiguity sets.

**V. TRACTABLE REFORMULATION**

**A. Conic risk measures**

Since ambiguity sets inducing coherent risk measures are convex by construction, many classes of ambiguity sets can be represented using conic inequaities. These risk measures, referred to as conic risk measures, are of great use for reformulating DR-OCPs of the form (20).

**Definition V.1 (Conic risk measure).** We say that an ambiguity set \(A \subseteq \Delta_d\) is conic representable if it can be written in the form

\[
A = \{p \in \Delta_d \mid \exists \nu : Ep + F \nu \preceq \gamma k, b\}, \tag{22}
\]

with matrices \(E, F\) and vector \(b\) of suitable dimensions, and a proper cone \(\mathcal{K}\). The coherent risk measure induced by a conic representable ambiguity set is called a conic risk measure.

By this definition, a conic risk measure \(\rho\) is given as the optimal value of a standard conic program (CP). Under strong duality, which holds if the CP is strictly feasible [57, Prop. 2.1], its epigraph \(\text{epi}\rho := \{(G, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}^+ \mid \gamma \geq \rho(G)\}\) can be characterized as [38]

\[
\text{epi}\rho = \left\{ (G, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}_{d+1}^+ \left| \begin{array}{c}
\exists y : E^\top y = G, F^\top y = 0, \\
y \in K^*, \gamma \geq b^\top y
\end{array} \right. \right\}. \tag{23}
\]

Since the TV ambiguity set defined in Section III as well as the ambiguity set inducing the average value-at-risk are polyhedral, they are conic representable (taking the nonnegative orthant as the cone \(\mathcal{K}\)). Similarly, the KL ambiguity set, and similarly the entropic value-at-risk [44] are known to be conic representable [7], [38]. Additionally, it is not difficult to show that the worst-case average
value-at-risk over a conic representable ambiguity set also defines a conic risk measure.

**Proposition V.2.** Let \( A = \{ p \in \Delta_d \mid \exists \nu : \mathbb{E} p + \mathbb{F} \nu \prec_{\mathcal{K}} \hat{b} \} \) be a conic-representable ambiguity set. Then, the risk measure \( \bar{\rho} = \max_{p \in A} \mathbb{A}V@R^p_\infty \) is a conic risk measure.

**Proof.** For any reference distribution \( p \in \Delta_d \), the ambiguity set \( A\mathbb{A}V@R^p_\infty \) can be written in the form (22) with \( E = [1_d - 1_t \alpha - I_t]^{\top} \), \( F = 0 \), \( K = \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)}_+ \) the nonnegative orthant, and \( b = [1_t p^w(t) 0]^{\top} \) (which is of the form \( b = b' + B p \)) [38]. Writing out the definition of \( \max_{p \in A} \mathbb{A}V@R^p_\infty \) and rearranging terms yields

\[
\max_{p \in A} \mathbb{A}V@R^p_\infty [z] = \max_{p \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \nu : [K] \mu + [-B 0 \mathcal{F}] \nu \preceq \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)}_+ \right\},
\]

which is exactly the form of (22).

Thus, if for all \((s, w, \beta) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W} \times [0, 1], A_\beta(s, w) \) is conic representable, then \( \rho^\infty_{s,w} \) and \( p^\infty_{s,w} \) are conic risk measures. This fact will allow us to leverage (23) to obtain an efficiently solvable reformulation of (20).

**B. Scenario tree reformulation**

Since \( W \) is a finite set, the possible realizations of \( w_{[0,N]} \) can be enumerated and represented on a scenario tree. A scenario tree with horizon \( N \) is a directed acyclic graph which represents the natural filtration of \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) induced by \( w_{[0,N]} \) [58]. An adapted stochastic process \((z_t)\) can be represented on such a scenario tree. We denote the value of \( z_t \) corresponding to a node \( \iota \) in the tree as \( z^\iota \), as illustrated in Figure 1. The set of nodes in the tree are partitioned into time steps or stages. The set of nodes at a stage \( k \) is denoted by \( \mathsf{nod}(k) \), and similarly, for \( k_0, k_1 \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,N]}, \) with \( k_1 > k_0, \mathsf{nod}([k_0,k_1]) = \bigcup_{k=k_0}^{k_1} \mathsf{nod}(k) \). For a given node \( \iota \in \mathsf{nod}(t), t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,N-1]} \), we call a node \( \iota_+ \in \mathsf{nod}(t+1) \) that can be reached from \( \iota \) in one step a child node, denoted \( \iota_+ \in \mathsf{ch}(\iota) \). Conversely, we denote the (unique) parent node of a node \( \iota \in \mathsf{nod}(t), t \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,N]} \) by \( \mathsf{anc}(\iota) \in \mathsf{nod}(t-1) \). The nodes \( \iota \in \mathsf{nod}(N) \) have no child nodes and are called leaf nodes. The unique node at stage 0 is called the root node.

An \( N \)-step policy \( \pi \) can thus be identified with a collection of control actions \( u = \{ u^\iota \mid \iota \in \mathsf{nod}([0, N-1]) \} \). It therefore suffices to optimize over a finite number of decision variables rather than infinite-dimensional control laws.

