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Abstract—We develop a risk-averse safety analysis method for stochastic systems on discrete infinite time horizons. Our method quantifies the notion of risk for a control system in terms of the severity of a harmful random outcome in a fraction of worst cases, whereas classical methods quantify risk in terms of probabilities. The theoretical arguments are based on the analysis of a value iteration algorithm on an augmented state space. We provide conditions to guarantee the existence of an optimal policy on this space. We illustrate the method numerically using an example from the domain of stormwater management.

Index Terms—Conditional Value-at-Risk, Safety and risk analysis, Stochastic systems, Markov decision processes

1. INTRODUCTION

The standard approach to stochastic safety analysis is to minimize the probability that a control system violates a given safety or performance criterion. Variations of this problem have been studied in the context of non-adversarial disturbances [1], [2], adversarial disturbances [3], distributional robustness [4], and temporal logic [5], [6].

While minimizing the likelihood of a harmful outcome is useful, it may be imperative to quantify and minimize its severity directly. For example, in periods of heavy rainfall, stormwater overflows may be inevitable, but reducing the magnitude of the overflows (e.g., maximum flood level or overflow volume) is important to preserve the structural integrity of cities. For another example, adverse side effects from chemotherapy may be unavoidable, but when side effects are less severe, treatment protocols can continue more readily.

In addition, the International Organization for Standardization risk management guidelines include “the likelihood of events and consequences” and “the nature and magnitude of consequences” as factors for consideration in risk analysis [7, Sec. 6.4.3]. The practical significance of quantifying and minimizing the magnitude of a random harmful outcome has motivated the development of risk-averse safety analysis methods for control systems.

In prior work, we devised a trajectory-wise risk-averse safety analysis method for stochastic systems on discrete finite time horizons [8]–[10]. Our framework uses the Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) functional to assess the magnitude of a random maximum cost incurred by a control system. The random cost represents a random distance between the state trajectory and a desired operating region. We use CVaR to evaluate this cost because CVaR quantifies the severity of a harmful outcome in a given fraction of worst cases. That is, if $G$ is a continuous random variable with finite $E\{G\}$, the CVaR of $G$ at level $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is the expectation of $G$ in the $\alpha \cdot 100\%$ worst cases. CVaR is becoming popular in the control systems and robotics research communities due to its quantitative yet intuitive interpretation [11]–[14].

CVaR was developed in the early 2000s by the operations research community [15], [16]. The CVaR of $G \in L^1 := L^1(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\nu)$ at level $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is defined by $\text{CVaR}_\alpha(G) := \inf \{ s \in \mathbb{R} | \nu\{ \{G \leq s\} \geq 1 - \alpha \} \}$ with $\alpha \in (0,1)$ if $G \in L^1$ is continuous, then $\text{CVaR}_\alpha(G)$ is the expectation of $G$ conditioned on $\{G \geq \text{CVaR}_\alpha(G)\}$. This statement explains the name Conditional Value-at-Risk. CVaR on $L^1$ with $\alpha \in (0,1)$ satisfies the four desired decision-theoretic axioms proposed by Artzner et al. (monotonicity, translation equivariance, subadditivity, and positive homogeneity) [15]. VaR is commonly criticized for lacking sub-additivity.

In control engineering, the classical risk functional is Exponential Utility, which takes the form $\rho_{\text{EU},\theta}(G) := -\log E(\exp(-G))$, where $G$ is a non-negative random variable, $\theta < 0$ in the risk-averse case, and $\theta > 0$ in the risk-seeking case. Exponential Utility is not positively homogeneous; i.e., $\lambda \rho_{\text{EU},\theta}(G) \neq \rho_{\text{EU},\theta}(\lambda G)$ with $\lambda \geq 0$. Under certain conditions, it holds that $\lim_{\theta \to 0} \rho_{\text{EU},\theta}(G) = E(G)$, and if $|\theta|$ is sufficiently small, then $\rho_{\text{EU},\theta}(G) \approx E(G) - \frac{\theta}{2} \text{variance}(G)$ [17]. When this approximation is not valid, Exponential Utility is an infinite linear combination of moments, which may be difficult to interpret intuitively. Recently, we showed that using a more negative value of $\theta$ in the optimal control problem of minimizing $\rho_{\text{EU},\theta}(G)$ can yield a distribution with a higher mean and a higher variance [18].

