

Markov decision processes with Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings ^{*}

Ziteng Cheng [†] and Sebastian Jaimungal [†]

Abstract.

Under suitable conditions, the Kusuoka representation of law invariant coherent risk measures allows one to cast them in terms of average value-at-risk. Here, we introduce the notion of Kusuoka-type conditional risk-mappings and use it to define a dynamic risk measure. We use such dynamic risk measures to study infinite horizon Markov decision processes with random costs and random actions. Under mild assumptions, we derive a dynamic programming principle and prove the existence of an optimal policy. We also derive the Q-learning version of the dynamic programming principle, which is important for applications. Furthermore, we provide a sufficient condition for when deterministic actions are optimal.

Key words.

AMS subject classifications.

1. Introduction. Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) may be viewed as a discrete-time stochastic control problems for sequential decision making in situations where costs are partly random and partly under the control of a decision maker. Classical MDP theory is concerned with minimizing the expected discounted total cost and, in many cases, the minimization problem is solved by establishing a Dynamic Programming Principle (DPP). Results on the vast area of MDPs may be founded in several textbooks, e.g., [6, 20, 5]. The classical expected performance criteria is, however, limited in its application and, in many cases, it is prudent to incorporate risk assessment into decision making.

One popular criterion is based on coherent risk measures [2, 16]. A naive combination of coherent risk measures and discounted total costs, however, lacks time consistency, hindering the derivation of a corresponding DPP. Roughly speaking, time consistency is about the property that smaller scores in the future epochs guarantee a smaller score at current epoch. We refer to [8] for a survey on various definitions of time consistency. There is a stem of literature (see, e.g., [18, 24, 25, 23, 13, 3]) that studies time consistency from multiple angles and/or attempts to integrate coherent risk measures and their variations into MDP. While in this work, we are not concerned with model uncertainty, we would like to point out [7] and the reference therein for a framework that handles model uncertainty in MDP.

In this paper, we focus on the framework proposed in [25] which considers deterministic costs. [25] introduces the notion of risk transition mappings and uses them to construct, in a recursive manner, a class of (discounted) dynamic risk measures. He proceeds to derive both finite and infinite (with bounded costs) time horizon DPPs for such dynamic risk measures. We also refer to [26] for the assumptions needed. [28] extends the infinite horizon DPP to unbounded costs as well as for average dynamic risk measures. The risk transition

*

Funding: SJ would like to acknowledge support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (grants RGPIN-2018-05705 and RGPAS-2018-522715).

[†]Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto (sebastian.jaimungal@utoronto.ca, ziteng.cheng@utoronto.ca).

mappings involved are assumed to exhibit an analogue of a strong Feller property. [14] studies a similar infinite horizon DPP with unbounded costs but under arguably more accessible assumptions. Recently, [4] considers unbounded latent costs and establishes the corresponding finite and infinite horizon DPP. The authors also prove sufficiency of Markovian actions against history dependent actions. They construct dynamic risk measures, for finite time horizon problems, from iterations of static risk measures that are Fatou and law invariant. The infinite horizon problems require in addition the coherent property. They also require the underlying MDP to exhibit a certain strongly continuous/semi-continuous transition mechanism. [15] develops a computational approach for optimization with dynamic convex risk measures using deep learning techniques. Finally, it is noteworthy that the concept of risk form is introduced in [17] and is applied to handle two-stage MDP with partial information and decision-dependent observation distribution.

The main goal of this paper is to study infinite horizon risk averse MDPs in a similar framework as above, but with latent costs and randomized actions, under a weakly continuous transition mechanism.

We note that, typically, MDP theory with Polish action spaces implicitly encompasses randomized actions. In order to compare deterministic and randomized actions, however, we must characterize the randomization explicitly. In certain risk averse settings, when randomness in action is accounted for along with the random outcome, deterministic actions do not necessarily yield the optimal outcome; we refer to Appendix A for an insightful example. To this end, we propose to study risk averse MDPs under the notion of Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings¹, which is inspired by the Kusuoka representation for law invariant coherent risk measures (cf. [21] and [27, Section 6.3.5]). Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings, in principle, covers a large class of conditional risk mappings of interest. To the best of our knowledge, the counterpart of Kusuoka representation for conditional risk mappings has not yet been established. As conditional average value at risk in general lacks joint measurability in the risk level and the random event, we introduce techniques to make the Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings rigorous, and this treatment may be of interest on its own.

For simplicity, we consider bounded costs, which allows for conditional risk mappings that contain conditional essential supremum as a major ingredient – a feature that is often omitted otherwise. The Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings and bounded costs together allows us access to a stronger set of regularities for the related operators, and allows us to establish the DPP with mild assumptions on the remainder of the components in our setup. To be more precise, we obtain the semi-continuity of value function jointly in state and action, avoiding the need to impose strong continuity on the transition kernel or the resulting risk transition mapping. We believe the conditional law invariant property of Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings is essential for obtaining regularity, while the assumption on bounded costs may possibly be weakened. In static case, semi-continuity of a coherent risk measure typically requires more than weak continuity of the input; we refer to [27, Section 6.3] for detailed statements. This is possibly due to the lack of law invariance. Imposing the law invariant property, as we do here, resolves such issues. In the dynamic case, we choose

¹The term, conditional risk mapping, follows from [27, Section 6.5.2].

to avoid the assumptions of strong continuity by implicitly leveraging a similar argument through Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. We introduce and investigate the notion of Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings. We first study conditional average value at risk and develop an appropriate formulation for integrating over the quantile level. A Kusuoka-type conditional risk mapping is defined as the essential supremum of a family of integrations with random integrand and integrator. We then establish a representation in terms of regular conditional expectations. We then show that the Kusuoka-type conditional risk mapping is conditionally law invariant and state dependent. The results are presented in Section 2.3.
2. Under mild conditions, we derive an infinite horizon DPP, for MDP with latent costs and randomized actions, subject to dynamic risk measure defined recursively via Kusuoka-type conditional risk mapping. We prove the existence of an optimal policy that is Markovian. We also derive a corresponding Q-learning version of the DPP which lends itself naturally to numerical implementation. We refer to Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.5 for detailed statements.
3. In Proposition 4.7, we argue that certain Markovian actions are no worse than any other history-dependent actions. We also formulate in Proposition 4.9 a sufficient condition on the optimality of deterministic actions. Further, we provide a related heuristic discussion from the perspective of a two-player game in Remark 4.10.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we first introduce our notation, then recall definitions and basic properties of various important concepts, and establish preliminary results on Kusuoka-type condition risk mappings. Formulations and assumptions for risk-averse MDP are collectively organized in the end of the section. Section 3 is devoted to auxiliary results. We introduce some useful operators related to Markovian policy and investigate their regularities. Properties of value functions are studied. In Section 4, we present the main results. We derive the DPP for Markovian actions and argue that Markovian actions can achieve the optimal. We also establish a sufficient condition on the optimality of deterministic actions. We accommodate an example, a brief review on pointwise supremum and essential supremum, some technical lemmas and supplemental proofs for Section 2.3 in Appendix A, B, C and D, respectively. Finally, for reference, Appendix E contains a glossary of notation.

2. Setup and preliminaries. To formulate our problem, we first specify the spaces related to the underlying process, action process, probability, among others. We use the following notations for various spaces throughout the paper. We also provide in Appendix E a glossary of notations that will be introduced later.

- We write $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. We let \mathbb{R} denote the real line. We endow \mathbb{R} with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. We let $\bar{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}) := \sigma(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \cup \{+\infty\}, \{-\infty\})$.
- For any measurable space $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, we write $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ for the set of bounded real-valued \mathcal{Y} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable functions. We let $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$ denote the set of $\mathbf{v} = (v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$, and equip it with norm $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \mathbb{Y}} |v_t(y)|$, which makes

- $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$ complete. For any $y \in \mathbb{Y}$, the Dirac probability measure at y , denoted by δ_y , is defined as $\delta_y(A) := \mathbb{1}_A(y)$ for $A \in \mathcal{Y}$.
- Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space. We write $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ for the set of real-valued \mathcal{H} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ random variables that are \mathbb{P} -almost surely bounded.
 - We let $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbb{G} := (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be filtrations of \mathcal{H} such that $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{G}_t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{F}_1 contains all \mathbb{P} -negligible set. We set $\mathcal{F}_0 := \mathcal{G}_0 := \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. We also define $\mathcal{U}_t := \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \vee \mathcal{F}_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\mathbb{U} := (\mathcal{U}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also a filtration. We also set $\mathcal{U}_0 := \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$.
 - Let \mathbb{X} be a complete separable metric space equipped with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. Let Ξ be the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. We endow Ξ with weak topology, which is the coarsest topology on Ξ containing sets $\{\xi \in \Xi : \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(a)\xi(dx) \in U\}$ with $f \in C_b(\mathbb{X})$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ open. The corresponding Borel σ -algebra is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$. The evaluation σ -algebra on Ξ , denoted by $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$, is generated by sets $\{\xi \in \Xi : \xi(A) \in B\}$ with $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$ is the σ -algebra generated by sets $\{\xi \in \Xi : \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\xi(dx) \in B\}$ for all $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. In view of Lemma C.7, we have $\mathcal{B}(\Xi) = \mathcal{E}(\Xi)$.
 - Let \mathbb{A} be another complete separable metric space equipped with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$. Let Λ be the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$. We endow Λ with the weak topology and the corresponding Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda)$. The evaluation σ -algebra on Λ is denoted by $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$. By Lemma C.7 again, we have $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$.
 - For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the domain of admissible actions $\mathcal{A}_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{A}}$ is nonempty closed valued and weakly measurable, i.e., $\{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{A}_t(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ for any open $U \subseteq \mathbb{A}$. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$, we let $\omega_t(x)$ be the set of probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $\pi(\mathcal{A}_t(x)) = 1$ for any $\pi \in \omega_t(x)$, and let Π_t consist of $\pi_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\Lambda, \mathcal{E}(\Lambda))$ such that $\pi_t(x) \in \omega_t(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$.² Π is the set of $\rho := (\pi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\pi_t \in \Pi_t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.
 - Let \mathbb{M} be the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$, endowed with the weak topology. Note \mathbb{M} under the weak topology is compact (cf. [1, Section 15.6, Theorem 15.22]). The corresponding Borel σ -algebra and evaluation σ -algebra are denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M})$, respectively. Since \mathbb{M} is separable and metrizable (cf. [1, Section 15.3, Theorem 15.15]), invoking Lemma C.7 again, we have $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M})$. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\mathcal{M}_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{M}}$ be non-empty, closed-valued, and weakly measurable, that is, $\{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{M}_t(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ for any open $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Finally, we let \mathcal{M}_0 denote a closed subset of \mathbb{M} .

2.1. Regular Conditional Distribution. In this section, we recall the definition of regular conditional distributions, as it plays a crucial role in many aspects of the paper.

Consider $Y : (\Omega, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. The conditional distribution of Y given \mathcal{G} , defined as $\{\mathbb{P}(Y \in B | \mathcal{G}) := \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_B(Y) | \mathcal{G})\}_{B \in \mathcal{Y}}$, can be viewed as a function of $\omega \in \Omega$ and $B \in \mathcal{Y}$. For each $B \in \mathcal{Y}$, however, $\mathbb{P}(Y \in B | \mathcal{G})$ is defined only almost surely, which hinders us from using $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{G})$ as a probability measure depending on $\omega \in \Omega$ (countable additivity may

² Π_t is not empty. To see this, note by Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem (cf. [1, Theorem 18.13]), there exists $\alpha : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{A}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A}))$ such that $\alpha(x) \in \mathcal{A}_t(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$. It follows that if $\pi(x) := \delta_{\alpha(x)}$, then $\pi \in \Pi_t$.

not hold). To resolve such issues, we recall the notion of a regular conditional distribution.

- Definition 2.1.** $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}} : \Omega \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{G})$ if
- (i) for each $A \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\omega \mapsto P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, A)$ is \mathcal{G} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable;
 - (ii) for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on \mathcal{Y} ;
 - (iii) for each $A \in \mathcal{Y}$, $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, A) = \mathbb{P}(Y \in A | \mathcal{G})(\omega)$ for \mathbb{P} -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

If \mathcal{G} is the σ -algebra generated by a random variable, say X , we will write $P^{Y|X}$ instead of $P^{Y|\sigma(X)}$.

Let the set of probability measures on \mathcal{Y} be denoted by \mathcal{P} and endowed with σ -algebra $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$. Because for $A \in \mathcal{Y}$, $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, \cdot) \in \{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \eta(A) \in B\}\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, A) \in B\} \in \mathcal{G},$$

by [1, Section 4.5, Corollary 4.24], $\omega \mapsto P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, \cdot)$ is a measure-valued \mathcal{G} - $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ random variable.