**Proposition V.3 (Tractable reformulation).** Given an initial augmented state \( y = (x, s, \beta) \), consider an \( N \)-stage scenario tree with given root node \( w^0 = w \) and the corresponding optimal control problem

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minimize} & \quad \tau^0 + \xi^0 \\
\text{subj. to} & \quad y^0 = y^+, \tau^+ = \hat{f}(y^0, w^0, u^0, w^+), \\
& \quad (\xi^+, \beta^+, \zeta^+) \in \mathsf{epi}(\rho^\infty_{s,w}), \tau^+ = \mathcal{R}_{\infty}(y^0, w^0, u^0, w^+), 0 \in \mathsf{epi}(p^\infty_{s,w}), \xi^0 (y^0, w^0, u^0, w^+), 0 \in \mathcal{X}_{\beta^0}(w^0), \\
& \quad (\xi^0, \beta^0, \zeta^0) \in \mathcal{X}_\beta(w^0), \beta = (\beta^0, \beta^+), \zeta = (\zeta^0, \zeta^+).
\end{align*}
\]

**VI. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS**

**A. Dynamic programming**

To facilitate theoretical analysis of the proposed MPC scheme, we follow an approach similar to [30] and represent (20) as a dynamic programming recursion. We define the Bellman operator \( T : \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{V}(z)) := \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}(z)} f(x, u, w) + \rho^\infty_{s,w}[\mathbb{V}(f(z, u, v)), v] \), where \( z = (x, s, \beta) \), terminal set \( \mathbb{X}_f \) are convex, with \( \beta = (\beta^0, \beta^+) \) as before, are fixed quantities and \( v \sim P_w \). We denote by \( S(\mathbb{V})(z) \) the corresponding set of minimizers. The optimal cost \( \mathbb{V}_N \) of (20) is obtained through the iteration,

\[
\hat{V}_k = T \hat{V}_{k-1}, \quad \hat{V}_0 = \hat{V}_1, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,N]}.
\]

Similarly, \( \hat{S}_k := \mathsf{dom} \hat{V}_k \) is given recursively by

\[
\hat{S}_k = \{ z \mid \exists u \in \mathcal{U}(z) : (f(z, u, v)), v \} \subset \hat{V}_{k-1}, \forall v \in W \}.
\]

Now consider the stochastic closed-loop system

\[
y_{t+1} = \tilde{f}(\tilde{z}_N(z_t, w_{t+1})) := \tilde{f}(z_t, \tilde{R}_N(z_t), w_{t+1}) + \tilde{\xi}_N(z_t), \quad y_t = \tilde{f}(\tilde{z}_N(z_t, w_t)) := \tilde{f}(z_t, \tilde{R}_N(z_t), w_t),
\]

where \( \tilde{R}_N(z_t) \in \mathcal{S}(\hat{V}_{N-1}(z_t)) \) is an optimal control law obtained by solving the data-driven DR-OCP of horizon \( N \) in receding horizon.
B. Constraint satisfaction and recursive feasibility

In order to show existence of \( \hat{K}_N \in S \hat{V}_{N-1} \) at every time step, Proposition VI.4 will require that \( \hat{X}_t \) is a robust control invariant set. We define robust control invariance for the augmented control system under consideration as follows.

**Definition VI.1** (Robust control invariance). A set \( \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \) is an RCI set for the system (13) if for all \( z \in \mathcal{R} \), \( \forall u \in \hat{U}(z) \) such that \( (f(z, u, v), v) \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in W \). Similarly, \( \mathcal{R} \) is a robust positive invariant (RPI) set for the closed-loop system (26) if for all \( z \in \mathcal{R} \), \( (\hat{f}^SN(z), v) \in \mathcal{R}, \forall v \in W \).

Since \( \hat{U} \) consists of conditional risk constraints, our definition of robust invariance provides a distributionally robust counterpart to the stochastic robust invariance in [60]. This notion is less conservative than the classical notion of robust invariance.

**Definition VI.2** (Classical robust control invariance). A set \( \mathcal{R}_x \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_X} \times W \) is RCI for system (1) in the classical sense if for all \( x \in \mathcal{R}_x \),

\[
\exists u : g(x, u, w, v) \leq 0, f(x, u, v) \in X_t(v), \forall v \in W. \tag{27}
\]

In fact, for any set \( \mathcal{R}_x \) as in Definition VI.2, the set \( \mathcal{R}_x \times S \times I \times W \) is covered by Definition VI.1, as illustrated in Example VI.3. On the other hand, our notion of robust control invariance is more strict than that of *uniform control invariance* considered in [30], which only requires successor states to remain in the invariant set for modes in the cover of the given mode \( w \), i.e., the set of modes \( v \) for which \( P_{uv} > 0 \). This flexibility is not available in the current setting, as the transition kernel is assumed to be unknown, so the cover of a mode cannot be determined with certainty.

**Example VI.3** (Classical robust invariant set). Suppose that the terminal constraint set \( X_t \) of the nominal problem is a robust control invariant set in the classical sense and define for convenience \( X_t(w) := \{ x \mid (x, w) \in X_t \} \). Then, if \( \hat{X}_t \) is chosen such that \( \hat{X}_t(w) := \{ y \mid (y, w) \in \hat{X}_t \} = X_t(w) \times S \times I, \hat{X}_t \) is RCI for the augmented system (13) according to Definition VI.1. Indeed, since \( AN(\mathcal{R}) (y(x, u, w, v)) \leq \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} y(x, u, w, v) \) for all \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \) and \( p \in \Delta_d(27) \) implies that for all \( u \in \hat{U}(z) \), there exists \( u \in U(z) \), such that \( f(z, u, v) \in X_t(v) \).

**Proposition VI.4** (Recursive feasibility). If \( \hat{X}_t \) is an RCI set for (13), then (20) is recursively feasible. That is, feasibility of DR-OCP (20) for some \( z \in \mathcal{Z} \), implies feasibility for \( z^+ := (\hat{f}^SN(z), v) \), for all \( v \in W, N \in \mathbb{N} \).

Proof. The proof follows from a straightforward inductive argument on the prediction horizon \( N \). We first show that if \( \hat{X}_t \) is RCI, then so is \( \hat{Z}_N \). This is done by induction on the horizon \( N \) of the OCP.