The problem of risk-averse safety analysis for control systems is related to the problem of optimizing risk-averse Markov decision processes (MDPs). In particular, the latter problem need not be amenable to a dynamic programming (DP) recursion on the state space. This is because some risk functionals, including CVaR, Mean-Variance, and Expected Utility (except for Exponential Utility), do not satisfy an analogue of the law of iterated expectations, in which the future cost is history-dependent only through the current state.
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Hence, a popular approach to mitigate this issue is to define the dynamics of an extra state so that a DP recursion or a linear program can be formulated on the augmented state space [10], [19]–[23]. An optimal policy that depends on the augmented state dynamics can be constructed under a measurable selection condition [10], [19]–[21]; such a policy may be called an optimal precommitment policy to highlight its extra dependencies. One can avoid state-space augmentation in a CVaR setting when minimizing an expected cumulative cost subject to a CVaR constraint on a stage cost [11], [12] or when minimizing the CVaR of a terminal cost [13].

In this paper, we generalize our risk-averse safety analysis method [10] to the infinite time setting. The core problem is to minimize the CVaR of the supremum of stage costs subject to the dynamics of an MDP and construct an optimal precommitment policy under appropriate conditions. The optimal values of the problem define a family of risk-averse safety specifications, which quantify the severity of a harmful outcome in a given fraction α of worst cases. In particular, the infinite time solution requires deriving a forwards DP recursion on an augmented state space (Lemma 1) and showing that a sequence of value functions converges pointwise to an optimal expected maximum cost (Thm. 2). We illustrate the method on a numerical example inspired by the challenge of mitigating the risk of combined sewer overflows.

**Notation.** If 𝑆 is a metrizable space, ℬ_S is the Borel sigma algebra on 𝑆, ℙ_S is the collection of probability measures on (𝑆, ℬ_S), and ℳ^+_S is the family of non-negative Borel-measurable functions on 𝑆. If 𝑦 ∈ 𝑆, δ_y ∈ ℙ_S is the Dirac measure concentrated at 𝑦. ℳ is the set of natural numbers and ℳ_0 := ℳ ∪ {0}. �臌^n is the non-negative orthant in ℍ^n, ℊ^n is the extended real line. For 𝑝 ∈ ℳ ∪ {+∞}, ℒ^𝑝(Ω, ℋ, 𝜈) is the ℒ^𝑝 space corresponding to the measure space (Ω, ℋ, 𝜈).

We use the abbreviations: w.r.t. = with respect to, lsc = lower semi-continuous, a.e. = almost everywhere or almost every.

### II. Problem Statement

We consider a stochastic control system operating on a discrete infinite time horizon ℳ₀. For each 𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀, the realizations of the random state 𝑋_𝑡, the random control 𝑈_𝑡, and the random disturbance 𝑊_𝑡 are elements of a non-empty Borel space, 𝑆, 𝐶, and 𝐷, respectively. The initial state 𝑋_0 is fixed at an arbitrary 𝑥 ∈ 𝑆. The disturbance process 𝑊_0, 𝑊_1, . . . is a sequence of random objects, such that for each 𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀, given (𝑋_𝑡, 𝑈_𝑡), 𝑊_𝑡 is independent of 𝑊_[0,𝑡] for all 𝑡 ≠ 𝑡. If (𝑥, 𝑢) ∈ 𝑆 × 𝐶 is the realization of (𝑋_𝑡, 𝑈_𝑡), then the distribution of 𝑊_𝑡 is 𝑝(·|𝑥, 𝑢), where 𝑝(·|·) is a Borel-measurable stochastic kernel on 𝐷 given 𝑆 × 𝐶. Moreover, the distribution of 𝑋_{𝑡+1} is 𝑄(·|𝑥, 𝑢), which is defined by 𝑄(𝐵|x, u) := {w ∈ 𝐷 : f(x, u, w) ∈ 𝐵} for any 𝐵 ∈ ℬ_𝐷, where 𝑓 : 𝑆 × 𝐶 × 𝐷 → 𝑆 is a Borel-measurable map.

We consider a random cost 𝑌 := sup_{𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀} 𝐶(𝑋_𝑡, 𝑈_𝑡), where 𝐶 : 𝑆 × 𝐶 → ℍ is Borel measurable, bounded, and non-negative. In particular, 𝐶(𝑥, 𝑢) ∈ ℋ := [0, ℋ] for all (𝑥, 𝑢) ∈ 𝑆 × 𝐶.