By [19, Chapter I Section 3, Theorem 3] (see also [12, Theorem 10.4.8 and Example 10.4.9]), if \mathbb{Y} is a complete separable metric space and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$ is the corresponding Borel σ -algebra, then $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{G})$ always has a regular version. Moreover, $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, \cdot)$ as a probability measure is unique upto a \mathbb{P} -negligible set of $\omega \in \Omega$ (cf. [12, Lemma 10.4.3]). In view of Lemma C.7, it is true in this case that $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}$ is also \mathcal{G} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P})$ measurable.

For a nonnegative \mathcal{Y} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable f , for each $\omega \in \Omega$, we consider the Lebesgue integral $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(\omega, dy)$. When no confusion arises, we will omit ω and write $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(B)$ and $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy)$ instead. Clearly, for any $A \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_A(y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy) = P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(A) = \mathbb{P}(Y \in A | \mathcal{G}), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (2.1)$$

2.2. Controlled process $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})$. We let $\mathfrak{X} := (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an \mathbb{X} -valued \mathbb{F} -adapted process, i.e., X_t is \mathcal{F}_t - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ measurable for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We also let $\mathfrak{A} := (A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a \mathbb{A} -valued \mathbb{G} -adapted process. \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{A} represent the underlying process and the action process, respectively. Heuristically, letting \mathfrak{A} be \mathbb{G} -adapted allows us to have randomized actions with the property $A_t \sim \pi_t(X_t)$, where $\pi_t : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \Lambda$. Below we recall the concepts of a transition kernel from (X_t, A_t) to X_{t+1} and Markovian action.

Suppose that for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} \in B | \mathcal{G}_t) = \mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} \in B | \sigma(X_t) \vee \sigma(A_t)), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}). \quad (2.2)$$

Let $P^{X_{t+1}|(X_t, A_t)}$ be the corresponding regular conditional distribution. By Definition 2.1 (i), for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, $\omega \mapsto P^{X_{t+1}|(X_t, A_t)}(\omega, B)$ is $\sigma(X_t) \vee \sigma(A_t)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. It follows from [1, Section 4.8, Theorem 4.11] that there is an $h_B^t : (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ such that $h_B^t(X_t(\omega), A_t(\omega)) = P^{X_{t+1}|(X_t, A_t)}(\omega, B)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Then by Definition 2.1 (ii), for $(x, a) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A}$ such that $(X_t(\omega), A_t(\omega)) = (x, a)$ for some $\omega \in \Omega$, we have $h^t(x, a)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. For (x, a) that does not belong to the pointwise range of (X_t, A_t) , we may set $h_B(x, a) = \delta_{x_0}(B)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ so that $h(x, a)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ and h_B is still measurable. By writing $P(t, x, a, B) = h_B^t(x, a)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} \in B | \sigma(X_t) \vee \sigma(A_t)) = P(t, X_t, A_t, B), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}). \quad (2.3)$$

Note that for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(x, a) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A} : P(t, x, a, \cdot) \in \{\xi \in \Xi : \xi(A) \in B\}\} \\ &= \{(x, a) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A} : P(t, x, a, A) \in B\} = \{(x, a) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A} : h_A^t(x, a) \in B\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A}), \end{aligned}$$

thus by [1, Section 4.5, Corollary 4.24], $(x, a) \mapsto P(t, x, a, \cdot)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ - $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$ measurable.

Finally, we say \mathfrak{A} is a Markovian action if

$$\mathbb{P}(A_t \in B | \mathcal{U}_t) = \mathbb{P}(A_t \in B | \sigma(X_t)), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A}), t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then, with similar reasoning as before, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\pi_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{A}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{A}))$ such that $\omega \mapsto \pi_t(X_t(\omega))$ is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(A_t \in \cdot | \sigma(X_t))$, and

$$\mathbb{P}(A_t \in B | \sigma(X_t)) = [\pi_t(X_t)](B), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A}). \quad (2.5)$$

2.3. Kusuoko-type dynamic risk measure. In this section we introduce Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings and the define dynamic risk measures as the nested composition of Kusuoka-type conditional risk mappings. The definitions and properties established in the section rely on the notions of pointwise supremum and essential supremum, and we refer to Appendix B for a brief review. To avoid confusion, we write $\text{essub } Y := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(Y > r) = 0\}$ and $\text{esslb } Y := \sup\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(Y < r) = 0\}$.

2.3.1. Kusuoka-type conditional risk mapping. We define the average value at risk conditioned on \mathcal{U}_t as follows

$$\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) := \begin{cases} \text{essinf}_{W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})} \left\{ W + \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left((Z - W)_+ \middle| \mathcal{U}_t \right) \right\}, & \kappa \in (0, 1], \\ \text{essinf}_{W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P}), \mathbb{P}(W > Z) = 1} W, & \kappa = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

Let us fix the underlying process \mathfrak{X} for the rest of this subsection. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we let $\Upsilon_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$ be a subset of random probability measures $M : (\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t) \rightarrow (\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M}))$ such that $M(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t(\omega))$ for \mathbb{P} -almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.³

To introduce the Kusuoka-type conditional risk mapping, we need to consider the following integration,

$$\text{esssup}_{M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathfrak{X}}} \int_{[0,1]} \text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) M(d\kappa).$$

For a fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, however, the measurability of $\kappa \mapsto \text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z)$ is elusive, thus the integral above may not be well-defined even if M is deterministic. On the other hand, in the unconditional case, it is known that $\text{AV@R}_\kappa(Z)$ is continuous in $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ (cf. Lemma C.1). Inspired by this observation, we consider the definition below.

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ contain all \mathbb{P} -negligible sets. Let $(Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ be essentially bounded from below, uniformly in $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, i.e., $\inf_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \text{esslb } Y_\kappa > -\infty$. Next, define $C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$ as the set of $(\tilde{Y}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}$ such that

³To see that \mathcal{M}_t is not empty, in view of Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem (cf. [1, Section 18.3, Theorem 18.13]), there is $m : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}))$ such that $m(x) \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$. By Lemma C.7, m is also $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M})$ measurable. Then, $M(\omega) := m(X_t(\omega)) \in \mathcal{M}_t$.

- (i) $\omega \mapsto \widetilde{Y}_\kappa(\omega)$ is \mathcal{A} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable for each $\kappa \in [0, 1]$;
- (ii) $\kappa \mapsto \widetilde{Y}_\kappa$ is continuous for each $\omega \in \Omega$;
- (iii) $\widetilde{Y}_\kappa \leq Y_\kappa$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $\kappa \in [0, 1]$.

For any $(\widetilde{Y}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$, we have that $(\omega, \kappa) \mapsto \widetilde{Y}_\kappa(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,1])$ -measurable (cf. [1, Section 4.10, Lemma 4.51]), and $C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$ contains at least the constant function with value $\inf_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \text{esslb } Y_\kappa$.

For $M : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \mapsto (\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M}))$, we define the operator $\diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}}$ via

$$(Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M)(\omega) := \text{ess sup}_{(\widetilde{Y}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})} \int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa(\omega) [M(\omega)](d\kappa),$$

where the integral on the right hand side is understood as integrating over κ for each fixed $\omega \in \Omega$. In the sequel, we omit ω when no confusion arises. The following lemma concerns the measurability of integrals and the $\diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\widetilde{Y}_\kappa \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$. Both $\int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa)$ and $Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M$ are \mathcal{A} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable.*

Proof. The measurability of $\int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa)$ is an immediate consequence of Lemma C.3. As for the measurability of $Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M$, we observe that by (B.1), there is a countable subset $\mathfrak{c} \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$ such that

$$Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M = \sup_{(\widetilde{Y}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \in \mathfrak{c}} \int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{(\widetilde{Y}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \in \mathfrak{c}_n} \int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.,$$

where \mathfrak{c}_n consists of the first n elements in \mathfrak{c} . Note the maximum on the right hand side above is \mathcal{A} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Then, by Lemma C.2, $Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M$ is \mathcal{A} -measurable. \blacksquare

The lemma below illustrates that the operator $\diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is essentially an integration of the continuous version of the integrand, if exists.

Lemma 2.3. *If $(\widetilde{Y}_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$ and $\widetilde{Y}_\kappa = Y_\kappa$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, then $\int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa) = Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $M : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M}))$.*

Proof. It follows from Definition B.1 (i) that $\int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa) \leq Y_\kappa \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}} M$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.. Next, notice that for any other $(\widetilde{Y}'_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; (Y_\kappa)_{\kappa \in [0,1]})$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Y}'_\kappa \leq \widetilde{Y}_\kappa, \kappa \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]) = 1$. Since $\widetilde{Y}_\kappa, \widetilde{Y}'_\kappa$ are pointwise continuous in $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Y}'_\kappa \leq \widetilde{Y}_\kappa, \kappa \in [0, 1]) = 1$, and thus $\int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}_\kappa M(d\kappa) \geq \int_{[0,1]} \widetilde{Y}'_\kappa M(d\kappa)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.. In view of Definition B.1 (ii), the proof is complete. \blacksquare

We are now in a position to define what we term a Kusuoka-type conditional risk mapping. We define $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}} : L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$ as

$$\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z) := \text{ess sup}_{M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathfrak{X}}} AV @_{\mathbb{R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}}(Z) \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}_t} M, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (2.7)$$

Notice that $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$ depends on X_t through $\Upsilon_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$ (see below (2.6)).

Remark 2.4. $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z)$ indeed belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$. It can be shown that for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, $\mathbb{P}(\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) \in [\text{esslb} Z, \text{essub} Z]) = 1$. The essential boundedness of $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z)$ follows automatically. As for the measurability, by (B.1), for $\kappa \in (1, 0]$ there is a countable $l \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$ such that

$$\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) = \inf_{W \in l} \left\{ W + \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left((Z - W)_+ \middle| \mathcal{U}_t \right) \right\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{W \in l_n} \left\{ W + \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left((Z - W)_+ \middle| \mathcal{U}_t \right) \right\},$$

where l_n consists of the first n elements on l . It follows from Lemma C.2 that $\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z)$ is \mathcal{U}_t - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable for $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. A similar argument holds for $\text{AV@R}_0^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z)$. Then, by Lemma 2.2, for $M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$, $\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M$ is also \mathcal{U}_t -measurable. Finally, with a similar argument as before, we obtain the \mathcal{U}_t - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurability for $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z)$.

The proposition below states that $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$ is a bona fide conditional risk mapping; see, e.g., [27, Section 6.5.2] for the definition. We defer the proof to Appendix D.

Proposition 2.5. *For any $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$ is a conditional risk mapping from $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ to $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$. More precisely, $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$ satisfies the following conditions:*

(a) [Monotonicity] for any $Z^1, Z^2 \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $Z^1 \leq Z^2$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z^1) \leq \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z^2), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.};$$

(b) [Translation equivariance] for any $Y \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$ and $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$,

$$\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Y + Z) = Y + \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.};$$

(c) [Positive homogeneity] for any $\beta \geq 0$ and $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$,

$$\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(\beta Z) = \beta \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.};$$

(d) [Convexity] for any $Z^1, Z^2 \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ and $\beta \in [0, 1]$,

$$\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(\beta Z^1 + (1 - \beta) Z^2) \leq \beta \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z^1) + (1 - \beta) \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z^2), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

Let $P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}$ be the regular version of $\mathbb{P}(Z \in \cdot | \mathcal{U}_t)$. The proposition below provides a useful representation for $\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$, the proof of which is provided in Appendix D.

Proposition 2.6. *The following is true for any $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$:*

(a) for any $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, $\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$, and

$$\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}; \quad (2.8)$$

(b) for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\kappa \mapsto \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}$ is continuous on $(0, 1]$, and

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0^+} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\} = \inf \{ r \in \mathbb{R} : P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((r, \infty)) = 0 \};$$

(c) $\inf \{ r \in \mathbb{R} : P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((r, \infty)) = 0 \} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$, and

$$\text{AV@R}_0^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) = \inf \{ r \in \mathbb{R} : P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((r, \infty)) = 0 \}, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.};$$

(d) the right hand side below belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z) = \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(\mathfrak{X}_t)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z-q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\} \eta(d\kappa) \right. \\ \left. + \eta(0) \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((r, \infty)) = 0\} \right\}, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \quad (2.9) \end{aligned}$$

2.3.2. Dynamic risk measure. Next, we introduce a (discounted) dynamic risk measure similar to [25, Section 6], but for Kusuoka-type conditional risk.

Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. For any $\mathfrak{Z} := (Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \text{ess sup} |Z_n| < \infty$, we define

$$\rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \begin{cases} \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_t + \gamma \rho_{t+1,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})), & t < T, \\ \rho_T^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_T), & t = T. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Equivalently,

$$\rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_t + \gamma \rho_{t+1}^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_{t+1} + \gamma \rho_{t+2}^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_{t+2} + \dots + \gamma \rho_{T-1}^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_{T-1} + \gamma \rho_T^{\mathfrak{X}}(Z_T)))).$$

The lemma below allows us to define the infinite horizon version of this risk measure, $\rho_{t,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})$, as a \mathbb{P} -almost sure limit. We refer to Appendix D for the proof.