**Base case** \( (N = 0) \). Trivial, since \( \hat{Z}_0 = \hat{X}_0 \).

**Induction step** \( (N \Rightarrow N + 1) \). Suppose that for some \( N \in \mathbb{N}, \hat{Z}_N \) is RCI for (13). Then, by definition of \( \hat{Z}_{N+1}, \) there exists for each \( z \in \hat{Z}_{N+1}, \) a nonempty set \( \hat{U}(z) \subseteq \hat{U}(z) \) such that for every \( u \in \hat{U}_N(z) \) and for all \( v \in W \), it holds that \( z^+ \in \hat{Z}_N, \) where \( z^+ = \hat{f}(z, u, v) \). Furthermore, the induction hypothesis (\( \hat{Z}_N \) is RCI), implies that there also exists a \( u^+ \in \hat{U}(z^+ \) such that \( \hat{f}(z^+, u^+, v^+) \in \hat{Z}_N(v^+) \), \( v^+ \in W \). Therefore, \( z^+ \) satisfies the conditions defining \( \hat{Z}_{N+1} \). In other words, \( \hat{Z}_{N+1} \) is RCI.

The claim follows from the fact that for any \( N > 0 \) and \( z \in \hat{Z}_N, \) \( u = \hat{K}_N(z) \in S(\hat{V}_{N-1}) \in \hat{U}(\hat{V}_{N-1}, z), \) as any other choice of \( u \) would yield infinite cost in the definition of the Bellman operator.

**Corollary VI.5** (Chance constraint satisfaction). If the conditions for Proposition VI.4 hold, then by Proposition IV.1, the stochastic process \( (z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (x_t, s_t, \beta_t, w_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \) satisfying dynamics (26) satisfies the nominal chance constraints

\[
P[\hat{g}(x_t, \hat{K}_N(z_t), w_{t+1}) > 0 \mid x_t, w_t] < \alpha, \tag{28}
\]
a.s., for all \( t \in \mathbb{N} \).

We conclude this section by emphasizing that although the MPC scheme guarantees closed-loop constraint satisfaction, it does so while being less conservative than a fully robust approach, which is recovered by taking \( A_\delta(s, w) = \Delta_d \) for all \( (s, w, \beta) \in S \times W \times [0, 1] \). It is apparent from (16) and (18), that for all other choices of the ambiguity set, the set of feasible control actions will be larger (in the sense of set inclusion).

C. Stability

In this section, we will provide sufficient conditions on the control setup under which the origin is mean-square stable (MSS) for (26), i.e., \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t\|^2] = 0 \) for all \( x_0 \) in some specified compact set containing the origin.

Our main stability result, stated in Theorem VI.7, hinges in large on the following lemma, which relates *risk-square stability* [30, Lem. 5] of the origin for the autonomous system (26) (with respect to a statistically determined ambiguity set) to stability in the mean-square sense (with respect to the true distribution).

**Lemma VI.6** (Distributionally robust MSS condition). Suppose that Assumptions II.3 and II.7 are satisfied and the following statements hold. (i) \( T \hat{V}_1 \leq \hat{V}_i; \) (ii) \( c\|x\|^2 \leq \hat{f}(z, u, v) \) for some \( c > 0 \), for all \( z \in \{ x, s, \beta, w \} \in \hat{V}_N \) and all \( u \in \hat{U}(z) \); (iii) \( \hat{V}_N \) is locally bounded on its domain. Then, the origin is MSS for the MPC-controlled system (26), over all compact RPI sets \( \hat{Z} \subseteq \hat{V}_N \) containing the origin.

**Proof.** The proof is along the lines of that of [30, thm. 6] and shows that \( \hat{V}_N \) satisfies the conditions of Lemma VI.6. Details are in the Appendix.

**Theorem VI.7** (MPC stability). Suppose that Assumptions II.3 and II.7 are satisfied and the following statements hold. (i) \( T \hat{V}_1 \leq \hat{V}_i; \) (ii) \( c\|x\|^2 \leq \hat{f}(z, u, v) \) for some \( c > 0 \), for all \( z \in \{ x, s, \beta, w \} \in \hat{V}_N \) and all \( u \in \hat{U}(z) \); (iii) \( \hat{V}_N \) is locally bounded on its domain. Then, the origin is MSS for the MPC-controlled system (26), over all compact RPI sets \( \hat{Z} \subseteq \hat{V}_N \) containing the origin.

**Proof.** The proof is along the lines of that of [30, thm. 6] and shows that \( \hat{V}_N \) satisfies the conditions of Lemma VI.6. Details are in the Appendix.

The results in this section indicate that after an appropriate choice of the learning system, the thusly defined risk measures can be used to design an MPC controller using existing techniques (e.g., those presented in [30]). Corresponding stability guarantees (assuming known transition probabilities) then translate directly into stability guarantees under an ambiguously estimated transition kernel.

D. Asymptotic consistency

Under appropriate constraint qualifications, we can show that the optimal value of the DR-OCP converges to that of the nominal problem as the sample sizes increase, see Theorem VI.11. In the particular case where the constraints do not depend on the distribution, we can relax the constraint qualification to obtain a similar result. We include this as a separate statement, as it permits a more direct and illustrative proof using dynamic programming.
Given an arbitrary state-mode pair \((x, w)\), initial value of the learning state \(s_0\) and confidence \(\beta_t\), the stochastic process defined by the optimal value of the DR-OCP \((20)\), i.e., 
\[
\hat{V}_N(t)(x, w) := \hat{V}_N(x, s_t, \beta_t, t, w), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}
\]
serves as a sequential approximation of the optimal value \(V_N(x, w)\) of the horizon-\(N\) nominal OCP \((7)\). This section will establish sufficient conditions under which \(\hat{V}_N(t)\) converges to \(V_N^\star\) almost surely. We will refer to this property as asymptotic consistency. To this end, we make the following assumption on the learner state and the corresponding ambiguity set.

