

On Non-stochastic Approximate Information States for Uncertain Systems with Additive Costs

Aditya Dave, *Student Member, IEEE*, Nishanth Venkatesh, *Student Member, IEEE*,
Andreas A. Malikopoulos, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we consider the problem of optimizing the worst-case behavior of a partially observed system. All uncontrolled disturbances of the system are modeled as non-stochastic uncertain variables taking values in finite sets. Using the theory of cost distributions, we present a dynamic program (DP) to derive a control strategy that minimizes the maximum possible total cost over a finite-time horizon. We also present a general definition for information states which can improve computational tractability of the DP without loss of optimality. We show that many information states constructed in previous research efforts are special cases of our general definition. Finally, we present a definition for approximate information states and an approximate DP that can further improve computational tractability by conceding a bounded performance loss.

I. INTRODUCTION

In many engineering applications, an agent is constrained to act with a partial understanding of the system state and uncertain knowledge of system dynamics [1]. Most commonly, this decision making problem is modeled as a stochastic control problem, where the agent is given a prior probability distribution for all uncertainties to compute a control strategy which minimizes an expected total cost across a time horizon [2]. Such stochastic formulations have also been utilized in reinforcement learning [3] and decentralized systems [4], [5]. However, the expected total cost may not be a suitable measure of a strategy's performance in all situations. In fact, many applications require guarantees on a system's worst-case performance, for example: (1) control of systems under attack from an adversary, like cyber-security systems [6], and (2) control of systems where a single event of failure can be damaging, like water reservoirs [7]. Furthermore, the actual performance of a stochastic control strategy is very sensitive to a mismatch between the given prior distribution and the real underlying distribution [8]. Thus, stochastic models are unsuitable for strategy computation when prior distributions can only be estimated with high ambiguity.

For such applications, we can instead utilize a non-stochastic formulation, where the agent can only access the sets of feasible values for all uncertainties and has no knowledge of probability distributions. Such non-stochastic formulations have been utilized in robust control [9]–[11], information theory [12], [13], estimation problems [14], reinforcement learning [15], and decentralized systems [16],

[17]. In this paper, we focus on a centralized non-stochastic control problem where an agent seeks a control strategy to minimize a *maximum* possible cost across a finite-time horizon. It is known that the optimal strategy in such problems can be derived offline using a dynamic program (DP) [10]. However, in general, the agent's action is a function of the entire memory. Therefore, utilizing the DP to compute an optimal strategy requires solving one optimization problem at each time for each possible realization of the memory. This makes the DP computationally challenging for long time horizons because the memory grows in size with time.

This issue can be alleviated using an *information state* to construct the DP. Two well known non-stochastic information states are: (1) the *conditional range*, a set valued information state for terminal cost problems [18], [19], and (2) the *maximum cost-to-come*, a function valued information state for additive cost problems [9], [10]. More recently, a more general notion of information states was developed which also presents approximate information states for terminal cost problems that result in a bounded approximation error [20]. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no general definition of either information states or approximate information states for non-stochastic *additive* cost problems.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows: (1) we use the theory of *cost distributions* to present a general definition for information states to compute an optimal control strategy (Theorem 2) for additive cost problems; (2) we present a definition for approximate information states to compute an approximate control strategy; and (3) we show that the approximate strategy concedes a bounded loss in performance when compared to the optimal strategy (Theorems 3 - 4).

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section II, we present our model. In Section III, we define the notion of the information state and the corresponding DP. In Section IV, we present the approximate information state, approximate DP, and bounds on the approximation loss. In Section V, we present a numerical example to illustrate our results. Finally, in Section VI, we draw concluding remarks and discuss ongoing work.