Lemma 2.7. For any \mathfrak{Z} such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \text{ess sup} |Z_n| < \infty$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})$ converges \mathbb{P} -almost surely as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Additionally, in view of C.2 and Remark 2.4, we have $\rho_{t,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$.

2.4. Problem formulation. Here, we provide some standing assumptions and remarks on the key problem that we address: how to optimise the Kusuoka type dynamic risk measure over actions?

We let Ψ be a subset of $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})$ satisfying (2.2) and $\mathbb{P}(A_t \in \mathcal{A}_t(X_t), t \in \mathbb{N}) = 1$ (note that by [1, Section 18.1, Theorem 18.6], $\{(x, a) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{A} : a \in \mathcal{A}_t(x)\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A})$). Throughout the rest of the paper, we make the following standing assumption.⁴

Assumption 2.8. The family $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P}), \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{G}, \Psi\}$ satisfies the conditions below:

- (i) there exist μ and P such that for any $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi$, $X_1 \sim \mu$ and (2.3) holds true for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, where μ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X})$ and P satisfies
 - $P(t, x, a, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X})$ for any $(t, x, a) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{A}$;
 - $(x, a) \mapsto P(t, x, a, B)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A})$ -measurable for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X})$;
- (ii) for any $\rho \in \Pi$, there is $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi$ such that (2.5) holds true for $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

⁴For a nontrivial example, one can set $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{A} = \mathbb{R}$ and construct $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})$ from any given P and ρ on a complete probability space that supports a countable family of mutually independent $U([0, 1])$ random variables. The construction can be done by utilizing that $F^{-1}(U)$ has distribution function F , where $U \sim U[0, 1]$, F is arbitrary and $F^{-1}(y) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq y\}$. For examples of \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{A} that are complete separable metric spaces, we refer to [10].

When \mathfrak{A} is associated with some $\rho \in \Pi$ via (2.5), we will write $(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho) = \{(X_t^\rho, A_t^\rho)\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ to emphasize the dependence on ρ .

At each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we are given a cost function $C_t : (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ and we stipulate $C_0 \equiv 0$. Let us define $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) := (C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. Below is our main goal.

$$\text{Find } \inf_{(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi} \rho_{0, \infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})), \text{ and the optimal policy if exists.} \quad (\text{P})$$

Apart from Assumption 2.8, we need some additional technical assumptions to hold for the derivation of the DPP to be rigorous.

Assumption 2.9. The following is true for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$:

- (i) $(x, a) \mapsto P(t, x, a, \cdot)$ is weakly continuous, that is, for any $(x^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $(a^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = x^0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a^n = a^0$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y) P(t, x^n, a^n, dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y) P(t, x, a, dy), \quad f \in C_b(\mathbb{X}).$$

- (ii) $\bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \mathcal{A}_t(x)$ is compact for $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and \mathcal{A}_t is upper hemi-continuous, that is, at any $x \in \mathbb{X}$ for every open $U_{\mathbb{A}} \supseteq \mathcal{A}_t(x)$ there is a open $U_{\mathbb{X}} \ni x$ such that $z \in U_{\mathbb{X}}$ implies $\mathcal{A}_t(z) \subseteq U_{\mathbb{A}}$;
- (iii) \mathcal{M}_t is lower hemi-continuous, that is, at any $x \in \mathbb{X}$ for every open $U_{\mathbb{M}} \subset \mathbb{M}$ such that $U_{\mathbb{M}} \cap \mathcal{M}_t(x) \neq \emptyset$ there is an open $U_{\mathbb{X}} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ such that $z \in U_{\mathbb{X}}$ implies $U_{\mathbb{M}} \cap \mathcal{M}_t(z) \neq \emptyset$;
- (iv) the cost function C_t is lower semi-continuous and $\|C_t\|_{\infty} \leq b$ for some $b > 0$.

Note Assumption 2.9 (ii) implies that $\bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \omega_t(x)$ is compact (cf. [1, Section 15.6, Theorem 15.22]) and ω_t is upper hemi-continuous (cf. [1, Section 17.2, Theorem 17.13]).

Remark 2.10. By Assumption 2.9 (i), $(x, a) \mapsto P(t, x, a, \cdot)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{E})$ measurable. This together with Lemma C.7 implies that any P satisfying Assumption 2.9 (i) also satisfies the conditions on P mentioned in Assumption 2.8 (i). Next, in our setting where the input space \mathbb{X} is endowed with $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, upper/lower hemi-continuous implies weakly measurable (cf. [1, Section 17.2, Lemma 17.4, Lemma 17.5 and Section 18.1, Lemma 18.2]). Therefore, Assumption 2.9 (ii) and (iii) does not contradict any previous conditions on \mathcal{M}_t and \mathcal{A}_t .

Remark 2.11. As an alternative formulation, we may study instead the problem from the first time-step, i.e., $\inf_{(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi} \rho_{1, \infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}))$. Under suitable conditions this, however, will lead to the same set of Markovian actions. We refer to Theorem 4.4 for the detailed statement.

3. Auxiliaries. Momentarily, let us restrict our attention to Markovian actions associated with ρ and investigate $\rho_{t, \infty}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho))$. The Markovian nature of the controlled process together with Proposition 2.6 provides a way to express $\rho_{t, T}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho))$ as composition of certain operators, which in turn provides a way to analyze $\rho_{t, \infty}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho))$. The various operators involved in this program are introduced below.

For $t = 0$ we define a functional H_0 on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ as follows, for any $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$

$$H_0 v := \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_0} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (\gamma v(y) - q)_+ \mu(dy) \right\} \eta(d\kappa) \right. \\ \left. + \eta(0) \cdot \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(\gamma v(y)) \mu(dy) = 0 \right\} \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

For $t \in \mathbb{N}$ we define operators G_t^λ and H_t^p on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ as

$$G_t^\lambda v(x) := \\ \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\} \eta(d\kappa) \right. \\ \left. + \eta(0) \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\} \right\} \quad (3.2)$$

and $H_t^p v(x) := G_t^{\pi_t(x)} v(x)$, respectively.

3.1. Regularities. We first establish the measurability of $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda v(x)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, the mapping $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda v(x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable.*

Proof. By Lemma C.3, $(x, q, a) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Let $g : (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{A}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ be non-negative. By Lemma C.3 again (with $f(x, \lambda, q, a) = g(x, q, a)$ and $M(x, \lambda, q) = \lambda$), $(x, \lambda, q) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{A}} g(x, q, a) \lambda(da)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Consequently,

$$(x, \lambda, q) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da)$$

is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Let \mathbb{Q}_n consist of the first n -th rational numbers. Because

$$(x, \lambda) \mapsto \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\} \\ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_n} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\}, \quad \kappa \in (0, 1], \quad (3.3)$$

we obtain $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurability (cf. [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29]). A similar reasoning as before implies the $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurability of

$$(x, \lambda) \mapsto \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\}. \quad (3.4)$$

In view of Lemma C.1, the function below is continuous in $[0, 1]$ for each (x, λ) :

$$\kappa \mapsto \begin{cases} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\}, & \kappa \in (0, 1], \\ \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\}, & \kappa = 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows from [1, Section 4.10, Lemma 4.51] that the right hand sides above as a function of (x, λ, κ) is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda) \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} ((x, \lambda), \eta) \mapsto & \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\} \eta(d\kappa) \right. \\ & \left. + \eta(0) \cdot \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is a continuous function of $\eta \in \mathbb{M}$ for $(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda$, and is a $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable function of $(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda$ for $\eta \in \mathbb{M}$ (cf. [11, Corollary 3.4.6]), thus Carathéodory (cf. [1, Section 4.10, Definition 4.50]).

Invoking the measurable maximal theorem (cf. [1, Section 18.3, Theorem 18.19]) completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 below reveals some basic properties of G_t^λ .

Lemma 3.2. *The following is true for any $(t, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \Lambda$:*

1. *If $v^1, v^2 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ satisfies $v^1 \leq v^2$, then $G_t^\lambda v^1(x) \leq G_t^\lambda v^2(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Moreover, under Assumption 2.9 (iv), $G_t^\lambda v \in [-b - \gamma \|v\|_\infty, b + \gamma \|v\|_\infty]$.*
2. *For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, we have $G_t^\lambda(a + v) = a + G_t^\lambda v$.*

Properties for H_0 also holds analogously.

Proof. These are immediate consequences of the definition of G_t^λ . \blacksquare

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose Assumption 2.9 (iv) holds. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $v^1, v^2 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, we have*

$$\|G_t^\lambda v^1 - G_t^\lambda v^2\|_\infty \leq \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty$$

and

$$|H_0 v^1 - H_0 v^2| \leq \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty.$$

Proof. Fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$ for the remainder of the proof. Then, for $i = 1, 2$ define

$$\begin{aligned} I_\kappa^i &:= \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^i(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\}, & \kappa \in (0, 1], \\ I_0^i &= \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^i(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $|I_\kappa^1 - I_\kappa^2| \leq \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty$

because

$$\begin{aligned} I_\kappa^1 &\leq \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^2(y) + \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \right\} \\ &= I_\kappa^2 + \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

and vice versa. As for $|I_0^1 - I_0^2|$, without loss of generality, suppose $I_0^1 - I_0^2 > \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty$, then there are r^1, r^2 such that $r^1 < I_0^1$, $r^2 > I_0^2$, $r^1 - r^2 > \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r^1, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^1(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) &> 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r^2, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^2(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This, however, leads to the contradiction below:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r^1, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^1(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r^2, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^1(y) - (r^1 - r^2)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r^2, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v^2(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we must have $|I_0^1 - I_0^2| \leq \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty$ as well. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |G_t^\lambda v^1(x) - G_t^\lambda v^2(x)| &= \left| \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} I_\kappa^1 \eta(d\kappa) + \eta(0) \cdot I_0^1 \right\} - \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} I_\kappa^2 \eta(d\kappa) + \eta(0) \cdot I_0^2 \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{M}} \left| \int_{(0,1]} (I_\kappa^1 - I_\kappa^2) \eta(d\kappa) + \eta(0)(I_0^1 - I_0^2) \right| \leq \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the contraction property of G_t^λ . A similar argument proves the contraction property of H_0 . ■

Below is a result regarding the lower semi-continuity of $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda v(x)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose Assumption 2.9 (i) (iii) and (iv). Let $(x^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{X}$ and $(\lambda^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Lambda$ converge to $x^0 \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda$, respectively. If $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ is lower semi-continuous, then*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_t^{\lambda^n} v(x^n) \geq G_t^{\lambda^0} v(x^0).$$

Proof. First, define

$$h(x, a, q) := \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, z) + \gamma v(z) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dz).$$

As $y \mapsto (y - q)_+$ is non-decreasing and $(x, a, z) \mapsto C_t(x, a, z) + \gamma v(z)$ is lower semi-continuous (due to Assumption 2.9 (iv)), we have $(x, a, z) \mapsto (C_t(x, a, z) + \gamma v(z) - q)_+$ is also lower semi-continuous. By the boundedness of C_t and v , we have that $(x, a, z) \mapsto (C_t(x, a, z) + \gamma v(z) - q)_+$ is also bounded. Let $(x^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $(a^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ converge to x^0 and a^0 , respectively. By Assumption 2.9 (i) and Lemma C.8, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x^n, a^n, q) \geq h(x^0, a^0, q),$$

This implies that $(x, a) \mapsto h(x, a, q)$ is lower semi-continuous for each $q \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, by Assumption 2.9 (i) and Lemma C.8 again, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{A}} h(x^n, a, q) \lambda^n(da) \geq \int_{\mathbb{A}} h(x^0, a, q) \lambda^0(da), \quad q \in \mathbb{R},$$

which implies that $(x, \lambda) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{A}} h(x, a, q) \lambda(da)$ is lower semi-continuous for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$. Next, for $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ define

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, \lambda, q, \kappa) &:= q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} h(x, a, q) \lambda(da) \\ &= q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da). \end{aligned}$$

As $q \mapsto f(x, \lambda, q, \kappa)$ is $(1 + \kappa^{-1})$ -Lipschitz continuous for any $(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, an application of the triangle inequality shows that $(x, \lambda, q) \mapsto f(x, \lambda, q, \kappa)$ is lower semi-continuous for each $\kappa \in (0, 1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x^n, \lambda^n, q^n, \kappa) &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x^n, \lambda^n, q^0, \kappa) + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f(x^n, \lambda^n, q^n, \kappa) - f(x^n, \lambda^n, q^0, \kappa)) \\ &\geq f(x^0, \lambda^0, q^0, \kappa), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^n = q^0$. Due to the boundedness of C and v , there is some constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} f(x, \lambda, q, \kappa) = \inf_{q \in [-K, K]} f(x, \lambda, q, \kappa), \quad (x, \lambda, \kappa) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda \times (0, 1].$$

By Lemma C.9, we obtain the lower semi-continuity of $(x, \lambda) \mapsto \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} f(x, \lambda, q, \kappa)$ for each $\kappa \in (0, 1]$.