**Assumption VI.8** (Ambiguity decrease). There exists a sequence \(\{\delta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) with \(\lim_{t \to \infty} \delta_t = 0\), such that
\[
\sup_{p, q \in A_{\beta_t}(s_t, w)} \|p - q\| \leq \delta_t \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \forall w \in W, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, n_0]}.
\]

Assumption VI.8 states that the ambiguity sets “shrink” to a singleton with probability one. Since the ambiguity is expected to decrease as more information is observed, this is a rather natural assumption, which is satisfied by most classes of ambiguity sets, such as those discussed in Section III above.

**Example VI.9** (Divergence-based ambiguity sets). Consider again the divergence-based ambiguity sets introduced in Section III. **Proposition III.2** provides an expression for the radius \(r_\epsilon(w)\) of two commonly used ambiguity sets, which asymptotically behave as \(r_\epsilon(w) \sim -t w^{-1} \log(\beta_t)\). Recall that \(t_w\) denotes the number of visits to mode \(w\) at time \(t\). In the requirement of Assumption VI.8 results in a lower bound on the rate at which \(\beta_t\) may decrease with \(t\), posing a trade-off with Assumption VI.7, which requires summability of the sequence \(\{\beta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\). Given ergodicity of the Markov chain (Assumption II.1), it is straightforward to verify – using the Borel-Cantelli lemma [41, Thm. 4.3] in conjunction with [61, Lem. 6] – that with probability 1, there exists a finite time \(T\), such that for all \(t > T\) and for all \(w \in W\), it holds that \(t_w \geq c_0\), where \(c_0 > 0\) is a constant depending on specific properties of the Markov chain. Hence, so long as \(\{\beta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) is chosen to satisfy \(\lim_{t \to \infty} -\log(\beta_t) = 0\) element-wise, then Assumption VI.8 is satisfied. Note that the choice in Example II.8 satisfies both this requirement and that of Assumption II.7.

We are now ready to prove consistency of the DR-OCP in the absence of chance constraints. Below, we denote \(X_t(w) = \{x \mid \langle x, w \rangle \in X_t\}\) and similarly \(\tilde{X}_t(w) = \{y \mid \langle y, w \rangle \in \tilde{X}_t\}\).

**Theorem VI.10** (Asymptotic consistency with hard constraints). Suppose that all constraints are hard constraints, i.e., \(\alpha = 0\), so that \(\hat{U}(z) = U(x, w)\) for all \(z = (x, s, \beta, w)\). If, additionally, \(X_t\) is constructed in relation to the original problem such that for all \(w \in W\), \(X_t(w) = X_t(w) \times S \times I\), and \(X_t\) is RCI for system \((1)\) in the sense of Definition VI.2, then for any state-mode pair \((x, w) \in \text{dom} V_N\), any initial learner state \(s_0 = s \in S\) and any initial confidence level \(\beta_0 = \beta \in I\), the optimal cost of the DR-OCP of horizon \(N \geq 0\) almost surely converges from above to the true optimal cost. That is, with probability one,
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \hat{V}_N(t)(x, w) \geq V_N(x, w) \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } t;
\]
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \hat{V}_N(t)(x, w) = V_N(x, w),
\]
for all \((x, w) \in \text{dom} V_N\).

**Proof.** See Appendix.

The more general case, in which beside the cost, also the constraints are probabilistic and therefore dependent on the learner state, some additional assumptions on the problem ingredients are required.

**Theorem VI.11** (Asymptotic consistency under chance constraints). Let \(s^\star \in S\) denote a stationary learner state (cf. **Assumption II.6**) and suppose that for a given state-mode pair \((x, w) \in \text{dom} V_N\), the following hold:
\[\]
(i) the costs \(\ell(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, w), V_t(\cdot, \cdot, w), \text{ and } f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, w)\) are continuously differentiable;
(ii) the ambiguity set \(A_0(s, w)\) is conic representable with convex cone \(K\) and parameters \(E_w(s, \beta), F_w(s, \beta)\) and \(b_w(s, \beta)\) that depend smoothly on \(s\) and \(\beta\);
(iii) \(\tilde{X}_t(w) = X_t(w) \times S \times I\), with \(X_t\) RCI in the sense of Definition VI.2, and \(X_t(w)\) is closed and convex;
(iv) Risk levels \(\alpha_t\) are chosen according to the upper bound of **Proposition IV.1**, i.e., \(\alpha_t = \frac{\beta_t}{t_w} \) and \(\beta_t < \alpha \leq 1\);
(v) Robinson’s constraint qualification [62, Def. 2.86] holds for \((24)\), for initial augmented state \(y^\star = \langle x, s^\star, 0\rangle\).

Then, \(\lim_{t \to \infty} \hat{V}_N(t)(x, w) = V_N(x, w), \text{ a.s.}
\]

**Proof.** By **Condition (ii)**, \((x, s, \beta, w) \in \tilde{X}_t \Leftrightarrow (x, w) \in X_t\). Therefore, the nominal OCP \((7)\) differs only from its DR counterpart \((20)\) in the parameters \(s_t, \beta_t\) that define the risk measures involved in the OCP and the choice of the risk levels \(\alpha_t\).

**Assumptions II.7 and VI.8** ensure that \(\lim_{t \to \infty} \beta_t = \beta^\star = 0\) and consequently, by **Condition (i)**, \(\lim_{t \to \infty} \alpha_t = \alpha\). By **Assumption VI.8** and the requirement \((8)\), the Borel-Cantelli lemma [41, Thm. 4.3] implies that for every sequence \((p_t \in A_{\tilde{\beta}_t}(s_t, w_t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\), \(\lim_{t \to \infty} P_{w_t} = P_{w_0}\) with probability 1. Furthermore, as \(s_t \to s^\star\), it follows by **Condition (ii)** that the mapping \((s, \beta) \rightarrow A_0(s, \beta)\) is continuous for all \(w \in W\) and therefore \(A_0(s^\star, w) = \{P_{w_0}\}\). Then, for \(x^\star = \langle x, s^\star, \beta^\star, w^\star\rangle\), it holds that \(\hat{V}_N(x^\star) = V_N(x, w)\).