II. MODEL

A. Notation and Preliminaries

We formulate our non-stochastic control problem using the mathematical framework of *uncertain variables* introduced in [12] for information theory. An uncertain variable is a non-stochastic analogue of a random variable which take values

in a known set and has an unknown distribution. Thus, for a sample space Ω and a given set \mathcal{X} , an uncertain variable is a mapping $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. For any $\omega \in \Omega$, the uncertain variable has the realization $X(\omega) = x \in \mathcal{X}$. To simplify the notation, we often write an uncertain variable as $X \in \mathcal{X}$ instead of $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. The *marginal range* of an uncertain variable X is the set of feasible realizations $[[X]] := \{X(\omega) \mid \omega \in \Omega\}$. For two uncertain variables $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, their *joint range* is the set of feasible simultaneous realizations $[[X, Y]] := \{(X(\omega), Y(\omega)) \mid \omega \in \Omega\}$. The *conditional range* of X given a realization y of Y is the set $[[X|y]] := \{X(\omega) \mid Y(\omega) = y, \omega \in \Omega\}$, and in general, the conditional range of X given Y is $[[X|Y]] := \{[[X|y]] \mid y \in [[Y]]\}$. Next, consider that the sets \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} are compact, nonempty subsets of a metric space (\mathcal{S}, d) and $d(x, y)$ is the distance between any feasible realization $x \in \mathcal{X}$ of X and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ of Y . Then, the distance between the sets \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} is measured using the Hausdorff metric [21, Chapter 1.12]

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \max \left\{ \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} d(x, y), \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, y) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

B. Problem Formulation

We consider a partially observed system where an agent selects actions over $T \in \mathbb{N}$ discrete time steps to control the evolution of a system. At any time $t = 0, \dots, T$, the state of the system is denoted by an uncertain variable $X_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and the action is denoted by an uncertain variable $U_t \in \mathcal{U}$. At each t , the system also receives an uncontrolled disturbance denoted by an uncertain variable $W_t \in \mathcal{W}$. Starting with an initial state $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, the state evolves as $X_{t+1} = f_t(X_t, U_t, W_t)$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$. Before selecting the control action at each t , the agent makes a partial observation of the system state as an uncertain variable $Y_t = h_t(X_t, N_t) \in \mathcal{Y}$ and the uncertain variable $N_t \in \mathcal{N}$ denotes an uncontrolled measurement noise.

Remark 1. We denote generic uncertain variables by sans-serif upper case alphabets $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, whereas, we denote the state and observation at any t by italicized upper-case alphabets $X_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y_t \in \mathcal{Y}$, respectively.

The agent stores the history of observations and control actions in their memory. At each t , the agent's memory is the tuple of uncertain variables $M_t := (Y_{0:t}, U_{0:t-1}) \in \mathcal{M}_t$, where $Y_{0:t} := (Y_0, \dots, Y_t)$. After updating their memory at any t , the agent selects an action $U_t = g_t(M_t)$ using a control law $g_t : \mathcal{M}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. We denote the agent's control strategy by $\mathbf{g} := (g_0, \dots, g_T) \in \mathcal{G}$. After selecting the action U_t , the agent incurs a cost $c_t(X_t, U_t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ at each t . The performance of a strategy $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ is measured using the *worst-case additive cost criterion* given by

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{g}) := \max_{\substack{x_0 \in \mathcal{X}, n_{0:T} \in \mathcal{N}^T \\ w_{0:T-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{T-1}}} \sum_{t=0}^T c_t(X_t, U_t). \quad (2)$$

In (2), we maximize the total cost over all feasible realizations of the *uncontrolled inputs*, i.e., initial state X_0 , noises $\{N_t \mid t = 0, \dots, T\}$, and disturbances $\{W_t \mid t = 0, \dots, T-1\}$. This is sufficient because all other uncertain variables are completely determined by these realizations through the dynamics $\{f_t, h_t \mid t = 0, \dots, T\}$ and the choice of strategy \mathbf{g} . Next, we state the agent's optimization problem.

Problem 1. The optimization problem is $\min_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{g})$, given the feasible sets $\{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{N}\}$ and the functions $\{f_t, h_t, c_t \mid t = 0, \dots, T\}$.

We seek a DP decomposition of Problem 1 which efficiently computes an optimal strategy $\mathbf{g}^* \in \mathcal{G}$. To facilitate this, we impose the following assumptions in our model:

Assumption 1. Each uncontrolled inputs is independent of all other other uncontrolled inputs.

Assumption 1 ensures that the system evolution is Markovian in a non-stochastic sense. This is a standard assumption [18] which will help develop our results.

Assumption 2. Each feasible set $\{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{N}\}$ is a finite subset of a metric space (\mathcal{S}, d) .