The problem is to compute a family of risk-averse safe sets. Each set 𝑆′_α := {𝑥 ∈ 𝑆 : 𝑉_α(𝑥) ≤ 𝑟} is defined in terms of a CVaR-optimal control problem.

\[
𝑉_α(𝑥) := \inf_{π ∈ ℨ} \text{CVaR}_α^{Σ_π}(\sup\{𝐶(𝑋_𝑡, 𝑈_𝑡) : 𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀\}).
\] (1)

In (1), ℨ is a class of history-dependent policies (to be defined in the next section), 𝛼 ∈ (0, 1] is a risk-aversion parameter, 𝑟 ∈ ℍ, and 𝐶𝑉𝑎𝑅_α^{Σ_π}(𝑌) is the CVaR of 𝑌 at level 𝛼 when the system is initialized at 𝑥 and uses the policy 𝜋. Recall that 𝐶𝑉𝑎𝑅_α^{Σ_π}(𝑌) represents the expectation of 𝑌 in the 𝛼· 100% worst cases. One may choose 𝑐 to quantify a distance between a state realization and a desired operating region 𝐾 ∈ ℬ_Equip., in which case, 𝑌 is a random distance between the state trajectory and 𝐾. In our numerical example of a stormwater system, we choose 𝑐 to quantify an overflow amount (Sec. 3). Our prior work further motivates risk-averse safe sets (in the finite time case) [9], [10] and explains how these sets generalize the safe sets of classical stochastic safety analysis [9].

### III. State-Space Augmentation Approach

While it is not possible to compute 𝑉_α* by formulating a DP recursion on 𝑆, computing 𝑉_α* is possible by defining a 𝑍-valued extra state, 𝑍_{𝑡+1} := max{𝑋_𝑡, 𝐶(𝑋_𝑡, 𝑈_𝑡)} with 𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀, to record historical data. We define the sample space Ω := (𝑆 × ℋ × ℋ)∞, where each 𝜔 ∈ Ω takes the form 𝜔 = (𝑥₀, 𝑧₀, 𝑢₀, 𝑥₁, 𝑧₁, 𝑢₁, . . .), and the coordinates of 𝜔 are related causally. We define 𝑋_𝑡, 𝑍_𝑡, and 𝑈_𝑡 to be projections from Ω to 𝑆, ℋ, and ℋ, respectively, such that for each 𝜔 ∈ Ω of the form above, 𝑋_𝑡(𝜔) := 𝑥_𝑡, 𝑍_𝑡(𝜔) := 𝑧_𝑡, and 𝑈_𝑡(𝜔) := 𝑢_𝑡. The initial augmented state is constant, i.e., (𝑋₀(𝜔), ℋ₀(𝜔)) = (𝑥₀, 𝑧₀) ∈ 𝑆 × ℋ for all 𝜔 ∈ Ω. We define the random cost 𝑌 as follows, 𝑌 : Ω → ℍ such that for each 𝜔 ∈ Ω of the form above, 𝑌(𝜔) := sup_{𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀} 𝐶(𝑋_𝑡(𝜔), 𝑈_𝑡(𝜔)) = sup_{𝑡 ∈ ℳ₀} 𝐶(𝑥_𝑡, 𝑢_𝑡).

II is the class of stationary policies that are history-dependent through (𝑋_𝑡, 𝑍_𝑡). That is, each 𝜋 ∈ ℨ takes the form 𝜋 = (𝜇_0, 𝜇_1, . . .), where 𝜇(·|·) is a Borel-measurable stochastic kernel on 𝐶 given 𝑆 × ℋ. IV is the class of policies that are history-dependent through (𝑋_𝑡, 𝑍_𝑡), which is a superset of II. Given 𝜋 = (𝜇_0, 𝜇_1, . . .) ∈ IV and (𝑥, 𝑧) ∈ 𝑆 × ℋ, the augmented system evolves as follows. Initialize 𝑡 = 0 and (𝑥₀, 𝑧₀) = (𝑥, 𝑧). For 𝑡 = 0, 1, . . .,

1) A realization 𝑢_𝑡 of 𝑈_𝑡 occurs according to 𝜇_𝑡(·|𝑥_𝑡, 𝑧_𝑡).
2) A realization 𝑤_𝑡 of 𝑊_𝑡 occurs according to 𝑝(·|𝑥_𝑡, 𝑢_𝑡).
3) The realization (𝑥_{𝑡+1}, 𝑧_{𝑡+1}) of (𝑋_{𝑡+1}, 𝑍_{𝑡+1}) is given by (𝑥_{𝑡+1}, 𝑧_{𝑡+1}) = (𝑓(𝑥_𝑡, 𝑢_𝑡, 𝑤_𝑡), max{𝑧_𝑡, 𝑐(𝑥_𝑡, 𝑢_𝑡)}).
4) Time 𝑡 updates by 1, and proceed to step 1.