Next, we consider $\kappa = 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$\mu^n(B) := \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(x^n, a, u) + \gamma v(u)) P(t, x^n, a, du) \lambda^n(da), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}),$$

and $s^n := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mu^n((r, \infty)) = 0\}$. Further, define $s^\diamond := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s^n$ and let $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that $s^\diamond = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s^{n_k}$. Since $(x, a, u) \mapsto C_t(x, a, u) + \gamma v(u)$ is lower semi-continuous, $(r, x, a, u) \mapsto$

$\mathbb{1}_{(r,\infty)}(C_t(x,a,u) + \gamma v(u))$ is also lower semi-continuous.⁵ Then, by Lemma C.8 (with (r,x,a) and u playing the roles of y and z), $(r,x,a) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r,\infty)}(C_t(x,a,u) + \gamma v(u)) P(t,x,a,du)$ is lower semi-continuous. By Lemma C.8 again (with (r,x) and a playing the roles of y and z), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(s^{n_k}, \infty)}(C_t(x^{n_k}, a, u) + \gamma v(u)) P(t, x^{n_k}, a, du) \lambda^{n_k}(da) \\ \geq \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(s^0, \infty)}(C_t(x^0, a, u) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x^0, a, dy) \lambda^0(da), \end{aligned}$$

which may be written succinctly as $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{n_k}((s^{n_k}, \infty)) \geq \mu^0((s^0, \infty))$. Note $\mu^n((s^n, \infty)) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.⁶ It follows that $\mu^0((s^\diamond, \infty)) = 0$ and thus $s^\diamond \geq s^0$. In other words,

$$(x, \lambda) \mapsto \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r,\infty)}(C_t(x,a,y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t,x,a,dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\}$$

is lower semi-continuous.

Finally, in view of Lemma C.1, the function below is continuous in $[0, 1]$ for each (x, λ) :

$$\kappa \mapsto \begin{cases} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x,a,y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t,x,a,dy) \lambda(da) \right\}, & \kappa \in (0, 1], \\ \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r,\infty)}(C_t(x,a,y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t,x,a,dy) \lambda(da) = 0 \right\}, & \kappa = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, it is jointly measurable in (x, λ, κ) (cf. [1, Section 4.10, Lemma 4.51]). The above together with Assumption 2.9 (iii) allows the application of Lemma C.10 and this completes the proof. \blacksquare

3.2. Connecting $\rho_{t,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p))$ and H_t^p . In this subsection, we reformulate the dynamic risk measure $\rho_{t,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p))$ in terms of composition of H_t^p 's. To this end, let $O(x) := 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Lemma 3.5. *Under Assumption 2.9 (iv), for any $0 < t \leq T < \infty$,*

$$\rho_{t,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = H_t^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p O(X_t^p), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.,$$

and

$$\rho_{0,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = H_0 \circ H_1^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p O.$$

⁵Let $(x^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, (a^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, (u^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, (r^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge to x^0, a^0, u^0, r^0 , respectively. Since indicator takes value from $\{0, 1\}$, it is sufficient to consider only the case of $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}_{(r^i, \infty)}(C_t(x^i, a^i, u^i) + v(y^i)) = 0$. To this end observe that there is a subsequence $(x^{i_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, (a^{i_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, (y^{i_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, (r^{i_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $C_t(x^{i_j}, a^{i_j}, u^{i_j}) + v(y^{i_j}) \leq r^{i_j}$. Taking $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty}$, due to the lower semi-continuity of $(x, a, u) \mapsto C_t(x, a, u) + \gamma v(u)$, we have $C_t(x^0, a^0, u^0) + v(u^0) \leq r^0$, i.e., $\mathbb{1}_{(r^0, \infty)}(C_t(x^0, a^0, u^0) + v(y^0)) = 0$.

⁶Since there is $(r^{n,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (s^n, \infty)$ such that $\bigcup_i (r^{n,i}, \infty) = (s^n, \infty)$ and $\mu^n((r^{n,i}, \infty)) = 0$. Thus, $\mu^n((s^n, \infty)) = \mu^n(\bigcup_i (r^{n,i}, \infty)) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu^n(\bigcup_{i=1}^j (r^{n,i}, \infty)) = 0$.

Proof. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, then by (2.2) and (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, X_{T+1}^\rho) \in B \mid \mathcal{U}_T\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}\left(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, X_{T+1}^\rho) \in B \mid \mathcal{G}_T\right) \mid \mathcal{U}_T\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{1}_B\left(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, X_{T+1}^\rho)\right) \mid \sigma(X_T^\rho) \vee \sigma(A_T^\rho)\right) \mid \mathcal{U}_T\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, y))P(t, X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, dy) \mid \mathcal{U}_T\right), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma C.5 in the last equality. It follows from (2.5), Lemma C.3 and Lemma C.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, X_{T+1}^\rho) \in B \mid \mathcal{U}_T\right) &= \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_T(X_T^\rho, a, y))P(t, X_T^\rho, a, dy)[\pi_t(X_T^\rho)](da), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \quad (3.5) \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to verify that $\int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_T(x, a, y))P(t, x, a, dy)[\pi_t(x)](da)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$. This together with (3.5) implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_T(X_T^\rho, a, y))P(t, X_T^\rho, a, dy)[\pi_t(X_T^\rho)](da)$$

is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, X_{T+1}^\rho) \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{U}_T)$. For each $\omega \in \Omega$, by simple function approximation from below (cf. [1, Section 4.7, Theorem 4.36]) and monotone convergence, the corresponding Lebesgue integration for nonnegative $f : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ equals to

$$\int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(C_T(X_T^\rho, a, y))P(t, X_T^\rho, a, dy)[\pi_t(X_T^\rho)](da).$$

It follows from Proposition 2.6 (d), (3.2), that

$$\rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho)) = \rho_T^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}\left(C_T(X_T^\rho, A_T^\rho, X_{T+1}^\rho)\right) = H_T^\rho O(X_T^\rho), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

In view of (2.10) and Lemma 2.5 (a), we have

$$\rho_{T-1,T}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho)) = \rho_{T-1}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}\left(C_{T-1}(X_{T-1}^\rho, A_{T-1}^\rho, X_T^\rho) + H_T^\rho O(X_T^\rho)\right), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

Inducing backward with similar reasoning as above, completes the proof. ■

3.3. Value functions. In this section, we study the value functions associated with a policy ρ .

In what follows, for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T \geq t$ we define the value functions

$$J_{t,T}^\rho := \begin{cases} O, & t > T, \\ H_t^\rho J_{t+1,T}^\rho, & t \leq T, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

and $J_{0,T}^p := H_0 J_{1,T}^p$. Recall from Lemma 3.1 that $x \mapsto H_t^p v(x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. In view of Lemma 3.5, we have the relationship between the dynamic risk measure and the value functions

$$\rho_{0,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = J_{0,T}^p, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{t,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = J_{t,T}^p(X_t^p), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad t, T \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t < T.$$

Lemma 3.6 below justifies the definition of $J_{t,\infty}^p$ as the infinite horizon version of $J_{t,T}^p$, and reveals the relationship between $J_{t,\infty}^p$ and $J_{t+1,\infty}^p$. Moreover, Lemma 3.6 together with Lemma 2.7 implies that

$$\rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = J_{0,\infty}^p \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{t,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = J_{t,\infty}^p(X_t^p), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.7)$$

Lemma 3.6. *Under Assumption 2.9 (iv), $(J_{t,T}^p)_{T \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly, and*

$$J_{t,\infty}^p := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J_{t,T}^p = \begin{cases} H_t^p J_{t+1,\infty}^p, & t \in \mathbb{N}, \\ H_0 J_{1,\infty}^p, & t = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover, $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_{t,\infty}^p\| \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}$.

Proof. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. First, by Assumption 2.9 (iv) and Lemma 3.2 (a), we have

$$H_{T+r}^p O(x) = G_{T+r}^{\pi_{T+r}(x)} O(x) \in [-b, b], \quad x \in \mathbb{X},$$

i.e., $\|H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \leq b$. Then, by Assumption 2.9 (iv) and Lemma 3.2 (a),

$$H_{T+r-1}^p \circ H_{T+r}^p O(x) = G_{T+r-1}^{\pi_{T+r-1}(x)} [H_{T+r}^p O](x) \in [-b - \gamma b, b + \gamma b],$$

i.e., $\|H_{T+r-1}^p \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \leq b + \gamma b$. By induction, we have $\|H_{T+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} b$. Then, by Lemma 3.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |H_T^p O(x) - H_T^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O(x)| &= \left| G_T^{\pi_T(x)} O(x) - G_T^{\pi_T(x)} [H_{T+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O](x) \right| \\ &\leq \gamma \|O - H_{T+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} b, \quad x \in \mathbb{X}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\|H_T^p O - H_T^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} b$. By induction backward we obtain

$$\|H_t^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p O - H_t^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} b.$$

The above proves that $(J_{t,T}^p)_{T \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly. The above also proves $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_{t,\infty}^p\| \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}$. Next, we prove (3.8).

For this, consider $t \in \mathbb{N}$. In view of (3.6), Lemma 3.3 and the uniform convergence proved above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|J_{t,\infty}^p - H_t^p J_{t+1,\infty}^p\|_\infty &\leq \|J_{t,\infty}^p - J_{t,T}^p\|_\infty + \|J_{t,T}^p - H_t^p J_{t+1,T}^p\|_\infty + \|H_t^p J_{t+1,T}^p - H_t^p J_{t+1,\infty}^p\|_\infty \\ &\leq (1 + \gamma) \|J_{t,\infty}^p - J_{t,T}^p\|_\infty \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the case of $t \in \mathbb{N}$ in (3.8). The case of $t = 0$ can be proved similarly. \blacksquare

We next establish that the operator \mathfrak{H}^p is a contraction mapping with fixed point given by the value function. To this end, define $\mathfrak{H}^p v := (H_t^p v_{t+1})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, then as a consequence of Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.6, we obtain the following proposition regarding the value of a policy ρ .

Proposition 3.7. *Under Assumption 2.9 (iv), for any $\rho \in \Pi$, \mathfrak{H}^p is a contraction mapping on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ and $(J_{t,\infty}^p)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the unique fixed point of \mathfrak{H}^p .*

4. Main results. Before presenting our main result concerning the DPP for Kusuoka type dynamic risk measures, we must introduce some new notation and some technical lemmas regarding the regularity of various components.

We define operator S_t acting on $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ as

$$S_t v(x) := \inf_{\lambda \in \hat{\omega}_t(x)} G_t^\lambda v(x), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Next, for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $T \geq t$, we define

$$J_{t,T}^* := \begin{cases} O, & t > T \\ S_t J_{t+1,T}^*, & t \leq T \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

In order for the definition above to be well defined, we must establish the measurability of $J_{t+1,T}^*$ (the boundedness is obvious from Lemma 3.2 (a)). The lemma below resolves this issue by establishing its lower semicontinuity.