Assumption 2 ensures that all extrema are well defined and that an optimal solution to Problem 1 exists. Furthermore, we will use the metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ in Section IV to quantify the distance between two elements in any set.

Assumption 3. All uncertain variables and the cost $c_t(X_t, U_t)$ have a finite maximum value at each t .

Assumption 3 ensures that the functions $\{f_t, h_t, c_t \mid t = 0, \dots, T\}$ are globally Lipschitz. To this end, we will denote the Lipschitz constant of a function f_t by $L_{f_t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

III. DYNAMIC PROGRAMS AND INFORMATION STATES

In this section, we first present a standard terminal cost DP which can obtain the optimal strategy in Problem 1. Then, in Subsection III-B, we construct a DP which is specialized to the additive cost criterion in (2), and in Subsection III-C, we define information states to simplify it. To begin, we transform Problem 1 into a terminal cost problem by augmenting the state X_t at each t with the *accrued cost*

$$A_t := \sum_{\ell=0}^{t-1} c_\ell(X_\ell, U_\ell), \quad (3)$$

which takes values in a finite set $\mathcal{A}_t \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Starting with $A_0 := 0$, the accrued cost evolves as $A_{t+1} = A_t + c_t(X_t, U_t)$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$. Thus, the augmented state (X_t, A_t) has a non-stochastic Markovian evolution. Furthermore, note that the performance criterion (2) can be written as a function of the terminal augmented state (X_T, A_T) , i.e., $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{g}) = \max_{x_0, n_{0:T}, w_{0:T-1}} (c_T(X_T, U_T) + A_T)$. This construction yields a terminal cost optimization problem in $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}$, where the optimal strategy can be computed using a memory based terminal cost DP [20], as follows. For all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we define the value functions

$$Q_t^{\text{tm}}(m_t, u_t) := \max_{m_{t+1} \in [[M_{t+1}|m_t, u_t]]} V_{t+1}^{\text{tm}}(m_{t+1}), \quad (4)$$

$$V_t^{\text{tm}}(m_t) := \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t^{\text{tm}}(m_t, u_t), \quad (5)$$

where, at time T , $Q_T^{\text{lm}}(m_T, u_T) := \max_{a_T, x_T \in \{[A_T, X_T | m_T, u_T]\}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + a_T)$ and $V_T^{\text{lm}}(m_T) := \min_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} Q_T(m_T, u_T)$. The control law at each t is $g_t^{\text{lm}}(m_t) := \arg \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t(m_t, u_t)$. Using standard arguments, we can conclude that the resulting control strategy $\mathbf{g}^{\text{lm}} = (g_0^{\text{lm}}, \dots, g_T^{\text{lm}})$ is an optimal solution to the terminal cost problem as well as Problem 1 [18]. However, note that the right hand side (RHS) of (5) involves solving a minimization problem for each possible realization $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, at each t . The number of possible realizations $|\mathcal{M}_t|$ increases with time because the agent receives more data, and consequently, the DP requires a large number of computations for a longer horizon T . To alleviate this issue, we formulate a DP specialized for additive cost problems in Subsection III-B and simplify it using *information states* in Subsection III-C. We will show (Remark 2) that the specialized DP allows us to define more computationally efficient information states than (4) - (5). To this end, we present a theory of cost distributions in the next subsection which is required to construct the specialized DP.

A. Cost distributions

In this subsection, we develop the mathematical framework of *cost distributions* for finite uncertain variables. Cost distributions were originally defined for $(\max, +)$ algebra [22], and applied to robust control problems [10], [11], [23] independently from the framework of uncertain variables. A cost distribution is a non-stochastic analogue of a probability distribution. Specifically, for a finite sample space Ω with a sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, a cost distribution is a function $q : \mathcal{B}(\Omega) \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup (-\infty, 0]$ satisfying the properties: (1) $q(\Omega) = 0$, (2) $q(\emptyset) = -\infty$, and (3) $q(B) = \max_{\omega \in B} q(\omega)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, where, by convention, the maximum over an empty set is $-\infty$. Furthermore, for two sets $B^1, B^2 \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ with $q(B^2) > -\infty$, the conditional cost distribution of B^1 given B^2 is $q(B^1 | B^2) := q(B^1, B^2) - q(B^2)$. Next, we extend this definition to include finite uncertain variables.