Thus, it remains to show that \(\hat{V}_N^\star\) is continuous with respect to the parameters \(s, \beta\), i.e.,
\[
\lim_{s \to x^\star, \beta \to \beta^\star} \hat{V}_N(x, s, \beta, w) = V_N(x, s^\star, \beta^\star, w).
\]

To do so, we will set out to show that we may write the scenario tree formulation of the DR-OCP \((24)\), in the form
\[
\hat{V}_N(z) = \min_{z} \Psi(z) \quad \text{subj. to } \Gamma(z, \theta) \in K, \quad (30)
\]
with \(\Psi\) and \(\Gamma\) continuously differentiable functions and \(K\) a closed convex set, where \(z\) represents the decision variables over the scenario tree and \(\theta = (s, \beta)\) denotes the parameters. The claim then follows directly from [62, Thm. 2.844]. By inspection of \((24a)\) it is clear that \(\Psi\) is a linear function, satisfying the requirements. We now proceed forward. Theorem \((24b)-(24d)\) admits the desired representation.

I The constraints \((24b)-(24d)\) can be directly combined into the form \(\Gamma_1(z, \theta) \in K_1 := \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n_1} \times \tilde{X}_t\), where \(\Gamma_1\) is a concatenation of the functions \(f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, w), V_t(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, w), \text{ and } f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, w)\) and therefore continuously differentiable, given that **Condition (i)** holds. \(K_1\) is convex due to **Condition (iii)**

II Finally, we consider the remaining constraints \((24e)\) and \((24f)\). Using \((23)\), a conic risk epigraph constraint \((\xi, \gamma) \in \text{epi} \tilde{\rho}\) with parameters \(E(\theta), F(\theta)\) and \(\tilde{b}(\theta)\) and cone \(K\) can be written in the desired form
\[
\hat{F}_2(\xi, y, \theta) := [E(\theta) F(\theta) t - \tilde{b}(\theta)]^\top y + [0 - 1]^\top \gamma + [-1 0]^\top \xi
\]
which is differentiable provided that \(E(\theta), F(\theta)\) and \(\tilde{b}(\theta)\) are differentiable. This is ensured exactly by **Condition (ii)**, for the cost risk measure \(\rho_{s_t, w_t}\), and thus \((24e)\) is of the form \((31)\).
Invoking Proposition V.2, \( \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\omega}(s, \hat{\beta}) \) is conic representable with parameters

\[
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{w}(s, \hat{\beta}) &= \left[ E_{\hat{\omega}} \right], \\
\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{w}(s, \hat{\beta}) &= \left[ E_{\hat{\omega}} \right], \\
\hat{b}_{w}(s, \hat{\beta}) &= \left[ b_{\hat{w}} \right], \\
\hat{b}_{w}(s, \hat{\beta}) &= \left[ b_{\hat{w}} \right], \\
\end{aligned}
\]

(32)

with \( E_{\hat{\omega}} = [1 - A \hat{\beta} - I]^\top, \) and \( B, \hat{b} \) constant. Condition (iv) requires that \( \hat{\beta} = \frac{\alpha - \hat{\beta}}{1 - \beta} \) is continuously differentiable in \( \hat{\beta} \) for all \( \beta < 1 \). The case \( \beta = 1 \) is excluded by design and furthermore inconsequential as \( \beta \to 0 \). As a result, (24), i.e., constraints \( g(x, u, w, v, 0) \) can be written in the form (31), replacing \( \xi \) with \( g(x, u, w, v) \) — which preserves continuous differentiability, due to Condition (i) — and replacing the risk parameters \( \hat{E}(\theta) \) and \( \hat{F}(\theta) \) and \( \hat{b}(\theta) \) and \( \hat{K} \), with those in (32).

We conclude that (24g) admits the representation (30), and thus, under the constraint qualification of Condition (v), it satisfies the requirements of [62, Thm. 2.84] and the proof is complete.

Remark VI.12. The required differentiability of the learner dynamics in Condition (i) can in principle be relaxed by relaxed as these dynamics are exogenous and can be precomputed over the scenario tree. In this case, the parameter vector in the proof of Theorem VI.11 can be taken to be \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \text{mod}(0, N-1) \), leaving the remainder of the argument mostly intact.

VII. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

We consider a Markov jump linear system \( x_{t+1} = A(w_{t+1})x_t + B(u_{t+1})u_t, \) with

\[
A(w) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 + \frac{w-1}{2} & 0.01 \\
0.01 & 1 + 2.5 \frac{w-1}{2}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad B(w) = I, \quad w \in \mathbb{N}[1, d]
\]

(33)

The state \( x_t \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) of this system, inspired by [63], models the deviation of temperatures from some nominal value of two adjacent servers in a data center. The actuators \( u_t \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) correspond to the amount of heating (\( u_t \geq 0 \)) or cooling (\( u_t < 0 \)) applied to the corresponding machines. The mode \( i \) models the load on the servers. If \( i = 1 \), the system is idle and no heat is generated. If \( i = d \), then the processors are fully occupied and a maximum amount of heat is added to the system. Note that the second server generates more heat under increasing loads.

As in [63], we will use a mode-independent quadratic cost \( \ell(x, u, w) = \|x\|^2 + 10^3 \|u\|^2_2 \).