Next, we present a family of probability measures on (Ω, ℬ_Equip.) that we use throughout the paper. By [24, Prop. 7.28] (a special case of the Ionescu Tulcea Thm.), for each (𝑥, 𝑧) ∈ 𝑆 × ℋ and 𝜋 = (𝜇_0, 𝜇_1, . . .) ∈ IV, there is a unique probability measure 𝑃_𝜃,𝜋 ∈ ℙ_Equip., such that for each 𝑡 ∈ {2, 3, . . .}, the marginal of 𝑃_𝜃,𝜋 on 𝜔_𝑡 := (𝑆 × ℋ × ℋ)^𝑡,

\[
\text{probes the criterion of interest } 𝑉_α* \text{ using the computation of } 𝑉_α* \text{ and the relation } 𝑉_α* = 𝑉_α + ℋ \text{ which holds as a result of translation equivariance.}
\]
where $\mathcal{B}_s \in B_S$, $\mathcal{B}_z \in B_Z$, $\mathcal{C}_z \in B_C$, and we use the notation $\pi_i := (x_i, z_i)$, $\nu_{\pi_i}(\xi) := \delta_0(\xi) \delta_0(x_i)$, and $\mathcal{Q}(\xi, \omega) := \delta_0\mathbb{I}(\xi) \delta_0(\omega) \mathcal{D}(\xi, \omega)$ for each $i$. The formula for $P^x_{\pi_i}$ reduces to the standard marginal for MDPs, e.g., see [24, Eq. 4, p. 191], if the extra state is removed, that is, if $\pi_i, S \times Z$, and $\mathcal{Q}$ are replaced by $x_i, S$, and $Q$, respectively. If $G : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is Borel measurable and non-negative, then the expectation of $G$ w.r.t. $P^x_{\pi_i}$ is defined by

$$E^x_{\pi_i}(G) := \int_{\Omega} G \ dP^x_{\pi_i}.$$  

Since $Y : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is bounded everywhere and Borel measurable, it holds that $Y \in L^\infty(\Omega, B_{\mathbb{R}}, P_{\pi_i})$ for all $(x, z) \in S \times Z$ and $\pi \in \Pi$. By selecting $z = 0$, $Y \in L^\infty(\Omega, B_{\mathbb{R}}, P_{\pi_i})$. The CVar of $Y$ at level $0 \in [0, 1]$ is defined by

$$\text{CVaR}^\pi_{a, x}(Y) := \inf_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{ s + \frac{1}{a} E^x_{\pi_i}(\max\{Y - s, 0\}) \}.$$  

We use [3] to express $V^*_a$ as a bi-level optimization problem by exchanging the order of infima over $\Pi$ and $\mathbb{R}$. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in S$, we define

$$V^*_a(x) := \inf_{s \in \mathbb{R}} E^x_{\pi_i}(\max\{Y - s, 0\}).$$  

Then, for any $a \in (0, 1]$ and $x \in S$, it holds that

$$V^*_a(x) = \inf_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{ s + \frac{1}{a} V^*_a(x) \} = \min_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \{ s + \frac{1}{a} V^*_a(x) \}.$$  

A minimizer $s^*_a, x \in Z$ exists due to $Y(\omega)$ being an element of $Z$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, the continuity of $s \mapsto s + \frac{1}{a} V^*_a(x)$, and the compactness of $Z$ [10, Lemma 1]. A procedure to compute $\{s^*_a, \alpha \in \Lambda, r \in R\}$ with $\Lambda \subseteq (0, 1]$ and $R \subseteq Z$ follows.

1) Implement a value iteration algorithm on $S \times Z$ to compute $V^*_a$ for each $s \in S$ exactly in principle (see Alg. I) and theoretical results to be presented in Sec. IV).

2) Use the family of functions $\{V^*_a : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ to compute $\{V^*_a : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ via [5].

3) Use $\{V^*_a : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ to calculate $\{\mathcal{S}^*_a : \alpha \in \Lambda, r \in R\}$.

Overall, our theoretical results guarantee the computation of risk-averse safe sets and optimal precommitment policies exactly in principle under a measurable selection condition (Assumption I). We define a sequence of value functions $\{v^*_t : t \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ parametrized by $s \in \mathbb{R}$ (Alg. I). We show that each $v^*_t$ has desired properties and the limit $v^*(x, z) := \lim_{t \to \infty} v^*_t(x, z)$ exists for all $(x, z) \in S \times Z$ (Thm. I). Then, in Thm. II and Corollary I we show that $v^* = J_s$, where $J_s(x, 0) = V^*_a(x)$ for all $x \in S$. In addition, we guarantee the existence of a policy parametrized by $s$, from which we obtain an optimal precommitment policy parametrized by $\alpha$ (Remark I).