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be a two finite sets and $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be two uncertain variables. The *cost distribution* for any realization $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is $q(x) := \max_{\omega \in \{\Omega | X(\omega) = x\}} q(\omega)$, and the cost distribution for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ given a realization $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $q(y) > -\infty$ is $q(x|y) = q(x, y) - q(y)$.

Any cost distribution given by Definition 1 satisfies the following properties that will be useful in the proof of Theorem 1 in Subsection III-C.

Lemma 1. Consider a sample space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ with a cost distribution $q : \mathcal{B}(\Omega) \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup (-\infty, 0]$. Let $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be two finite uncertain variables and let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that $Y = f(X)$ and $f^{-1}(y) \neq \emptyset$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then,

$$q(y) = \max_{x \in \{\mathcal{X} | f(x) = y\}} q(x), \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (6)$$

and furthermore, for any function $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (g(f(x)) + q(x)) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (g(y) + q(y)). \quad (7)$$

Proof. We first prove (6). Using Definition 1, $q(y) = \max_{\omega \in \{\Omega | Y(\omega) = y\}} q(\omega)$, where $\{\Omega | Y(\omega) = y\} = \cup_{x \in \{\mathcal{X} | f(x) = y\}} \{\Omega | X(\omega) = x\}$. This implies that $q(y) = \max_{x \in \{\mathcal{X} | f(x) = y\}} \max_{\omega \in \{\Omega | X(\omega) = x\}} q(\omega) = \max_{x \in \{\mathcal{X} | f(x) = y\}} q(x)$, where, in the second equality, we used Definition 1. To prove (7), using (6) in the RHS of (7), we obtain, $\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (g(y) + q(y)) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (g(y) + \max_{x \in \{\mathcal{X} | f(x) = y\}} q(x)) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \max_{x \in \{\mathcal{X} | f(x) = y\}} (g(f(x)) + q(x)) = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (g(f(x)) + q(x))$. \square

B. Specialized Dynamic Program

In this subsection, we construct a specialized DP decomposition for Problem 1 using two specific cost distributions, the first of which is an indicator function.

Definition 2. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ be two finite uncertain variables. The *indicator function* for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{I}(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in [[X]], \\ -\infty, & \text{if } x \notin [[X]], \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and the conditional indicator function for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ given a realization $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $\mathbb{I}(y) > -\infty$ is

$$\mathbb{I}(x|y) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in [[X|y]], \\ -\infty, & \text{if } x \notin [[X|y]]. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The indicator function \mathbb{I} can be shown to satisfy the conditions in Definition 1 and thus, it constitutes a valid cost distribution. In addition to Lemma 1, for two uncertain variables $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and any function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it also satisfies the following useful property:

$$\max_{x \in [[X|y]]} f(x) = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + \mathbb{I}(x|y)), \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (10)$$

The second distribution we require is the *accrued distribution* for an uncertain variable at each t . It is defined, next, using the indicator \mathbb{I} and accrued cost $A_t \in \mathcal{A}_t$ from (3).

Definition 3. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ be two finite uncertain variables and let $A_t \in \mathcal{A}_t$ be the accrued cost at any $t = 0, \dots, T$. An *accrued distribution* at any t for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a function $r_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a_t^{\max}, 0]$, given by

$$r_t(x) := \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(x, a_t)) - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(a_t)), \quad (11)$$

and for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ given a realization $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\mathbb{I}(y) > -\infty$, it is a function $r_t : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a_t^{\max}, 0]$, given by

$$r_t(x|y) := \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(x, a_t|y)) - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(a_t|y)), \quad (12)$$

where $a_t^{\max} := \max \mathcal{A}_t$.