Lemma 4.1. *Under Assumption 2.9, for any $t, T \in \mathbb{N}$, $t < T$, $x \mapsto J_{t,T}^*(x)$ is lower semicontinuous on \mathbb{X} .*

Proof. Note due to Assumption 2.9 (i) and Prokhorov theorem (cf. [1, Section 15.6, Theorem 15.22]), $\hat{\omega}_t(x)$ is compact. If $t = T$, then $J_{t,T}^* = S_t O$ by (4.1), and the lower semi-continuity in $x \in \mathbb{X}$ follows from Assumption 2.9 (ii), Lemma 3.4, and Lemma C.9. We induce backward for $t < T$. Since $J_{t,T}^* = S_t J_{t+1,T}^*$, invoking again Assumption 2.9 (ii), Lemma 3.4, and Lemma C.9, completes the proof. \blacksquare

For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the infinite horizon version of the value function as $J_{t,\infty}^*(x) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J_{t,T}^*(x)$, which is justified by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Under Assumption 2.9, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $(J_{t,T}^*)_{T > t}$ converges uniformly and $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_{t,\infty}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}$.*

Proof. Fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for the remainder of this proof. First, we show that for any $t < T$,

$$\|J_{t,T}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}. \quad (4.2)$$

To this end, observe that $\|J_{T-1,T}^*\|_\infty \leq b$ because $\|G_{T-1}^\lambda O\|_\infty \leq b$ due to Assumption 2.9 (iv) and Lemma 3.2 (a). By Assumption 2.9 (iv) and Lemma 3.2 (a) again, $\|G_{T-2}^\lambda J_{T-1,T}^*\|_\infty \leq b + \gamma b$ and thus $\|J_{T-2,T}^*\|_\infty \leq b + \gamma b$. Then, (4.2) follows by induction. Next, note for any $t \leq T$, by Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{t,T}^*(x) - J_{t,T+r}^*(x)| &= \left| \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x) - \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T+r}^*(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x) - G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T+r}^*(x)| \leq \gamma \|J_{t+1,T}^* - J_{t+1,T+r}^*\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

In view of (4.2) and (4.3), by induction, we conclude

$$|J_{t,T}^*(x) - J_{t,T+r}^*(x)| \leq \gamma^{T-t} \|J_{T,T}^*(x) - J_{T,T+r}^*(x)\| = \gamma^{T-t} \|J_{T,T+r}^*(x)\| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t} b}{1 - \gamma}. \quad \blacksquare$$

By combining Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we obtain the lower semi-continuity of $x \mapsto J_{t,\infty}^*(x)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Under Assumption 2.9, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \mapsto J_{t,\infty}^*(x)$ is lower semi-continuous on \mathbb{X} .*

We are now in position to present our main results. The theorem below regards the dynamic programming principle for the optimization problem $\inf_{(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}^p}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p))$. In view of (3.7), it is sufficient to solve $\inf_{p \in \Pi} J_{0,\infty}^p$.

Theorem 4.4. *Under Assumption 2.9, the following is true.*

- (a) $(J_{t,\infty}^*)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $J_{t,\infty}^* = S_t J_{t+1,\infty}^*$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, for $(J'_{t,\infty})_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ satisfying $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J'_t\|_\infty < \infty$ and $J'_{t,\infty} = S_t J'_{t+1,\infty}$, we have $(J'_{t,\infty})_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (J_{t,\infty}^*)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$.
- (b) For $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,\infty}^*(x)$ is not empty and closed, and there is a measurable $\pi_t^* : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\Lambda, \mathcal{E}(\Lambda))$ such that

$$\pi_t^*(x) \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,\infty}^*(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (4.4)$$

- (c) For $p^* = (\pi_t^*)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (4.4) for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $J_{t,\infty}^{p^*} = J_{t,\infty}^* = \inf_{p \in \Pi} J_{t,\infty}^p$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and $J_{0,\infty}^{p^*} = H_0 J_{1,\infty}^* = \inf_{(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}^p}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p))$.

Proof. (a) First, observe that by (4.1), Lemma 4.2 and (4.5), we have

$$\|J_{t,\infty}^* - S_t J_{t+1,\infty}^*\|_\infty \leq \|J_{t,\infty}^* - J_{t,T}^*\|_\infty + 0 + \|S_t J_{t+1,T}^* - S_t J_{t+1,\infty}^*\|_\infty \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Next, by Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_t^*(x) - J'_t(x)| &= |S_t J_{t+1}^*(x) - S_t J'_{t+1}(x)| = \left| \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x) - \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J'_{t+1}(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x) - G_t^\lambda J'_{t+1}(x)| \leq \gamma \|J_{t+1}^* - J'_{t+1}\|_\infty, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_t^* - J_t'\|_\infty \leq \gamma \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_{t+1}^* - J_{t+1}'\|_\infty \leq \gamma \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_t^* - J_t'\|_\infty.$$

This together with Lemma 4.2 and the hypothesis that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_t'\|_\infty < \infty$ completes the proof.

(b) We fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for the rest of the proof. By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.3, $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x)$ is lower semi-continuous. Due to Assumption 2.9 (ii), $\omega_t(x)$ is compact. It follows that for $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x)$ is not empty and closed. We claim that the lower semi-continuity of $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x)$ implies that for any closed $F \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \omega_t(x)$,

$$B_F := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{X} : \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x) \cap F \neq \emptyset \right\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}),$$

i.e., the set-valued mapping $x \mapsto \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ -measurable (cf. [1, Section 18.1, Definition 18.1]). To this end note that by statement (a) we have

$$B_F = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{X} : J_t^*(x) = \min_{\lambda \in F} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x) \right\},$$

where $x \mapsto \min_{\lambda \in F} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x)$ is well defined and lower semi-continuous in $x \in \mathbb{X}$ due to Lemma 3.4, Lemma 4.3, Lemma C.9 and the fact that $F \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \omega_t(x)$ is compact and upper hemi-continuous. Recall from Lemma 4.3 that J_t^* is lower semi-continuous. It follows that both $\min_{\lambda \in F} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*$ and J_t^* are $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Consequently, $B_F \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. Note that a measurable set-valued function is also weakly measurable (cf. [1, Section 18.1, Lemma 18.2]). Then, by applying the Kuratowski and Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem (cf. [1, Section 18.3, Theorem 18.13]), the set-valued function $x \mapsto \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1}^*(x)$ has a $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) - \mathcal{B}(\Lambda)$ measurable selector. In view of Lemma C.7, such selector is also $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ measurable.

(c) Combining Lemma 3.2 (a) with (3.6) and (4.1), we obtain $J_{t,T}^*(x) \leq J_{t,T}^\rho(x)$ for any $t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\rho \in \Pi$. Then by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 4.2, we have $J_{t,\infty}^*(x) \leq J_{t,\infty}^\rho(x)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\rho \in \Pi$. On the other hand, note that by (a) and (b) we have

$$J_{t,\infty}^* = S_t J_{t+1,\infty}^* = G_t^{\pi_t^*(x)} J_{t+1,\infty}^*(x).$$

It follows from Proposition 3.7 that $J_{t,\infty}^{\rho^*} = J_{t,\infty}^*$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, we have that $J_{t,\infty}^{\rho^*} = J_{t,\infty}^* = \inf_{\rho \in \Pi} J_{t,\infty}^\rho$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, this together with (3.1), (3.7) and (3.8) implies $J_{0,\infty}^{\rho^*} = H_0 J_{1,\infty}^* = \inf_{\rho \in \Pi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^\rho, \mathcal{A}^\rho))$. \blacksquare

Next, we provide a Q-learning version of Theorem 4.4. Let $Q_t(x, \lambda) := G_t^\lambda J_{t,\infty}^*(x)$ for $(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda$. Note that Q_t is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable due to Lemma 3.1. For $u : (\mathbb{X} \times \Lambda, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ satisfying $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|Q_t'\|_\infty < \infty$, $x \mapsto \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} u(x, \lambda) \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, we define $T_t u(x, \lambda) := [G_t^\lambda \inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(\cdot)} u(\cdot, \zeta)](x)$.

Corollary 4.5. *Under Assumption 2.9, the following hold:*

- (a) For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $\inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} Q_t(x, \lambda) = J_{t,\infty}^*(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $Q_t = T_t Q_{t+1}$. Moreover, for any $(Q'_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(\cdot)} Q'_{t+1}(\cdot, \zeta) \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ and $Q'_t = T_t Q'_{t+1}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(Q'_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (Q_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$.
- (b) For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $\pi_t^* : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\Lambda, \mathcal{E}(\Lambda))$ such that

$$\pi_t^*(x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} Q_t(x, \lambda), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}.$$

- (c) If $\rho^* = (\pi_t^*)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $\pi_t^*(x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} Q_t(x, \lambda)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$, ρ^* is the optimal Markovian policy.

Proof. (a) It follows immediately from the definition of Q_t and Theorem 4.4 (a) that $\inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(x)} Q_t(x, \zeta) = S_t J_{t+1,\infty}^*(x) = J_{t,\infty}^*(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$. In addition, $J_{t,\infty}^* \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ due to Lemma 4.3. Consequently, we have

$$Q(t, \lambda) = \left[G_t^\lambda \inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(\cdot)} Q_{t+1}(\cdot, \zeta) \right](x) = T_t Q_{t+1}(t, \lambda).$$

Next, note that by Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_t - Q'_t\|_\infty &= \|T_t Q_{t+1} - T_t Q'_{t+1}\|_\infty \\ &= \sup_{(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda} \left| \left[G_t^\lambda \inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(\cdot)} Q_{t+1}(\cdot, \zeta) \right](x) - \left[G_t^\lambda \inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(\cdot)} Q'_{t+1}(\cdot, \zeta) \right](x) \right| \\ &\leq \gamma \sup_{(x, \lambda) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Lambda} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \left| \inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(x)} Q_{t+1}(x, \zeta) - \inf_{\zeta \in \omega_t(x)} Q'_{t+1}(x, \zeta) \right| \leq \gamma \|Q_{t+1}^* - Q'_{t+1}\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|Q_t - Q'_t\|_\infty \leq \gamma \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|Q_{t+1}^* - Q'_{t+1}\|_\infty \leq \gamma \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|Q_t^* - Q'_t\|_\infty$. Notice that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|Q_t^* - Q'_t\|_\infty < \infty$ due to Lemma 4.2 and the proven. We finally yield $(Q'_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (Q_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$.

(b) This follows from Theorem 4.4 (b) and the definition of Q_t .

(c) Note that for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, π_t^* satisfies (4.4) due to the definition of Q_t . Invoking Theorem 4.4 (c), completes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark 4.6. When the transition kernel P , the action domain \mathcal{A}_t and the family of probability measures \mathcal{M}_t are constant in $t \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows immediately from (4.1) that S_t is constant in $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $J_{t,T}^* = J_{t+1,T+1}^*$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T \geq t$. Thus, by Lemma 4.2, J_t^* is also constant in t . The stationary versions of Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.5 following immediately.

Now we argue that the optimal Markovian action is no worse than any other \mathbb{G} -adapted action. First, recall from Theorem 4.4 that the optimal Markovian policy is attainable.

Proposition 4.7. *Under Assumption 2.9, we have that*

$$\inf_{(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = \inf_{(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{A}) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{A})).$$

Proof. Fix $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{C}) \in \Psi$ for the remainder of the proof. Let $P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}$ be the regular version of $\mathbb{P}(A_t \in \cdot | \mathcal{Z}_t)$. By (2.2), (2.3), Lemma C.3 and Lemma C.5, for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_B(C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1})) | \mathcal{Z}_t) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{1}_B(C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1})) | \sigma(X_t) \vee \sigma(A_t)\right) | \mathcal{Z}_t\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(X_t, A_t, y)) P(t, X_t, A_t, dy) | \mathcal{Z}_t\right) \\ &= \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(X_t, a, y)) P(t, X_t, a, dy) P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(da), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, $\int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(C_t(X_t, a, y))} P(t, X_t, a, dy) P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(da)$ is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}) \in \cdot | \mathcal{Z}_t)$ big). For each $\omega \in \Omega$, by simple function approximation from below (cf. [1, Section 4.7, Theorem 4.36]) and monotone convergence, the corresponding Lebesgue integration for nonnegative $f : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ equals

$$\int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} f(C_t(X_t, a, y)) P(t, X_t, a, dy) P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(da).$$

This together with (2.10) and Proposition 2.6 (d) implies that, for any $T \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) &= \\ &\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} (C_T(X_T, a, y) - q)_+ P(T, X_T, a, dy) P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(da) \right\} \eta(d\kappa) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta(0) \cdot \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_T(X_T, a, y)) P(T, X_T, a, dy) P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(da) = 0 \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(B) |_{B=\mathcal{A}_T(X_T)} = \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_T(X_T)}(a) P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(da) = 1$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ due to the definition of Ψ and Lemma C.5 (we invoke [1, Section 18.1, Theorem 18.6] for the joint measurability of $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_T(x)}(a)$ as a function of (x, a)). It follows from (4.1) that $\rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{T,T}^*(X_T)$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$. We next proceed to pull back the time index by induction. Suppose for some $0 < t < T$ we have $\rho_{t+1,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{t+1,T}^*(X_{t+1})$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$. Then, by (2.10) and Proposition 2.5 (a), $\rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq \rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}(C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}) + \gamma J_{t+1,T}^*(X_{t+1}))$. With similar reasoning as before, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) &\geq \\ &\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} (C_t(X_t, a, y) + \gamma J_{t+1,T}^*(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(da) \right\} \eta(d\kappa) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta(0) \cdot \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(X_t, a, y) + \gamma J_{t+1,T}^*(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(da) = 0 \right\} \right\}, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.1) and the fact that $P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(B) |_{B=\mathcal{A}_t(X_t)} = 1$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ again, we have $\rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{t,T}^*(X_t)$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$. Consequently, $\rho_{1,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{1,T}^*(X_1)$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$. With similar reasoning as before, we yield $\rho_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{0,T}^*$. Finally, in view of Lemma 2.7, (3.7) and Theorem 4.4 (c), we have $\inf_{(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}^p}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p)) = J_{0,\infty}^* \leq \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}))$. \blacksquare