We impose hard constraints \(-1.5 \leq u \leq 1.5 \) on the actuation and (nominally) impose chance constraints

\[
\mathbb{P}[H_i x_{t+1} > h_i | x_t, w_t] \leq \alpha \text{ with } H = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} & 1_{\mathbb{N}} \end{bmatrix}, h = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{\mathbb{N}} \\ 0.5 \end{bmatrix},
\]

for all \( t \in \mathbb{N}[0,N-1], \) and \( \alpha = 0.2 \). Hence, in this example, we have \( g_i(x, u, w, v) = H_i(A(x)x + B(v)u) - h_i. \)

We compute stabilizing terminal ingredients offline using standard techniques from robust control. We compute a robust quadratic Lyapunov function \( V_i(x) = x^\top Q_i x \) along with a local linear control gain \( K_i \), such that \( V_i(A(w)+B(w)K)x \leq -\ell(x, K_i x), \forall w \in W \) by solving a linear matrix inequality (LMI) as in [64]. The RCI terminal set \( \mathcal{X}_i \) is computed as the level set \( \mathcal{X}_i = \text{lev}_{\leq \varepsilon} V_i, \) where \( \varepsilon = \min_{i} \left\{ h_i / \|Q_i \|^{1/2} H_i, \|Q_i \|^2 \right\} \) is the largest value such that \( \text{lev}_{\leq \varepsilon} V_i \) lies inside the polyhedral set \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} | H(A(w)+B(w)K) \leq h, \forall w \in W \} \).

For the DR controllers below, we use the TV ambiguity set described in Section III-A. We choose confidence levels \( \beta_i = (\hat{\beta}_l, \hat{\beta}_W) \) and \( \hat{\beta}_l = 0.19t^{-2} < \alpha \) for the cost and the constraints, respectively, ensuring that both Assumption II.7 and Assumption VI.8 are satisfied, as discussed in Example VI.9. For simplicity, we use identical confidence levels \( \hat{\beta}_W \) for all the constraints.

We compare the proposed DR-MPC controller with (i) the (nominal) stochastic MPC controller (see (7)), which we call omniscient as it has access to the true transition matrix \( P \); and (ii) the robust MPC controller, obtained by solving (24), taking the ambiguity set \( \mathcal{A}_i(w, s, w') = \mathcal{A}_i(s, w') = \Delta_d \) to be the entire probability simplex, regardless of the mode or learner state. Both the LMIs involved in the offline computation of the terminal ingredients as the online risk-averse optimal control problem (24) are solved using MOSEK [65] through the CVXNPY [66] interface.

We fix the number of modes to \( d = 3 \), and take \( N = 5 \). For these values, the average and maximum online solver times over 1500 monte-carlo runs were 56.8 ms and 87.5 ms, respectively, on an Intel Core i7-7700K CPU at 4.20GHz.

A. Closed-loop simulation

Fixing the initial state at \( x = [0.5 0.5]^\top \), we perform 50 monte-carlo simulations of the described MPC problems for 30 steps. As the simulation time is rather short, we initialize the DR controller with 10 and 100 offline observations of the Markov chain to obtain more interesting comparisons. Hence, the simulation below essentially compares the controller responses after a sudden disturbance after 10 and 100 time steps. All considered controllers are recursively feasible and mean-square stabilizing by construction. By the nature of the problem set-up, the optimal behavior is to just barely stabilize the system with minimal control effort. However, the larger the uncertainty on the state evolution, the controller is forced to drive the states further away from the constraint boundary, leading to larger control actions and consequently, larger costs.

Fig. 2. Control effort and second component of the state vector over 50 monte-carlo simulations. Full lines depict the means over the realizations and the shades areas are delineated by the 0.05 and 0.95 quantiles.

Fig. 3. Box plot of the closed-loop cost over 50 monte-carlo simulations. The annotated lines show the mean. The whiskers depict the 0.05 and 0.95 quantiles.

This behavior can be observed in Fig. 2 and 3. Fig. 2 shows the controls and states over time and Fig. 3 presents the distribution of the closed-loop costs (sum of the stage costs over the simulation
time). In the first time step, the robust controller takes the largest step, driving the state the furthest from the constraint boundary. As illustrated in Fig. 2 (right), this is particularly pronounced for the second component of the state vector, as it is more sensitive to the mode (cf. (33)). The omniscient stochastic MPC, by contrast, has perfect knowledge of the transition probabilities, and by consequence is able to more slowly drive the state to the origin, reducing the control effort considerably. The DR controller naturally ‘interpolates’ between these behaviors. Initially, it performs only marginally better than the robust controller (due to the very limited number of online learning steps). As it gets access to increasing sample sizes, however, it gradually approximates the behavior of the omniscient controller, while guaranteeing satisfaction of the constraints throughout.

B. Asymptotic consistency

To illustrate the consistency results from Section VI-D, we fix the initial state-mode pair \( x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.25 & 0.25 \end{bmatrix}^T \), \( w_0 = 1 \) and recompute the solution to problem (24) to obtain \( \hat{V}(t) := V_N(t)(x_0, w_0) \) for increasing sample sizes \( t \). For comparison, we compute (i) the true value \( V^\ast := V_N(x_0, w_0) \) by solving the stochastic MPC problem (7), using the true transition probabilities; and (ii) the robust value function \( V_r \) obtained by solving (24), taking the ambiguity set \( A_\beta(s, w) = \Delta \beta \) to be the entire probability simplex, regardless of the mode or learner state.

Figure 4 shows the relative difference between the DR value \( \hat{V}(t) \) and the true value \( V^\ast \). At very low sample sizes, the DR controller achieves the same cost as the robust controller. However, as more data is gathered and the ambiguity set is updated, \( \hat{V}(t) \) approaches \( V^\ast \) from above, at a rate of \( \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{t}) \).