At each $t = 0, \dots, T$, the accrued distribution over any uncertain variable satisfies the properties in Definition 1 and thus, it is a valid cost distribution. Furthermore, in Problem 1, note that at each t , we can compute the conditional range $[[X_t, M_{t+1} | m_t, u_t]]$ given the realizations $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$. Subsequently, we can use Definitions 2 - 3 to derive the accrued distribution $r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} | m_t, u_t)$. Since

this accrued distribution can be computed by the agent at each t , we use it in the specialized DP decomposition for Problem 1 as follows. For all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we define the value functions

$$Q_t(m_t, u_t) := \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (c_t(x_t, u_t) + V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} | m_t, u_t)), \quad (13)$$

$$V_t(m_t) := \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t(m_t, u_t), \quad (14)$$

where, at time T , $Q_T(m_T, u_T) := \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | m_T))$ and $V_T(m_T) := \min_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} Q_T(m_T, u_T)$. We define the corresponding control law at time t as $g_t^*(m_t) := \arg \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t(m_t, u_t)$ and the control strategy as $\mathbf{g}^* = (g_0^*, \dots, g_T^*)$. Next, we show that solving the DP (13) - (14) computes the optimal performance and control strategy.

Theorem 1. For all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T$,

$$Q_t^{im}(m_t, u_t) = Q_t(m_t, u_t) + \max_{a_t \in [[A_t | m_t]]} a_t, \quad (15)$$

$$V_t^{im}(m_t) = V_t(m_t) + \max_{a_t \in [[A_t | m_t]]} a_t, \quad (16)$$

and furthermore, \mathbf{g}^* is an optimal solution to Problem 1.

Proof. For all $t = 0, \dots, T$, let $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$ be given realizations of M_t and U_t , respectively. We prove the result by mathematical induction starting at the last time step T . We use (10) to expand the left hand side (LHS) of (15) as $Q_T^{im}(m_T, u_T) = \max_{a_T, x_T \in [[A_T, X_T | m_T, u_T]]} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + a_T) = \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T, x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (x_T + a_T + \mathbb{I}(a_T, x_T | m_T, u_T))$. In the RHS, we add and subtract $\max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(a_T | m_T))$ to write that $Q_T^{im}(m_T, u_T) = \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(a_T, x_T | m_T)) - \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(a_T | m_T))) + \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(a_T | m_T)) = \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | m_T)) + \max_{a_T \in [[A_T | m_T]]} a_T$, where, in the second equality, we use (12) from Definition 3. Thus, using the definition of $Q_T(m_T, u_T)$, we complete the proof for (15) at time T . We can prove (16) at time T directly by minimizing both sides of (15) with respect to $u_T \in \mathcal{U}$. Furthermore, note that $g_T(m_T) = \arg \inf_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} Q_T(m_T, u_T) = \arg \inf_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} Q_T^{im}(m_T, u_T)$, i.e., $u_T = g_T^*(m_T)$ minimizes $Q_T^{im}(m_T, u_T)$. This forms the basis of our induction. Next, for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we consider the induction hypothesis $V_{t+1}^{im}(m_{t+1}) = V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) + \max_{a_{t+1} \in [[A_{t+1} | m_{t+1}]]} a_{t+1}$. Then, using the hypothesis $Q_t^{im}(m_t, u_t) = \max_{m_{t+1} \in [[M_{t+1} | m_t, u_t]]} V_{t+1}^{im}(m_{t+1}) = \max_{m_{t+1} \in [[M_{t+1} | m_t, u_t]]} (V_t(m_{t+1}) + \max_{a_{t+1} \in [[A_{t+1} | m_{t+1}]]} a_{t+1}) = \max_{m_{t+1}, a_{t+1} \in [[M_{t+1}, A_{t+1} | m_t, u_t]]} (V_t(m_{t+1}) + a_{t+1}) = \max_{m_{t+1}, x_t, a_t \in [[M_{t+1}, X_t, A_t | m_t, u_t]]} (V_t(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + a_t) = \max_{m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}, x_t \in \mathcal{X}_{t+1}, a_t \in \mathcal{A}_{t+1}} (V_t(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + a_t + \mathbb{I}(x_t, m_{t+1}, a_t | m_t, u_t))$, where, in the third equality, we use the fact that $[[A_{t+1} | m_{t+1}]] = [[A_{t+1} | m_{t+1}, m_t, u_t]]$ because $m_{t+1} = (m_t, u_t, y_{t+1})$; in the fourth equality, we use the definition of a_{t+1} ; and in the fifth equality, we use the property of the of the indicator

function. Then, as for time T , we add and subtract $\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(a_t | m_t))$ in the RHS and use (12) from Definition 3 to conclude that $Q_t^{im}(m_t, u_t) = \max_{m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}, x_t \in \mathcal{X}_{t+1}} (V_t(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} | m_t, u_t)) - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(a_t | m_t)) = Q_t(m_t, u_t) + \max_{a_t \in [[A_t | m_t]]} a_t$, which proves (15) at time t . We can prove (16) at time t directly by minimizing both sides of (15) respect to $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, and furthermore, $g_t^*(m_t) = \arg \inf_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t(m_t, u_t) = \arg \inf_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t^{im}(m_t, u_t)$. This proves the induction hypothesis at time t and thus, the result holds for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ using mathematical induction. \square