As a final key result, we provide a sufficient condition on when deterministic actions can attain the optimal. We first introduce a technical lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, $\lambda^1, \lambda^2 \in \Lambda$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$. If at a point $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$ is singleton, then*

$$G_t^{\beta\lambda^1 + (1-\beta)\lambda^2} v(x) \geq \beta G_t^{\lambda^1} v(x) + (1-\beta) G_t^{\lambda^2} v(x).$$

Proof. The statement follows immediately from the observations below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) (\beta\lambda^1 + (1-\beta)\lambda^2)(da) \right\} \\ & \geq \beta \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda^1(da) \right\} \\ & \quad + (1-\beta) \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda^2(da) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) (\beta\lambda^1 + (1-\beta)\lambda^2)(da) = 0$ implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda^i(da) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proposition 4.9. *Under Assumption 2.9, if $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$ is a singleton for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$, then there is $\pi_t^\delta : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\Lambda, \mathcal{E}(\Lambda))$ such that $\pi_t^\delta(x)$ is a Dirac measure for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and*

$$\pi_t^\delta(x) \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x).$$

Proof. We will fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for the rest of the proof. We first argue that for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$ the set $D(x) := \{a \in \mathcal{A}_t(x) : G_t^{\delta_a} J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x) = \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x)\}$ is not empty and closed. To this end, notice that $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$ is compact (due to Assumption 2.9 (ii)) thus totally bounded (cf. [1, Section 3.7, Theorem 3.28]), i.e., for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(A_k^\varepsilon)_{k=1}^n$ such that $A_k^\varepsilon \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ is an ε -open ball and $\mathcal{A}_t(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_k^\varepsilon$. Let $\lambda^* \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x)$. We claim that if $\lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon) > 0$, then

$$\lambda_{A_k^\varepsilon}^* := \frac{\lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon \cap \cdot)}{\lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon)} \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x). \quad (4.7)$$

To see this notice that if $\lambda^*((A_k^\varepsilon)^c) = 0$, $\lambda^* = \lambda_{A_k^\varepsilon}^*$ and (4.7) follows immediately. If $\lambda^*((A_k^\varepsilon)^c) > 0$, then $\lambda_{(A_k^\varepsilon)^c}^*$ is well defined and $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon) \lambda_{A_k^\varepsilon}^* + \lambda^*((A_k^\varepsilon)^c) \lambda_{(A_k^\varepsilon)^c}^*$, and (4.7) follows from Lemma 4.8 and the hypothesis that $\lambda^* \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x)$. Since $(A_k^\varepsilon)_{k=1}^n$ covers $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$, there exists one $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon) > 0$. This together with (4.7) implies that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $a^m \in \mathcal{A}_t(x)$ and $\lambda^m \in \omega_t(x)$ such that $\text{support } \lambda^m \subseteq \mathcal{A}_t(x) \cap \overline{B}_{\frac{1}{m}}(a^m)$ and $\lambda^m \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x)$, where $\overline{B}_{\frac{1}{m}}(a^m)$ is the closed $\frac{1}{m}$ -ball centered at a^m . As $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$

is compact, without loss of generality, we set $a^0 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a^n$. Let $f \in C_b(\mathbb{A})$; note f is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{A}} f(a) \lambda^m(\mathrm{d}a) - f(a^0) \right| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{A}_t(x) \cap \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{m}}(a^m)} f(a) \lambda^m(\mathrm{d}a) - f(a^0) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}_t(x) \cap \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{m}}(a^m)} |f(a) - f(a^0)| \\ &\leq \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}_t(x) \cap \bar{B}_{\frac{1}{m}}(a^m)} |f(a) - f(a^m)| + |f(a^m) - f(a^0)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $(\lambda^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to δ_{a^0} weakly. By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$\min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x) = \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} G_t^{\lambda^m} J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x) \geq G_t^{\delta_{a^0}} J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x),$$

and thus $\delta_{a^0} \in D(x)$. The closedness of $D(x)$ follows from Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.3 and the fact that $(\delta_{a^\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly if $(a^\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{A}$ converges.

Now that we have shown $D(x)$ is non-empty and closed for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$, the existence of π_t^δ follows from an analogous argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.4 (b). \blacksquare

Remark 4.10. Let us fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Here we provide some discussion on the case when $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$ is not a singleton from the perspective of two-player games. We may treat $\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)$ as an action controlled by another player who aims to maximize the score. Let us name the players as player- λ and player- η , respectively. From the definition of $G_t^\lambda v$, the decision of player- η is made without the realization of player- λ 's action. This incites player- λ to use a randomized policy to take advantage of player- η 's reduced information. On the contrary, if player- η was allowed to make decisions with the additional information on the realization of player- λ 's action, the corresponding score would be

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{A}} \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y) - q)_+ P(t, x, a, \mathrm{d}y) \right\} \eta(\mathrm{d}\kappa) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta(0) \cdot \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, \mathrm{d}y) = 0 \right\} \right\} \lambda(\mathrm{d}a), \end{aligned}$$

which, with a similar argument leading to Proposition 4.9, guarantees the sufficiency of deterministic actions. Finally, unlike player- λ , player- η does not benefit from further randomization over the set $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$, again due to a similar argument leading to Proposition 4.9.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. D. ALIPRANTIS AND K. C. BORDER, *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [2] P. ARTZNER, F. DELBAEN, J. EBER, AND D. HEATH, *Coherent measures of risk*, *Mathematical Finance*, 9 (1999), pp. 203–228.
- [3] N. BÄUERLE AND A. GLAUNER, *Minimizing spectral risk measures applied to markov decision processes*, *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 94 (2021), pp. 35–69.

- [4] N. BÄUERLE AND A. GLAUNER, *Markov decision processes with iterated coherent risk measures*, European Journal of Operational Research, 296 (2022), pp. 953–966.
- [5] N. BÄUERLE AND U. RIEDER, *Markov Decision Processes with Applications to Finance*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [6] D. P. BERTSEKAS AND S. E. SHREVE, *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete-Time Case*, Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [7] T. R. BIELECKI, T. CHEN, AND I. CIALENCO, *Risk-sensitive markov decision problems under model uncertainty: finite time horizon case*, arXiv:2104.06915, (2021).
- [8] T. R. BIELECKI, I. CIALENCO, AND M. PITERA, *A survey of time consistency of dynamic risk measures and dynamic performance measures in discrete time: Lm-measure perspective*, Probability, Uncertainty and Quantitative Risk, 2 (2017).
- [9] P. BILLINGSLEY, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1999.
- [10] D. BLACKWELL AND L. E. DUBINS, *An extension of skorohod’s almost sure representation theorem*, Proceeding of the American Mathematical Society, 89 (1983).
- [11] V. I. BOGACHEV, *Measure Theory Volume I*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [12] V. I. BOGACHEV, *Measure Theory Volume II*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [13] Y. CHOW, A. TAMAR, S. MANNOR, AND M. PAVONE, *Risk-sensitive and robust decision-making: a cvar optimization approach*, Advances in Neural Processing Systems, (2015).
- [14] S. CHU AND Y. ZHANG, *Markov decision processes with iterated coherent risk measures*, International Journal of Control, 88 (2014), pp. 2286–2293.
- [15] A. COACHE AND S. JAIMUNGAL, *Reinforcement learning with dynamic convex risk measures*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13414, (2021).
- [16] F. DELBAEN, *Coherent risk measures on general probability spaces*, Advances in Finance and Stochastics, 9 (2002), pp. 1–37.
- [17] D. DENTCHEVA AND A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Risk forms: representation, disintegration, and application to partially observable two-stage systems*, Mathematical Programming, Series B, 181 (2020), pp. 297–317.
- [18] E. R. GIANIN, *Risk measures via g-expectations*, Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 39 (2006), pp. 19–34.
- [19] I. I. GIKHMAN AND A. V. SKOROKHOD, *The Theory of Stochastic Processes I*, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [20] O. HERNANDEZ-LERMA AND J. B. LASSERRE, *Discrete-Time Markov Control Processes: Basic Optimality Criteria*, Springer, New York, NY, 1996.
- [21] S. KUSUOKA, *On law invariant coherent risk measures*, Advances in Mathematical Economics, (2001), pp. 83–95.
- [22] M. LOEVE, *Probability Theory II*, Springer, New York, 1978.
- [23] G. C. PFLUG AND A. PICHLER, *Time-consistent decisions and temporal decomposition of coherent risk functionals*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 41 (2016).
- [24] F. RIEDEL, *Dynamic coherent risk measures*, Mathematical Programming, Series B, 121 (2004), pp. 185–200.
- [25] A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Risk-averse dynamic programming for markov decision processes*, Mathematical Programming, Series B, 125 (2010), pp. 235–261.
- [26] A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Erratum to: Risk-averse dynamic programming for markov decision processes*, Mathematical Programming, Series A, 145 (2014), pp. 601–604.
- [27] A. SHAPIRO, D. DENTCHEVA, AND A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory, Third Edition*, Springer, 2021.
- [28] Y. SHEN, W. STANNAT, AND K. OBERMAYER, *Risk-sensitive markov control processes*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51 (2013), pp. 3652–3672.

Appendix A. Example. We let

$$\rho(Z) = \max \{0.8\mathbb{E}(Z) + 0.2\text{CV}@R_{0.1}(Z), \text{CV}@R_{0.5}(Z)\},$$

where $\text{CV}@R_{\kappa}(Z) := \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \{q + \kappa^{-1}\mathbb{E}(Z - q)_+\}$ for $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ and $(x)_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$. Let us consider controls

0 and 1 with the following random costs,

$$C^0 = \begin{cases} 0, & p = 0.9, \\ 5, & p = 0.1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad C^1 = \begin{cases} 0, & p = 0.5, \\ 1.4, & p = 0.5. \end{cases}$$

Let $\beta \in [0, 1]$. We also consider randomly and independently choosing between control 0 and 1 with $1 - \beta$ and β probability, respectively. Accordingly, we define

$$C^\beta := I^\beta C^0 + (1 - I^\beta) C^1, \quad \beta \in [0, 1],$$

where I^β is a random variable independent of C^0 and C^1 , and $\mathbb{P}(I^\beta = 1) = 1 - \beta$, $\mathbb{P}(I^\beta = 0) = \beta$. It follows that for $\beta \in [0, 1]$, C^β has the distribution below,

$$C^\beta = \begin{cases} 0, & p = 0.9 - 0.4\beta, \\ 1.4, & p = 0.5\beta, \\ 5, & p = 0.1 - 0.1\beta. \end{cases}$$

It can be shown that $\rho(C^0) = \rho(C^1) = 1.4 > \rho(C^{0.5}) = 1.2$.

Appendix B. Pointwise supremum and essential supremum.

Let \mathfrak{U} be a subset of $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ random variables. We introduce below pointwise supremum and essential supremum. The pointwise supremum of \mathfrak{U} is denoted by $\sup \mathfrak{U}$. For each $\omega \in \Omega$, we define $(\sup \mathfrak{U})(\omega) := \sup_{Y \in \mathfrak{U}} Y(\omega)$. Note that $\sup \mathfrak{U}$ may not be $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ measurable. If, however, \mathfrak{U} is countable and \mathfrak{U}_n consists of the first n elements of \mathfrak{U} , then we have $\sup \mathfrak{U} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{Y \in \mathfrak{U}_n} Y$ and the $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ measurability follows from Lemma C.2. The analogue holds true for the pointwise infimum $\inf \mathfrak{U}$.

Below we introduce the definitions of essential supremum and essential infimum.

Definition B.1. *The essential suppermum of \mathfrak{U} , denoted by $\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}$, is an $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ random variables satisfying*

- (i) $\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U} \geq Y$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $Y \in \mathfrak{U}$;
- (ii) if there is an $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ random variable Y' such that $Y' \geq Y$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $Y \in \mathfrak{U}$ then $Y' \geq \text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s..

Definition B.2. *The essential infimum of \mathfrak{U} , denoted by $\text{ess inf } \mathfrak{U}$, is an $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ random variables satisfying*

- (i) $\text{ess inf } \mathfrak{U} \leq Y$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $Y \in \mathfrak{U}$;
- (ii) if there is an $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ random variable Y' such that $Y' \leq Y$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $Y \in \mathfrak{U}$, then $Y' \leq \text{ess inf } \mathfrak{U}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s..

By [27, Proposition 9.44], $\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}$ exists and there is a countable subset $\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ such that

$$\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U} = \sup \mathfrak{u}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the right hand side is understood as the pointwise supremum.