![Figure 4. Relative suboptimality versus sample size for the example system (33). The dashed line depicts the relative suboptimality of the robust controller: \( (V_r - V^\ast)/V^\ast \).](image)

VIII. CONCLUSION

We presented a distributionally robust MPC strategy for Markov jump systems with unknown transition probabilities subject to general chance constraints. Using data-driven ambiguity sets, we derived a DR counterpart to a nominal stochastic MPC scheme, and showed that the resulting controller provides a priori guarantees on closed-loop constraint satisfaction and mean-square stability of the true system, without requiring explicit knowledge of the transition probabilities. Additionally, we have shown convergence of the cost to the nominal value. We illustrate the favorable properties of the obtained MPC scheme on a numerical example.

In future work, we aim to extend the methodology to the case where the discrete mode cannot be observed directly [67], and extend the numerical simulations to more extensive case studies. Furthermore, we plan to investigate tailored (parallelized) solution methods for the discussed optimal control problems, which are still hindered by an exponential growth in the prediction horizon.
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APPENDIX

A. Technical Lemma

Lemma A.1 (Infimum convergence). Consider a sequence of proper, lsc functions $V^{(t)} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and a proper, lsc, level-bounded function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that

(i) (Eventual upper bound) there exists a $T \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $t > T$, and for all $u$, $V^{(t)}(u) \geq V(u)$;

(ii) (Pointwise convergence) $V^{(t)} \xrightarrow{p} V$. That is, for all $u$, $\lim_t V^{(t)}(u) = V(u)$.

Then, $\lim_t \inf_{u \in \mathbb{N}} V^{(t)}(u) = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{N}} V(u)$.

Proof. By (i) it follows that for any sequence $u_t \rightarrow \bar{u}$,

$$\lim_t \inf_{u} V^{(t)}(u) = \lim_t \inf_{u \rightarrow \bar{u}} V^{(t)}(u) \geq \lim_{u \rightarrow \bar{u}} V^{(u)}(\bar{u}),$$

where the first inequality follows from Condition (i), and the second inequality follows from lower semicontinuity of $V$. Moreover, fixing $(u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be the constant sequence $u_t = u$, it follows from (ii) that $\limsup_t V^{(t)}(u_t) = \lim_t V^{(t)}(u) \leq V(\bar{u})$. Invoking [68, Prop. 7.2], we conclude that $V^{(t)} \xrightarrow{p} V$, i.e., $V^{(t)}$ e-converges to $V$. Secondly, from Condition (i) and the level-boundedness of $V$, it follows that $(V^{(t)})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is eventually level-bounded [68, Ex. 7.32]. The claim then follows from [68, Thm. 7.33].

B. Deferred proofs

Proof of Lemma VI.6.

Let $(z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (x_t, s_t, \beta_t, u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the stochastic process satisfying dynamics (26), for some initial state $z_0 \in \text{dom } V$. For ease of notation, let us define $V_t := V(z_t), t \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to nonnegativity of $V$,

$$E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} c_t ||x_t||^2\right] \leq E\left[V_k + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} c_t ||x_t||^2\right] = E\left[V_k - V_0 + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} c_t ||x_t||^2\right] + V_0,$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $V_0$ is deterministic. By linearity of the expectation, we can in turn write

$$E\left[V_k - V_0 + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} c_t ||x_t||^2\right] = E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} (V_{t+1} - V_t + c_t ||x_t||^2)\right] = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E\left(V_{t+1} - V_t + c_t ||x_t||^2\right).$$

Therefore,

$$E\left[c_t \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} ||x_t||^2\right] - V_0 \leq \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E\left[V_{t+1} - V_t\right] + c E\left[||x_t||^2\right].$$

Recall that $\beta_t$ denotes the coordinate of $\beta_t$ corresponding to the risk measures in the cost function (19). Defining the event $E_t := \{\omega \in \Omega \mid P_{\omega}(\omega) \in A(\beta_t(s(\omega), u_t(\omega)))\}$, and its complement $\neg E_t = \Omega \setminus E_t$, we can use the law of total expectation to write

$$E[V_{t+1} - V_t] = E[V_{t+1} - V_t | E_t] P[E_t] + E[V_{t+1} - V_t | \neg E_t] P[\neg E_t].$$

By condition (8), $P[\neg E_t] < \beta_t$. From Conditions (i) and (iii), it follows that $z_t \in \text{dom } V, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}[0,k]$ and that there exists a $\nu_t \geq 0$ such that $V(z_t) \leq \nu_t$, for all $z_t \in \text{dom } V$. Therefore, $E[V_{t+1} - V_t | \neg E_t] \leq \nu_t$. Finally, by Condition (ii), $E[V_{t+1} - V_t | E_t] \leq E[\neg c_t ||x_t||^2 | E_t]$. Thus,

$$E[V_{t+1} - V_t] \leq E[-c ||x_t||^2 | E_t] P[E_t] + \nu_t.$$

This allows us to simplify expression (34) as

$$E[c \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} ||x_t||^2] - V_0 \leq \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} -c E[||x_t||^2 | E_t] P[E_t] + \nu_t + c E[||x_t||^2],$$

which remains finite as $k \rightarrow \infty$, since $\beta_t \in \mathbb{N}$ is summable. Thus, the necessary $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E[||x_t||^2] = 0$.

Proof of Theorem VI.7.