Theorem 1 establishes that the specialized DP (13) - (14) computes an optimal solution to Problem 1. Note that at each t , the optimization in the RHS of (14) must still be solved for each possible $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, in a manner similar to (4) - (5). Thus, we expect the DP decomposition (13) - (14) to require a large number of computations for longer time horizons as more data is added to the memory. In the next subsection, we define *information states* which can resolve this issue.

C. Information States

In this subsection, we present conditions to identify information states which are sufficient to construct an optimal DP decomposition for Problem 1.

Definition 4. An *information state* for Problem 1 at any $t = 0, \dots, T$ is an uncertain variable $\Pi_t = \sigma_t(M_t)$ taking values in a finite set \mathcal{P}_t and generated by a function $\sigma_t : \mathcal{M}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_t$. Furthermore, for all t , for all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\pi_{t+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{t+1}$, it satisfies:

$$r_t(x_t, \pi_{t+1} | m_t, u_t) = r_t(x_t, \pi_{t+1} | \sigma_t(m_t), u_t), \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1, \quad (17)$$

$$r_T(x_T | m_T) = r_T(x_T | \sigma_T(m_T)). \quad (18)$$

In the corresponding DP, for all $\pi_t \in \mathcal{P}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we define the value functions

$$\bar{Q}_t(\pi_t, u_t) := \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \pi_{t+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{t+1}} (\bar{V}_{t+1}(\pi_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \pi_{t+1} | \pi_t, u_t)), \quad (19)$$

$$\bar{V}_t(\pi_t) := \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \bar{Q}_t(\pi_t, u_t), \quad (20)$$

where, at time T , $\bar{Q}_T(\pi_T, u_T) := \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | \pi_T))$ and $\bar{V}_T(\pi_T) := \min_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} \bar{Q}_T(\pi_T, u_T)$. The control law at each t is $\bar{g}_t^*(\pi_t) := \arg \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \bar{Q}_t(\pi_t, u_t)$. Next, we prove that the information state based DP (19) - (20) yields the same value as the specialized DP (13) - (14).

Theorem 2. Let $\Pi_t = \sigma_t(M_t)$ be an information state at each $t = 0, \dots, T$. Then, for all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, $Q_t(m_t, u_t) = \bar{Q}_t(\sigma_t(m_t), u_t)$ and $V_t(m_t) = \bar{V}_t(\sigma_t(m_t))$.

Proof. Let $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$ be given realizations of M_t and U_t , respectively, for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. We prove the result using mathematical induction starting with T , where $Q_T(m_T, u_T) = \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | m_T)) = \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | \sigma_T(m_T))) = \bar{Q}_T(\sigma_T(m_T), u_T)$ holds as a direct consequence of

(18) in Definition 4. Subsequently, by taking the minimum on both sides with respect to $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, it holds that $V_T(m_T) = \bar{V}_T(\sigma_T(m_T))$. With this as the basis, for each $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we consider the induction hypothesis $V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) = \bar{V}_{t+1}(\sigma_{t+1}(m_{t+1}))$. Next, we prove that $Q_t(m_t, u_t) = \bar{Q}_t(\sigma_t(m_t), u_t)$ at time t by showing that the RHS of (13) is equal to the RHS of (19). Using the induction hypothesis in the RHS of (13), $Q_t(m_t, u_t) = \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1}|m_t, u_t)) = \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (\bar{V}_{t+1}(\sigma_{t+1}(m_{t+1})) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1}|m_t, u_t)) = \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \pi_{t+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{t+1}} (\bar{V}_{t+1}(\pi_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \pi_{t+1}|\pi_t, u_t))$, where, in the second equality, we use result 2 from Lemma 1 and (17). Thus, at time t , it holds that $Q_t(m_t, u_t) = \bar{Q}_t(\sigma_t(m_t), u_t)$. Subsequently, we can prove $V_t(m_t) = \bar{V}_t(\sigma_t(m_t))$ by minimizing both sides with $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$. This proves the induction hypothesis at time t , and the result follows by mathematical induction. \square