Note that $\text{ess inf } \mathfrak{U} = -\text{ess sup } (-\mathfrak{U})$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., and $\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}$ is unique in \mathbb{P} -almost sure sense due to Definition B.1 (ii). Additionally, essential supremum has the following properties.

Lemma B.3. *For any $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{U}'$ that are subsets of $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ random variables, the following is true:*

- (a) $\text{ess sup } (a + \mathfrak{U}) = a + \text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\text{ess sup } \beta \mathfrak{U} = \beta \text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for $\beta \geq 0$;
- (b) if $\mathfrak{U} \leq \mathfrak{U}'$, i.e., for any $Y \in \mathfrak{U}$ there is $Y' \in \mathfrak{U}'$ such that $Y \leq Y'$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., or $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}'$, then $\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U} \leq \text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}'$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.;
- (c) let $\mathfrak{U} + \mathfrak{U}' := \{Y'' : Y'' = Y + Y', Y \in \mathfrak{U}, Y' \in \mathfrak{U}'\}$, then $\text{ess sup } (\mathfrak{U} + \mathfrak{U}') \leq \text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U} + \text{ess sup } \mathfrak{U}'$, \mathbb{P} -a.s..

Properties for $\text{ess inf } \mathfrak{J}$ can be derived analogously.

If $\mathfrak{J} = (Y_i)_{i \in I}$ for some set of indices I , we will write $\sup \mathfrak{J} = \sup_{i \in I} Y_i$ and $\text{ess sup } \mathfrak{J} = \text{ess sup}_{i \in I} Y_i$ instead.

Appendix C. Technical Lemmas.

Lemma C.1. *Let $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$, $\text{AV@R}_\kappa(Z) := \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \{q + \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{E}(Z - q)_+\}$ for $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ and $\text{AV@R}_0(Z) := \text{ess sub } Z$. Then, $\text{AV@R}_\kappa(Z)$ is non-increasing and continuous in $\kappa \in (0, 1]$.*

Proof. See [27, Section 6.2.4, Remark 22]. ■

Lemma C.2. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space. Let $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of real-valued \mathcal{A} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ random variable converging to Z \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Then, Z is \mathcal{A} -measurable.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29] and that \mathcal{A} contains all \mathbb{P} -negligible sets. ■

Lemma C.3. *Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$ and $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ be measurable spaces. Consider nonnegative $f : (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ and $M : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}))$, where \mathcal{P} is the set of probability measure on \mathcal{Y} and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ is the corresponding evaluation σ -algebra. Then, $x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(x, y)[M(x)](dy)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable.*

Proof. We first consider $f(x, y) = \mathbb{1}_D(x, y)$, where $D \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$. Let \mathcal{D} consist of $D \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ such that $x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(x, y)[M(x)](dy)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Note $\{A \times B : A \in \mathcal{X}, B \in \mathcal{Y}\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ because $\int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{A \times B}(x, y)[M(x)](dy) = \mathbb{1}_A(x)[M(x)](B)$ and

$$\{x \in \mathbb{X} : [M(x)](B) \in C\} = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : M(x) \in \{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \zeta(B) \in C\}\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}), \quad C \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]).$$

If $D^1, D^2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $D^1 \subseteq D^2$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^2 \setminus D^1}(x, y)[M(x)](dy) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^2}(x, y)[M(x)](dy) - \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^1}(x, y)[M(x)](dy)$$

is also $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Similarly, if $D^1, D^2 \in \mathcal{D}$ are disjoint, then $D^1 \cup D^2 \in \mathcal{D}$. If $(D^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is increasing and $D^0 = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D^n$, then by monotone convergence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^n}(x, y)[M(x)](dy) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^0}(x, y)[M(x)](dy), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}.$$

It follows from [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29] that $D^0 \in \mathcal{D}$. Invoking monotone class theorem (cf. [11, Theorem 1.9.3 (ii)]), we yield $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$.

Now let f be any non-negative measurable function. Note that f can be approximated by a sequence of simple function $(f^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $f^n \uparrow f$ (cf. [1, Section 4.7, Theorem 4.36]). Since $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f^n(x, y)[M(x)](dy)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Finally, by monotone convergence and [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29] again, we conclude the proof. ■

Consider $Z : (\Omega, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$. Suppose $\mathbb{E}Z$ is well-defined, i.e., either $\mathbb{E}(Z)_+ < \infty$ or $\mathbb{E}(-Z)_+ < \infty$. The conditional expectation of Z given $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathbb{E}(Z|\mathcal{G})$, is a \mathcal{G} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ random variable satisfying $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_A Z) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{E}(Z|\mathcal{G}))$ for any $A \in \mathcal{G}$. We refer to [22, Section 27.2] for the existence and uniqueness of such definition. The lemma below is known as the conditional monotone convergence theorem.

Lemma C.4. *Let $Z_n : (\Omega, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ be non-negative for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $Z_n \uparrow Z$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(Z_n|\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}(Z|\mathcal{G})$, \mathbb{P} -a.s..*

Proof. See [22, Section 28.2]. ■

Lemma C.5. Let $Y : (\Omega, \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$. Let $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}$ be the regular version of $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{G})$. Then, for any nonnegative $f : (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(f(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where the right hand side is understood as $\int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(x, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy)|_{x=X}$, and is \mathcal{G} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable due to Lemma C.3.

Proof. We first consider $f(x, y) = \mathbb{1}_D(x, y)$ for $D \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$. We let \mathcal{D} be the set of $D \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ such that (C.1) holds true. Notice that (C.1) holds true if $f = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y}}$ due to Definition 2.1 (ii), thus $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y} \in \mathcal{D}$. If $D^1 \subseteq D^2$ and $D^1, D^2 \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $\mathbb{1}_{D^1 \setminus D^2} = \mathbb{1}_{D^2} - \mathbb{1}_{D^1}$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{D^2}(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) - \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{D^1}(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^2}(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy) - \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^1}(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

Consequently, $D^2 \setminus D^1 \in \mathcal{D}$. If $D^1, D^2 \in \mathcal{D}$ are disjoint, we have $\mathbb{1}_{D^1 \cup D^2} = \mathbb{1}_{D^1} + \mathbb{1}_{D^2}$, and similarly as before, $D^1 \cup D^2 \in \mathcal{D}$. If $(D^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}$ is increasing and $D^0 := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D^n$, applying conditional monotone convergence (cf. Lemma C.4) on $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{D^n}(X, Y)|\mathcal{G})$ and monotone convergence on $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{D^n}(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy)$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$, we yield

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{D^0}(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{D^n}(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^n}(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{D^0}(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.,$$

i.e., $D^0 \in \mathcal{D}$. Additionally, observe that for $A \in \mathcal{X}$, $B \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A \times B}(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{1}_A(X) \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_B(Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{1}_A(X) \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_B(y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{A \times B}(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.,$$

where we have used (2.1) in the second equality. Therefore, $\{A \times B : A \in \mathcal{X}, B \in \mathcal{Y}\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. It follows from monotone class theorem (cf. [11, Theorem 1.9.3 (ii)]) that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$.

Now let f be any nonnegative measurable function. Note there is a sequence of simple function $(f^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $f^n \uparrow f$ in a pointwise sense (cf. [1, Section 4.7, Theorem 4.36]). Since $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(f^n(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}) = \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f^n(X, y) P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}(dy), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

Applying conditional monotone convergence (cf. Lemma C.4) on the left hand side and monotone convergence on the right hand side for each $\omega \in \Omega$, we have proved (C.1). ■

In what follows, we let \mathbb{Y} and \mathbb{Z} be two topological space. Below is a reduction of Portmanteau theorem.

Lemma C.6. Suppose \mathbb{Y} is a metric space endowed with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$. Let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$, and μ a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to μ ;
- (b) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^n(F) \leq \mu(F)$ for any closed set $F \subset \mathbb{Y}$;
- (c) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^n(U) \geq \mu(U)$ for any open set $U \subset \mathbb{Y}$;
- (d) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y) \mu^n(dy) \leq \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y) \mu(dy)$ for any upper semicontinuous $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$;
- (e) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y) \mu^n(dy) \geq \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y) \mu(dy)$ for any lower semicontinuous $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$.

Proof. See [1, Section 15.1, Theorem 15.3 and Theorem 15.5]. ■

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$ be the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{Y} , and \mathcal{P} be the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$. We endow \mathcal{P} with weak topology and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P})$ be the corresponding Borel σ -algebra. Let $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ be the σ -algebra on \mathcal{P} generated by sets $\{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \zeta(A) \in B\}$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$, $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ is the σ -algebra generated by sets $\{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y)\zeta(dy) \in B\}$ for any real-valued bounded $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable f and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. The lemma below states that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ are equivalent.

Lemma C.7. *If \mathbb{Y} is a separable metric space, then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$.*

Proof. Notice that the weak topology of \mathcal{P} is generated by sets $\{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y)\zeta(dy) \in U\}$ for any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{Y})$ and open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$. On the other hand, by [1, Section 15.3, Theorem 15.13], for any bounded real-valued $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable f and any $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, we have $\{\zeta \in \mathcal{P} : \int_{\mathbb{Y}} f(y)\zeta(dy) \in B\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P})$. The proof is complete. ■

Lemma C.8. *Let $\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Z}$ be a separable metric space endowed with product Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Z})$. Let $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Z}))$ be lower semi-continuous. Let $(y^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Y}$ converges to $y^0 \in \mathbb{Y}$ and let $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Z})$ converging weakly to μ^0 . Then,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Z}} f(y^n, z) \mu^n(dz) \geq \int_{\mathbb{Z}} f(y^0, z) \mu^0(dz).$$

Proof. To start with, let us $\delta_y(B) := \mathbb{1}_B(y)$, i.e., δ_y is the dirac measure on y . It follows that $(\delta_{y^n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to δ_{y^0} . Therefore, by [9, Theorem 2.8 (ii)], $(\delta_{y^n} \otimes \mu^n)_{n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\delta_{y^0} \otimes \mu^0$. Due to Lemma C.6 (e), we yield

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Z}} f(y^n, z) \mu^n(dz) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Z}} f(y, z) \delta_{y^n} \otimes \mu^n(dy dz) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Z}} f(y, z) \delta_{y^0} \otimes \mu^0(dy dz) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}} f(y^0, z) \mu^0(dz), \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

where we have used Fubini's theorem in the first and last equality.

Lemma C.9. *Let f be a real-valued lower semi-continuous function on $\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\phi : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be nonempty compact valued and upper hemi-continuous. Then, $\inf_{z \in \phi(y)} f(y, z)$ is attainable for all $y \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $\inf_{z \in \phi(y)} f(\cdot, z)$ is lower semi-continuous on \mathbb{Y} .*

Proof. It follows from the compactness of $\phi(y)$ and the lower semi-continuity of f implies that $\inf_{z \in \phi(y)} f(y, z)$ is attainable for $y \in \mathbb{Y}$. By (cf. [1, Section 17.5, Lemma 17.30]), $y \mapsto \sup_{z \in \phi(y)} (-f(y, z))$ is upper semi-continuous, and thus $y \mapsto \inf_{z \in \phi(y)} f(y, z)$ is lower semi-continuous. ■

Lemma C.10. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a separable metric space, $\phi : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{M}}$ be lower hemi-continuous, and $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y} \times [0, 1], \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}) \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1]))$. Suppose $f(\cdot, \kappa)$ is lower semi-continuous for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ and $f(y, \cdot)$ is continuous and non-increasing for $y \in \mathbb{Y}$. Then, $y \mapsto \sup_{\eta \in \phi(y)} \int_{[0, 1]} f(y, \kappa) \eta(d\kappa)$ is lower semi-continuous on \mathbb{Y} .*

Proof. We first show that f is lower semi-continuous. To this end let $(y^n) \subseteq \mathbb{Y}$ and $(\kappa^n) \subseteq [0, 1]$ converge to $y^0 \in \mathbb{Y}$ and κ^0 , respectively. If $\kappa^0 = 1$, then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y^n, \kappa^n) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y^n, 1) \geq f(y^0, \delta)$. If $\kappa^0 < 1$, then for any $\delta \in (\kappa, 1]$ we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y^n, \kappa^n) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y^n, \delta) \geq f(y^0, \delta)$. Letting $\delta \downarrow \kappa^0$, by the continuity of $f(y, \cdot)$, we yield $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y^n, \kappa^n) \geq f(y^0, \kappa^0)$.

By Lemma C.8, $(y, \eta) \mapsto \int_{[0, 1]} f(y, \kappa) \eta(d\kappa)$ is lower semi-continuous. Then, in view of [1, Section 17.5, Lemma 17.29], the proof is complete. ■

Appendix D. Supplemental Proofs for Section 2.3.

Proof of Proposition 2.5. It is not difficult to check that $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}$ is a conditional risk mapping from $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ to $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$ for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$. We dedicate the rest of the proof to address $\diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}$ and $\text{esssup}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_t}$.