### IV. Theoretical Results

We assume the following measurable selection condition.

**Assumption I (Measurable selection):**

1) The control space $C$ is compact.

2) The dynamics function $f$ and the stage cost $c$ are continuous with $c(x, u) \in Z := [0, \bar{c}] \ \forall (x, u) \in S \times C$.

3) The disturbance kernel $p(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a continuous stochastic kernel on $D$ given $S \times C$.

Measurable selection conditions are used to guarantee the existence of an optimal policy. To optimize an expected cumulative cost subject to an MDP, it is typical to assume that $C$ is compact, $f$ and $p$ are continuous, and $c$ is l.s.c and bounded below [24, Def. 8.7]. In the setting of risk-aware MDPs, it is standard to impose additional conditions on $c$. For instance, Refs. [20] and [22] both assume bounded positive costs.

The cost-update operation in Alg. I (to follow) is a composition rather than a summation. Assuming that $c$ is continuous is a natural choice that helps preserve lower semi-continuity under the cost-update operation.

**Algorithm I (Value iteration):** Let Assumption I hold, and let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ be given. Define $v^*_0(x, z) := \max\{z - s, 0\}$, and for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define $v^*_{t+1}(x, z) := \inf\{\int_D v^*_t(f(x, u, w), \max\{z, c(x, u)\}) \ d\nu(x, u) : u \in C\}$ for all $(x, z) \in S \times Z$.

For convenience, we use the following definition.

**Definition I (Operator $F$):** Define $F := \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z} \times C$. If $v \in M_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}}$, then we define $F(v)(x, u, z) := \int_D f(x, u, w, \max\{z, c(x, w)\}) \ d\nu(x, u, w)$. Then, there exists a measurable function $\kappa^*$ on $S \times \mathbb{Z} \to C$ s.t.

$$\kappa^*(x, z) = \Phi(v^*_t(x, z, u)) \ \forall (x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}.$$  

Our first result guarantees regularity properties of the value functions defined recursively by Algorithm I.

**Theorem I (Analysis of Alg. I):** Let Assumption I hold, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{v^*_t : t \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ be given by Alg. I and $c^* := \max\{\bar{c} - s, 0\}$. Then, the following statements hold: a) for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $v^*_t$ is l.s.c and $0 \leq v^*_t \leq c^*$, b) for each $(x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}$, the limit of $\{v^*_t(x, z)\}_{t \to \infty}$ exists, which we denote by $v^*(x, z) := \lim_{t \to \infty} v^*_t(x, z)$, and $0 \leq v^*_t \leq v^*_{t+1} \leq v^* \leq c^* \ \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, c) $v^*$ is l.s.c and $v^*(x, z) = \inf_{u \in C} \Phi(v^*_t(x, z, u)) \ \forall (x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}$, and d) there is a Borel-measurable function $\kappa^*$ on $S \times \mathbb{Z} \to C$.

**Proof:** Part a follows by induction using the arguments from [10, Lemma 4] and the fact that the infimum of a l.s.c function over a compact metrizable space is lsc [24, Prop. 7.32 (a)]. Moreover, for each $(x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a minimizer that attains $\inf_{u \in C} \Phi(v^*_t(x, z, u))$, and hence, $v^*_{t+1}(x, z) = \min_{u \in C} \Phi(v^*_t(x, z, u))$ [24, Prop. 7.32 (a)]. For part b), $v^*_t \leq v^*_{t+1}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ follows by induction, which we omit in the interest of space. In particular, note that $v^*_t(x, z) = \inf_{u \in C} \max\{c(x, u, z) - s, 0\}$. The monotonicity and boundedness of the sequence of functions guarantees the existence of the limit. For part c) $v^*$ is l.s.c because it is a supremum of a family of lsc functions. Now, $\Phi(v^*)$ and $\Phi(v^*)$ are lsc for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $C$ is compact, it follows that $\Phi(v^*)$ and $\Phi(v^*)$ are inf-compact. A key step is that $\Phi(v^*) : S \times \mathbb{Z} \times C \to R$ being lsc implies that $\{u \in C : \Phi(v^*)(x, z, u) \leq r\}$ is closed for each $(x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, the limit as $t \to \infty$ and the minimum over $C$ commute [25, Lemma 4.2.4]. Now, $v^*(x, z) = \min_{u \in C} \lim_{t \to \infty} \int_{D} f(x, u, w, \max\{z, c(x, w)\}) \ d\nu(x, u, w)$.