First, note that using the monotonicity of coherent risk measures [34, Sec. 6.3, (R2)], a straightforward inductive argument allows us to show that under Condition (i),

$$\mathbf{T} \hat{V}_N \leq \hat{V}_N, \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (35)$$

Since $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \text{dom } \hat{V}_N$, recall that by definition (25), we have for any $z = (x, s, \beta, \omega) \in \mathbf{F}$ that

$$\hat{V}_N(z) = \ell(x, \hat{R}_N(z), w) + \rho_{w,s}^{\beta} \hat{V}_{N-1}(f_{\hat{R}_N}(z), v),$$

where $\beta$ denotes the component of $\beta$ corresponding to the cost. Therefore, we may write

$$\rho_{w,s}^{\beta} \hat{V}_{N-1}(f_{\hat{R}_N}(z), v) - \hat{V}_N(z) = \rho_{w,s}^{\beta} \hat{V}_{N-1}(f_{\hat{R}_N}(z), v) - \ell(x, \hat{R}_N(z), w) - \rho_{w,s}^{\beta} \hat{V}_{N-1}(f_{\hat{R}_N}(z), v) \leq -\ell(x, \hat{R}_N(z), w) \leq -c ||x||^2,$$

where the first inequality follows by (35) and monotonicity of coherent risk measures. The second inequality follows from Condition (ii). Combined with Condition (iii), this implies that $V : z \rightarrow \hat{V}_N(z) + \delta_\mathbb{F}(z)$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma VI.6 and the assertion follows.

Proof of Theorem VI.10.

By construction, the equivalence $(x, w) \in X \Leftrightarrow (x, s, \beta, w) \in X_t$ holds for all $s, \beta \in S \times I$. Hence, for $N = 0$, we have that $\hat{V}_0^{(t)} = V_0 = V^{(t)}$ and there is nothing to prove. The general case, $N > 0$, is proved by induction. Assume that equations (28) and (29) hold for some $N \geq 0$. We will now demonstrate that this implies...
that they also hold for \( N + 1 \). Let us define auxiliary functions \( Q^{(t)}_N \) and \( Q_N \) as

\[
Q^{(t)}_N(x, u, w) := \ell(x, u, w) + \rho^{x, u, w}_{p, s} \bar{V}^{(t+1)}_{N-1}(f(x, u, v), v),
\]

\[
Q_N(x, u, w) := \ell(x, u, w) + E_{P_{w}}[V_{N-1}(f(x, u, v), v)|x, w],
\]

so that we may write \( \bar{V}^{(t)}_N(x, w) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x, w)} Q^{(t)}_N(x, u, w) \) and \( V_N(x, w) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x, w)} Q_N(x, u, w) \).

We will start with the inductive argument for (28). Under Assumption II.7, the Borel-Cantelli lemma [41, Thm. 4.3] guarantees that with probability 1, there exists a finite \( T_N \in \mathbb{N} \), such that for all \( t > T_N \), \( P_{w} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, w}^{\star}(s_t, w) \), for all \( w \in W \) and \( i \in [1, n_{\beta, w}] \), and consequently \( \rho^{x, u, w}_i \geq E_{P_{w}} \), uniformly. It follows that for all \( t > T_N \) and for all \( u \in \mathcal{U}(x, w) \),

\[
Q^{(t)}_{N+1}(x, u, w) \geq \ell(x, u, w) + E_{P_{w}}[\bar{V}^{(t+1)}_{N}(f(x, u, v), v)|x, w]
\]

and thus necessarily \( \bar{V}^{(t)}_{N+1}(x, w) \geq V^{N+1}_{N+1}(x, w) \), where (a) follows from the induction hypothesis. This establishes (28) for all \( N \in \mathbb{N} \).

To demonstrate the induction step \( N \Rightarrow N + 1 \) for (29), we show that under the induction hypothesis, the sequence \( (Q^{(t)}_{N+1}(x, \cdot, w))_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \) and the function \( Q^{(t+1)}_{N+1}(x, \cdot, w) \), satisfy the conditions of Lemma A.1. Under Assumption II.3, and using [68, Thm. 3.31], it follows from [38, Prop. 2] that \( Q_N \) and \( Q^{(t)}_{N+1} \), are proper, lsc, and level-bounded in \( u \) locally uniformly in \( x \), for all \( w \in W \). Let us introduce the shorthand for the worst-case conditional distribution \( p^t(u) = (p^t_{i, w}(u))_{i \in W} \):

\[
p^t_i(u) := \arg\max_{p \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, i}(w, s_t)} \sum_{v \in W} p_v \bar{V}^{(t+1)}_{N}(f(x, u, v), v),
\]

where we have omitted the dependence on the constant \( x \) and \( w \). Then, by the induction hypothesis (29), there exists for every \( \epsilon > 0 \), a \( T' \geq T_N \), such that for all \( t > T' \),

\[
Q^{(t)}_{N+1}(x, u, w) - Q_N(x, u, w) = \sum_{v \in W} p^t_{i, w}(u) \bar{V}^{(t+1)}_{N}(f(x, u, v), v) - P_{w} V_N(f(x, u, v), v)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{v \in W} (p^t_{i, w}(u) - P_{w}) V_N(f(x, u, v), v) + \epsilon,
\]

where the final inequality is due to Assumption VI.8 and the fact that for all \( t > T_N \), \( P_{w} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, i}(w, s_t) \). As \( \delta_t \rightarrow 0 \), the first term in (36) can be made arbitrarily small by increasing \( t \), provided that \( V_N(f(x, u, v), v) < \infty \), for all \( w \in W \), hence establishing pointwise convergence \( Q^{(t)}_{N+1} \xrightarrow{P} Q^{(t+1)}_{N+1} \) whenever \( \text{dom} \ V_N \) is RCI for (1), which in turn holds if \( \mathcal{X}_t \) is RCI by Proposition VI.4. The sequence \( (Q^{(t)}_{N+1}(x, \cdot, w))_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \) and the function \( Q^{(t+1)}_{N+1}(x, \cdot, w) \) thus satisfy the conditions of Lemma A.1, which establishes (29) for \( N + 1 \).