As a direct consequence of Theorem 2, the control strategy $\bar{g}^* = (\bar{g}_0^*, \dots, \bar{g}_T^*)$ computed using information states is an optimal solution to Problem 1. In practice, using information states to compute \bar{g}^* is more tractable than using the memory to compute g^* only when the set \mathcal{P}_t has fewer elements than \mathcal{M}_t for most instances of time t . This is usually true for systems with long time horizons.

D. Examples of Information States

In this subsection, we present examples of information states which satisfy the conditions in Definition 4.

1) *Partially observed systems*: Consider a general system with a partially observed state. Then, at each $t = 0, \dots, T$ a valid information state which satisfies Definition 4 is the function valued uncertain variable $\Pi_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a_t^{\max}, 0]$. At time t , for a given realization $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ of the memory M_t , the realization of the Π_t is the function $p_t(X_t)$, where, $p_t(x_t) := r_t(x_t|m_t) = \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(x_t, a_t|m_t)) - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(a_t|m_t))$ for all $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. Note that this can be interpreted as a normalization of the standard information state from [9], [10], and this interpretation is consistent with [11].

2) *Perfectly observed systems*: Consider a system where $Y_t = X_t$ for all t . An information state for such a system is $\Pi_t = X_t$ at each t , i.e, the state itself. This information state is simpler than the one in Case 1.

3) *Systems with action dependent costs*: Consider a partially observed system where the incurred cost at each $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ depends only on the control action, i.e., it is given by $c_t(U_t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and the terminal cost is given by $c_T(X_T, U_T)$. For such a system, an information state which satisfies Definition 4 is the conditional range $\Pi_t = [[X_t|M_t]]$ at each t . This information state is simpler than the one presented in Case 1. The derivation for this information state can be found in Appendix A.

Remark 2. From [20], we know that the terminal DP (4) - (5) can be used to derive another information state $\Xi_t = [[X_t, A_t|M_t]]$ for each t for Case 1. The conditional range

Ξ_t can take $2^{|\mathcal{A}_t| \times |\mathcal{X}|}$ feasible values whereas Π_t from Case 1 can take $|\mathcal{A}_t|^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ values. As $|\mathcal{A}_t|$ grows in size with time t , the number of feasible values of Π_t increases at a slower rate than the number of feasible values of Ξ_t . Thus, Π_t yields a more computationally tractable DP than Ξ_t . This illustrates that constructing information states using the specialized DP (13) - (14) is better than using the terminal DP (4) - (5).

Remark 3. Using Definition 4 we can identify simpler information states for systems with special properties, as shown in Cases 2 - 3 when compared to Case 1. However, in many applications, merely using an information state may not sufficiently improve the ease of computing optimal strategies. Thus, we extend Definition 4 to include approximate information states in Section IV.

IV. APPROXIMATE INFORMATION STATES

In this section, we define approximate information states and utilize them to develop an approximate DP for Problem 1 which results in a bounded performance loss. We begin with a definition for the distance between two cost distributions.

Definition 5. Let \mathcal{X} be a finite subset of a metric space (\mathcal{S}, d) with an uncertain variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$, and consider two cost distributions $r : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a^1, 0]$ and $q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a^2, 0]$, $a^1, a^2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then:

- 1) The *finite domains* of r and q are the sets $\mathcal{X}^r := \{x \in \mathcal{X} | r(x) \neq -\infty\}$ and $\mathcal{X}^q := \{x \in \mathcal{X} | q(x) \neq -\infty\}$, respectively.
- 2) For any $x \in \mathcal{X}^r \cup \mathcal{X}^q$, the *nearest finite inputs* for r and q are given by $\psi^r(x) := \arg \min_{\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}^r} d(\hat{x}, x)$, and $\psi^q(x) := \arg \min_{\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}^q} d(\hat{x}, x)$, respectively.
- 3) The *distance* between the distributions r and q is

$$\mathcal{R}(r, q) := \max(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{X}^r, \mathcal{X}^q), \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}^r \cup \mathcal{X}^q} |r(\psi^r(x)) - q(\psi^q(x))|), \quad (21)$$

where, \mathcal{H} is the Hausdorff metric defined in (1).