4 A function $\varphi : S \times \mathbb{Z} \times C \to R$ is inf-compact if for each $(x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{u \in C : \varphi(x, z, u) \leq r\}$ is compact.
and for any \((x, z, u) \in F, v_i^*(f(x, u, \cdot), \max(z, c(x, u))) \uparrow v^*(f(x, u, \cdot), \max(z, c(x, u)))\). Then, the desired result follows from the Monotone Convergence Theorem. Part d) holds by using \(v^*(x, z) = \inf \Phi(v^n(x, z, u))\) for all \((x, z) \in S \times Z\), lower semi-continuity of \(\Phi(v^n)\), and compactness of \(C\) with [24, Prop. 7.33].

To continue our study of \(v^*\), we present additional information. Let \((x, z) \in S \times Z, \pi \in \Pi'\), and for any Thm. 4.1.11 and [24, Prop. 7.29], and it holds that \(c(\pi, (x, z)) \in \Omega_{(x, z)}\) as a consequence of \(c\) being bounded and \(X_1, Z_1, U_1, c\) being Borel measurable. For convenience, we define

\[
J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) := E_{x,z}(\max(Z - s, 0))
\]

(6)

\[
J^\pi_s(x, z) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} J^\pi_{s}(x, z).
\]

(7)

\[
J^\pi_s(x, 0) = E_{x,0}(\max(Z - s, 0)) = \max_z(\max(y - s, 0)),
\]

(9)

which is useful for a later result (Corollary \textsuperscript{1}). The next theorem specifies the relationship between \(v^*\) and \(J^\pi_s\).

**Theorem 2 (DP operator):** Given \(\mu\), a Borel-measurable stochastic kernel on \(C\) given \(S \times Z\), the operator \(\Pi_\mu : M^0_{\mathbb{R} \times Z} \rightarrow M^0_{\mathbb{R} \times Z}\) is defined by \(\Pi_\mu(v)(x, z) := \int_C \int_Z v(t, q) \delta_{\max(z, c(x, u))}(du)_Q(d|x, z)\mu(du, x, z)\).

Note that the variable \((x, z) \in T(v)(x, z)\) corresponds to the outer-most measure \(\mu(\cdot, x, z)\).

**Lemma 1 (DP recursion):** Let \(\pi = (\mu_0, \mu_1, \ldots) \in \Pi'\), \(s \in \mathbb{R}\), and \(t \in N_0\). It holds that \(J^\pi_{s,t} = 0\). If \(t \geq 1\), then \(J^\pi_{s,t}(x, z) = \mu_0(T_{\mu_0}(\cdots(T_{\mu_{t-1}}(v^*(\cdot, \cdot)))(\cdots)(x, z))\cdots)\) for all \((x, z) \in S \times Z\). If \(\pi = (\mu, \mu, \ldots) \in \Pi\), then \(J^\pi_{s,t+1}(x, z) = T_\mu(J^\pi_{s,t})(x, z)\) for all \((x, z) \in S \times Z\) and \(t \in N_0\).

We provide a proof for Lemmas \textsuperscript{1} in the Appendix.

**Definition 3 (\(\pi^\ast\))** Recall the existence of a Borel-measurable selector \(\kappa^\ast : S \times Z \rightarrow C\) by Thm. \textsuperscript{1}. Define \(\pi^\ast := (\kappa^\ast, \kappa^\ast, \ldots) \in \Pi\) which is a deterministic stationary policy. That is, if \((x_1, z_1) \in S \times Z\) is the realization of \((X_1, Z_1)\), then the distribution of \(U_1\) is the Dirac measure \(\delta_{\kappa^\ast(x_1, z_1)}\), and the realization of \(U_1\) is \(u_1 = \kappa^\ast(x_1, z_1)\).

**Lemma 2 (\(J^\pi_{s,t} \leq v^*\))** Let Assumption \textsuperscript{1} hold and \(s \in \mathbb{R}\). Then, \(J^\pi_{s,t} \leq v^*\) for all \(t \in N_0\).