(a) Notice that $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^1) \leq AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^2)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, and thus

$$C\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^1)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right) \subseteq C\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^2)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right).$$

Therefore, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_t$,

$$AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^1) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M \leq AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^2) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Taking $\text{esssup}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_t}$ on the both hand side above, the inequality still holds true due to Lemma B.3 (b). This proves the monotonicity.

(b) Notice that Y is constant in κ and $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}$ satisfies translation equivariance. Therefore,

$$Y + C\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right) = C\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Y + Z)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right).$$

It follows that $Y + AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M = AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Y + Z) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_t$. The equality under $\text{esssup}_{M \in \mathcal{M}_t}$ follows from Lemma B.3 (b). This proves the translation equivariance.

(c) Observe that for $\beta > 0$, due to the positive homogeneity of $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}$,

$$\beta L\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right) = L\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(\beta Z)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right).$$

The positive homogeneity of $\rho_t^{\mathcal{X}}$ for $\beta > 0$ can be proved with a similar argument as in (b). If $\beta = 0$, we have $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(0 \cdot Z) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M = 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., and the proof is complete.

(d) Since $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(\beta Z^1 + (1 - \beta)Z^2) \leq \beta AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(\beta Z^1) + (1 - \beta)AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(\beta Z^2)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. due to the convexity of $AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & C\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(\beta Z^1 + (1 - \beta)Z^2)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right) \\ & \subseteq C\left(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}; \left(\beta AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^1) + (1 - \beta)AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^2)\right)_{\kappa \in [0,1]}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} & AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(\beta Z^1 + (1 - \beta)Z^2) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M \leq \left(\beta AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^1) + (1 - \beta)AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^2)\right) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M \\ & \leq \left(\beta AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^1)\right) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M + \left((1 - \beta)AV@R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z^2)\right) \diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t} M, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to the esssup in the definition of $\diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{A}}$. With a similar argument as in (c), we can factor β and $1 - \beta$ out of $\diamond_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}$. The rest of the proof follows from Lemma B.3 (b). \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 2.6. For the rest of the proof, we will fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$, and we will use the notation below

$$R_\kappa := \begin{cases} \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}, & \kappa \in (0, 1], \\ \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((r, \infty)) = 0\}, & \kappa = 0. \end{cases}$$

(a) Note that $P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}([\text{ess lb } Z, \text{ess ub } Z]) = 1$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$. Thus for $\kappa \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\kappa &\geq \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\} \geq \int_{\mathbb{X}} (z)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \geq \text{ess lb } Z, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \\ R_\kappa &\leq \text{ess ub } Z + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - \text{ess ub } Z)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) = \text{ess ub } Z, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \end{aligned}$$

To see the measurability of R_κ , $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, let \mathcal{Q}_n be the set consisting of the first n -th rational numbers and note that

$$R_\kappa = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where the right hand side is \mathcal{U}_t -measurable due to Lemma C.2 and Lemma C.5.

In order to show (2.8), we first note that by Lemma C.5, for any $W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$,

$$W + \kappa^{-1} \mathbb{E}((Z - W)_+ | \mathcal{U}_t) = W + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - W)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

This together with Lemma B.3 (b) implies that

$$\text{AV@R}_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) = \text{ess inf}_{W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})} \left\{ W + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - W)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

It remains to show that R_κ equals to the essential infimum of the right hand side above. To this end observe that

$$R_\kappa \leq \text{ess inf}_{W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})} \left\{ W + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - W)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}, \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Thus, R_κ satisfies Definition B.2 (i). Next, we define W^n as the first element in \mathcal{Q}_n such that

$$W^n \in \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right\}.$$

Because $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz)$ is \mathcal{U}_t - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable due to Lemma C.5, $W^n \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$. By (D.1), we yield

$$R_\kappa = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(W^n + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - W^n)_+ P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right), \quad \omega \in \Omega,$$

and Definition B.2 (ii) follows.

(b) This is an immediate consequence of Definition 2.1 (ii) and Lemma C.1

(c) Since $\mathbb{P}(Z \in [\text{ess lb } Z, \text{ess ub } Z] | \mathcal{U}_t) = 1$ almost surely, we have $P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}([\text{ess inf } Z, \infty)) = 1$ and $P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((\text{ess ub } Z, \infty)) = 0$. Thus, $\inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((r, \infty)) = 0\} \in [\text{ess lb } Z, \text{ess ub } Z]$ almost surely. Combining (a), (b) with Lemma C.2, we have $R_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$.

Next, notice that for any $W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathbb{P}(W \geq Z) = 1$, by Lemma C.5 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(W - z) P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(W - z) | \mathcal{U}_t \right) \right) = \mathbb{E} (\mathbb{P}(W \geq Z | \mathcal{U}_t)) = \mathbb{P}(W \geq Z) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.,$$

which implies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(W-z) P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) = 1 - P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}((w,\infty))|_{w=W} = 1$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.. It follows that $W \geq R_0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. and thus R_0 satisfies Definition B.2 (i). With a similar argument as above, we yield

$$\mathbb{P}(R_0 \geq Z) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(R_0 - z) P^{Z|\mathcal{U}_t}(dz) \right) = 1,$$

i.e., $R_0 \in \{W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P}), \mathbb{P}(W \geq Z) = 1\}$, and thus R_0 satisfies Definition B.2 (ii).

(d) Combining statements (a) (b) (c) and [1, Section 4.10, Lemma 4.51], we have $(\omega, \kappa) \mapsto R_\kappa(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{U}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,1])$ -measurable. Moreover, in view of statement (b) and Lemma 2.3, for any $M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathbb{X}}$ we have

$$\int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa M(d\kappa) = AV @ R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}_t} M, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Then, by Lemma B.3 (b),

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathbb{X}}} \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa M(d\kappa) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathbb{X}}} AV @ R_\kappa^{\mathcal{U}_t}(Z) \diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}_t} M, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Next, note that $(\omega, \eta) \mapsto \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa(\omega) \eta(d\kappa)$ is a \mathcal{U}_t - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ random variable for each $\eta \in \mathbb{M}$ (cf. [11, Corollary 3.4.6]) and continuous on $\eta \in \mathbb{M}$ under weak topology for each $\omega \in \Omega$ (due to statement (b)), i.e., it is Carathéodory (cf. [1, Section 4.10, Definition 4.50]). Note additionally that \mathbb{M} under weak topology is compact (cf. [1, Section 15.6, Theorem 15.22]). Moreover, $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{M}_t(X_t(\omega))$ is \mathcal{U}_t -weakly measurable, because for any open $U \in \mathbb{M}$ we have

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : \mathcal{M}_t(X_t(\omega)) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : X_t(\omega) \in \{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{M}_t(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}\}$$

and $\{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{M}_t(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ as $\mathcal{M}_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{M}}$ is weakly measurable. Then, by measurable maximum theorem (cf. [1, Section 18.3, Theorem 18.19]), $\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t)} \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa \eta(d\kappa)$ is \mathcal{U}_t -measurable and can be attained with a \mathcal{U}_t -measurable selector $M^* : (\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t) \rightarrow (\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}))$ such that $M^*(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t(\omega))$ for $\omega \in \Omega$. By Lemma C.7, M^* is also \mathcal{U}_t - $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M})$ measurable, and thus $M^* \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathbb{X}}$.

It follows from Definition B.1 that

$$\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t)} \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa \eta(d\kappa) \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{M \in \Upsilon_t^{\mathbb{X}}} \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa M(d\kappa) \geq \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa M^*(d\kappa) = \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t)} \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa \eta(d\kappa), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

This together with (D.2) implies (2.9). Finally, it is proved in (a) and (c) that

$\mathbb{P}(R_\kappa \in [\operatorname{ess\,lb} Z, \operatorname{ess\,ub} Z]) = 1$ for $\kappa \in [0,1]$. It follows from (b) that $\mathbb{P}(R_\kappa \in [\operatorname{ess\,lb} Z, \operatorname{ess\,ub} Z], \kappa \in [0,1]) = 1$, and thus

$$\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(X_t)} \int_{[0,1]} R_\kappa \eta(d\kappa) \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{U}_t, \mathbb{P}).$$

The proof is complete. ■

Proof of Lemma 2.7. We let $K := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \operatorname{ess\,ub} |Z_n|$ for the rest of the proof. By Proposition 2.5 (a), we have $|\rho_T^{\mathbb{X}}(Z_T)| \leq K$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus $|Z_T + \gamma \rho_{T+1}^{\mathbb{X}}(Z_{T+1})| \leq K + \gamma K$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.. It follows from Proposition 2.5 (a) again that $|\rho_T^{\mathbb{X}}(Z_T + \gamma \rho_{T+1}^{\mathbb{X}}(Z_{T+1}))| \leq K + \gamma K$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.. By induction, for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|\rho_{T, T+r}^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})| \leq (1 - \gamma)^{-1} K, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

The above, together with Proposition 2.5 (a) (d) and (2.10), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{T,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) &\leq \rho_T^{\mathfrak{X}}(\gamma \rho_{T+1,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})) \leq \gamma(1-\gamma)^{-1}K, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \\ \rho_{T,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) &\leq \rho_T^{\mathfrak{X}}(-\gamma \rho_{T+1,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})) \leq \gamma(1-\gamma)^{-1}K, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..\end{aligned}$$

Then, by Proposition 2.5 (a) (d) and (2.10) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{T-1,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{T-1,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) &\leq \rho_{T-1}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\gamma(\rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{T,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}))) \leq \gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{-1}K, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \\ \rho_{T-1,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{T-1,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) &\leq \rho_{T-1}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\gamma(\rho_{T,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}))) \leq \gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{-1}K, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..\end{aligned}$$

Inducing backward, we have

$$|\rho_{t,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{Z})| \leq \gamma^{T-t+1}(1-\gamma)^{-1}K, \quad t \leq T, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \quad \blacksquare$$

Appendix E. Glossary of notations.

Notations	Definitions
\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0	$\{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. See Section 2.
$\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$	Set of bounded \mathcal{Y} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable functions. See Section 2.
δ_y	Dirac measure at y . See Section 2.
$(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P}), \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{G}$	Probability space and filtrations. See Section 2.
\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{A}	State and action spaces. See Section 2.
Ξ, Λ	Set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$. See Section 2.
$\mathcal{B}(\Xi), \mathcal{B}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}(\Xi), \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$	Borel σ -algebras and evaluation σ -algebras of Ξ and Λ . See Section 2.
\mathcal{A}_t	Admissible action domain. See Section 2.
ω_t	Set of probability measures with support contained by \mathcal{A}_t . See Section 2.
Π_t	Set of $\pi_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{A}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{A}))$ such that $\pi_t(x) \in \omega_t(x)$. See Section 2.
ρ, Π	Abbreviation of $(\pi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the set of ρ . See Section 2.
\mathbb{M}	Set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$. See Section 2.
$\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}), \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{M})$	Borel σ -algebras and evaluation σ -algebras of \mathbb{M} . See Section 2.
\mathcal{M}_t	Mapping from \mathbb{X} to $2^{\mathbb{M}}$. See Section 2.
\mathcal{M}_0	Closed subset of \mathbb{M} . See Section 2.
$P^{Y \mathcal{G}}$	Regular conditional distribution Y given \mathcal{G} . See Definition 2.1.
$X_t, A_t, \mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}$	State and action process, abbreviations of $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. See Section 2.2.
Ψ	Subset of $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})$. See Section 2.4.
μ, P	Initial distribution of X_1 and transition kernel from (X_t, A_t) to X_{t+1} . See Assumption 2.8.
$X_t^p, A_t^p, \mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p$	Counterparts of $X_t, A_t, \mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}$ subject to Markovian action kernel ρ . See Section 2.4.
C_t, \mathcal{C}	Cost function and abbreviation of $(C_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. See Section 2.4.
$AV@R_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{U}_t}$	Conditional average valued at risk. See (2.6).
$\Upsilon_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$	Subset of random probability measures. See Section 2.3.1.
$\diamond_{\kappa}^{\mathcal{A}}$	Customarily defined integration. See Section 2.3.1.
$\rho_t^{\mathfrak{X}}$	Kusuoka-type conditional risk measure. See (2.7).
$\rho_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}, \rho_{t,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}$	Dynamic risk measures. See (2.10) and Lemma 2.7.
O	Function on \mathbb{X} that is constant 0.
H_0, G_t^λ, H_t^p	Operators defined on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$. See Section 3.
$J_{t,T}^p, J_{t,\infty}^p$	Value functions related to ρ . See (3.6) and (3.8).
S_t	Operator defined on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$. See Section 4.
$J_{t,T}^*, J_{t,\infty}^*$	Value functions for technical purpose. See (4.1) and Lemma 4.2.