**Proof:** Proceed by induction. The base case is \(J^\pi_{0,0} = 0 \leq v^*\) by Lemma \textsuperscript{1} and Thm. \textsuperscript{1}. Now, assume (the induction hypothesis) that for some \(t \in N_0\), it holds that \(J^\pi_{s,t} \leq v^*\). Let \((x, z) \in S \times Z\) be given. By Thm. \textsuperscript{1} \(v^*(x, z, \mu) = \Phi(v^*(x, z, \kappa^\ast(x, z))) = T_{\mu_0}(v^*(x, z))\). Since \(0 \leq J^\pi_{s,t} \leq v^*\) and \(J^\pi_{s,t}\) are Borel-measurable functions on \(S \times Z\), it follows that \(v^*(x, z) \geq T_{\mu_0}(J^\pi_{s,t})(x, z) = J^\pi_{s,t+1}(x, z)\), where the equality holds by Lemma \textsuperscript{1} as \(\pi^\ast\) is stationary.

**Lemma 3 (\(v^s \leq J^\pi_{s,t}\))** Let Assumption \textsuperscript{1} hold and \(s \in \mathbb{R}\). Then, \(v^s \leq J^\pi_{s,t}\) for all \(t \in N_0\) and \(s \in \mathbb{R}\).

**Proof:** Proceed by induction. The base case is \(v^0 = J^\pi_{0,0}\) for all \(\pi \in \Pi\) by Lemma \textsuperscript{1}. Now, assume (the ind. hyp.) that for some \(t \in N_0\), it holds that \(v^0 \leq J^\pi_{s,t}\) for all \(\pi \in \Pi\). Let \((x, z) \in S \times Z\) be given. By Thm. \textsuperscript{1}, and \(J^\pi_{s,t} \leq v^s\) and \(v^s\) are Borel-measurable functions on \(S \times Z\), it follows that \(v^s(x, z) \geq T_{\mu_0}(J^\pi_{s,t})(x, z) = J^\pi_{s,t+1}(x, z)\), where the equality holds by Lemma \textsuperscript{1} as \(\pi^\ast\) is stationary.
Remark 1 (Policy synthesis): Let $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and $x \in S$ be given. Recall that there is a minimizer $s_{s,x}^* \in S$ such that the minimum CVaR is $V_s^*(x) := \inf_{s \in \mathbb{R}} (s + \frac{1}{\alpha} V_s(x)) = s_{s,x}^* + \frac{1}{\alpha} V_{s,s,x}(x)$. By Corollary 1 it holds that $V_s(x) = E_{x,0}(\max\{Y - s, 0\})$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\pi^s = (\delta_{s,x}, \delta_{x,x}, \ldots) \in \Omega$ satisfies Def. Select $s = s_{s,x}^*$ to obtain an optimal precommitment policy $\pi^{s,x} \in \Pi$. To deploy this policy, follow the procedure provided at the start of Sec. III with the initialization $(x_0, z_0) = (x, 0)$ and the control $u_0 = \kappa^{s,x}(x_t, z_t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

We consider an urban stormwater system, consisting of two tanks connected by an automated valve, which we have adopted from our prior work [10]. Water enters the system due to a random process of surface runoff, and water discharges through a storm sewer drain in tank 2 or through outlets that lead to a combined sewer. We penalize the latter discharge through a state-dependent stage cost $c(x, u) := \max\{x_1 - k_1, x_2 - k_2\}$. The $i$th coordinate $x_i$ of the state $x = [x_1, x_2]^T$ is the water level of tank $i$, $k_i$ is the maximum water level prior to release into a combined sewer outlet ($k_1 = 3$ ft, $k_2 = 4$ ft), and the control $u \in C := [0,1]$ is the valve setting. We have implemented Alg. I by discretizing the state space $S = [0,5] \times [0,6]$ ft$^2$ at a resolution of $\Delta x = \frac{\pi}{8}$ ft in each dimension to estimate $\{v_{x,0}, v_{x,1}, \ldots, v_{x,N}\}$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $V_{s,x}^*, x, \Omega$ denote an estimate for $V_s^*$ using $v_{x,n}$, and define $\gamma_0(N', N) := \sup\{V_{s,x}^*(x) - V_{x,x}^*(x) : x \in S\}$ for $N' < N$. We consider $N'$ to be sufficiently large when our estimate for $\gamma_0(N', N)$ is at most $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha_0} = 0.005$ for some $N' < N$. Estimates for risk-averse safe sets $S_{s,x}^*$ are $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\alpha = 0.0005$ are shown in Fig. I and sets prior to convergence are shown for comparison. In particular, when $N' = 280$ and $N = 300$, we find that $\gamma_0(N', N) = 0.0030$ and $\gamma_0.0005(N', N) = 0.0048$.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have devised a CVaR-based trajectory-wise safety analysis method for infinite-time stochastic systems with theoretical guarantees. In the future, we plan to investigate the feasibility of grid-free policy improvement methods, e.g., stochastic rollout, to improve the scalability to high-dimensional systems, such as city-wide water networks.

APPENDIX

Below, we provide a proof for Lemma 1.

Proof: Let $\pi = (\mu_0, \mu_1, \ldots) \in \Pi'$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $(x, z) \in S \times Z$. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the definition of $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z)$ is $\int_0^t \max\{Z_i - s, 0\} dP_{x,z}^\pi$. First, note that $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) = \int_0^t \max\{Z_i - s, 0\} dP_{x,z}^\pi = \max\{z - s, 0\} = v_0(x, z)$ since $Z_0(\omega) = z$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Now, let $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and recall that $\Omega_{t+1} := (S \times Z \times C)^{t+1}$. Define $\varphi_{t,s} : \Omega_{t+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi_{t,s}(x_0, z_0, u_0, \ldots, x_t, z_t, u_t) = \max\{z_t - s, 0\}$, and define $H_{t+1} : \Omega \to \Omega_{t+1}$ by $H_{t+1}(\omega) := (X_0(\omega), Z_0(\omega), U_0(\omega), \ldots, X_t(\omega), Z_t(\omega), U_t(\omega))$. Note that $\varphi_{t,s}$ and $H_{t+1}$ are Borel measurable, $\varphi_{t,s}$ is non-negative, and $\varphi_{t,s} \circ H_{t+1} = \max\{Z_t - s, 0\}$. Thus,

$$J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) = \int_0^t \varphi_{t,s} \circ H_{t+1} dP_{x,z}^\pi = \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} \varphi_{t,s} dP_{x,z}^\pi,$$

where the second equality in (12) holds by [26, Thm. 4.1.11], as the marginal $P_{x,z}^\pi$ is $H^{-1}_{t+1}$ an image measure of $P_{x,z}^\pi$. All together, $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z)$ is equivalent to $\int_{S \times Z \times C} \max\{z_t - s, 0\} dP_{x,z}^\pi$, and $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z)$ is constant in $(x_t, u_t)$ and from the definition of $Q$ and $\nu_{x,z}$, it follows that $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) = \int S \times Z \int C \int S \times Z \int C \max\{z_t - s, 0\}$

$$\mu_1(du_1)Q(dv_r|x_{t-1}, u_{t-1}) \cdots Q(dx_r|x_0, u_0)\nu_0(dx_0|x, z),$$

where there are $t+1$ copies of $S \times Z \times C$ in (13). Since $\max\{z_t - s, 0\} = v_0(x_t, z_t)$ is constant in $(x_t, u_t)$ and from the definition of $Q$ and $\nu_{x,z}$, it follows that $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) = \int C \int S \int Z \int T_{t+1} \mu_0(v_0^t(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1})) \cdots \delta_{\max\{z,c(x,u_0)\}}(dz)Q(dx|x, u_0)\mu_0(dx_0|x, z),$

where $t \in \mathbb{N}$ copies of $C \times S \times Z$ in (15). By writing more of the integrals explicitly and using Def. 2, we find that $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) = \int C \int S \int Z \int T_{t+1} \mu_0(v_0^t(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1})) \cdots \delta_{\max\{z,c(x,u_0)\}}(dz)Q(dx|x, u_0)\mu_0(dx_0|x, z)$

with $t \in \mathbb{N}$ copies of $C \times S \times Z$ in (16). By repeating this process until the integral has one copy of $C \times S \times Z$, we conclude that $J^\pi_{t,s}(x, z) = \int C \int S \int Z \int T_{t+1} \mu_0(\cdots(v_0^{t-1}) \cdots) (x_1, z_1) \delta_{\max\{z,c(x,u_0)\}}(dz)Q(dx|x, u_0)\mu_0(dx_0|x, z)$

where we use Def. 2 in the last line.

If $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\pi = (\mu, \mu, \ldots) \in \Pi$, the previous results give $J^\pi_{t+1,s}(x, z) = T_{\mu}(T_{\mu}(\cdots(T_{\mu}(v_0^s) \cdots))(x, z),$
where the operator $T_{\mu}$ is applied $t + 1$ times. Using \((\ref{eq:3})\) and Def. \(\ref{def:5}\) it follows that $J_{t+1,\alpha}(x, z) = T_{\mu}(J_{t,\alpha})(x, z)$.
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