Remark 4. Recall from Subsection III-A that any cost distribution on an uncertain variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$ cannot identically return $-\infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus, for all distributions r, q on X , the sets \mathcal{X}^r and \mathcal{X}^q are non-empty and subsequently, the distance $\mathcal{R}(r, q)$ always returns a finite value.

Using \mathcal{R} , we can quantify the distance between two different *accrued distributions* on an uncertain variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Specifically, let $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ be two uncertain variables taking realizations $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, respectively, such that $[[X, A_t|y]] \neq \emptyset$ and $[[X, A_t|z]] \neq \emptyset$ for some time t . Then, we denote the functional forms of the conditional distributions on X given y and given z as $r_t(X|y)$ and $r_t(X|z)$, respectively, and quantify the distance between them as

$$\mathcal{R}(r_t(X|y), r_t(X|z)) := \max(\mathcal{H}([X|y], [X|z]), \max_{x \in [[X|y]] \cup [[X|z]]} |r_t(\psi^y(x)|y) - r_t(\psi^z(x)|z)|), \quad (22)$$

where, the finite domains are $\{x \in \mathcal{X} | r_t(x|y) \neq -\infty\} = [[X|y]]$ and $\{x \in \mathcal{X} | r_t(x|z) \neq -\infty\} = [[X|z]]$; and for any $x \in [[X|y]] \cup [[X|z]]$, the nearest finite inputs are $\psi^y(x) :=$

$\arg \min_{\tilde{x} \in [|\mathcal{X}|y]} d(\tilde{x}, x)$ and $\psi^z(x) := \arg \min_{\tilde{x} \in [|\mathcal{X}|z]} d(\tilde{x}, x)$. Next, we use \mathcal{R} to quantify the approximation gap between two accrued distributions in our definition of approximate information states for Problem 1.

Definition 6. An *approximate information state* for Problem 1 at each $t = 0, \dots, T$ is an uncertain variable $\hat{\Pi}_t = \hat{\sigma}_t(M_t)$ taking values in a finite subset $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t$ of some metric space and generated by a function $\hat{\sigma}_t : \mathcal{M}_t \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}_t$. Furthermore, for all t , there exists a parameter $\epsilon_t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, it satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(r_t(X_t, \hat{\Pi}_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t), r_t(X_t, \hat{\Pi}_{t+1} \mid \hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)) \\ \leq \epsilon_t, \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(r_T(X_T \mid m_T), r_T(X_T \mid \hat{\sigma}_T(m_T))) \leq \epsilon_T. \quad (24)$$

In the approximate DP, for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, for all $\hat{\pi}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, we recursively define the value functions

$$\hat{Q}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t) := \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \mid \hat{\pi}_t, u_t)), \quad (25)$$

$$\hat{V}_t(\hat{\pi}_t) := \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t), \quad (26)$$

where, at time T , $\hat{Q}_T(\hat{\pi}_T, u_T) := \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T \mid \hat{\pi}_T, u_T))$ and $\hat{V}_T(\hat{\pi}_T) := \min_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{Q}_T(\hat{\pi}_T, u_T)$. The control law at each t is $\hat{g}_t^*(\hat{\pi}_t) := \arg \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t)$ and the approximate control strategy is $\hat{g}^* := (\hat{g}_0^*, \dots, \hat{g}_T^*)$. Next, we bound the loss of optimality from implementing the approximate control strategy \hat{g}^* in Problem 1 instead of the optimal control strategy g^* . We begin with a preliminary result which will be required in subsequent derivations.

Lemma 2. Let \mathcal{X} be a finite subset of a metric space (\mathcal{S}, d) and consider two cost distributions $r : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a^1, 0]$ and $q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a^2, 0]$, where $a^1, a^2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then, for a Lipschitz function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x)) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x)) \right| \\ \leq (L_f + 1) \cdot \mathcal{R}(r, q). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Proof. We prove this result by considering two cases which are mutually exclusive but cover all the possibilities. *Case 1:* $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x)) \geq \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x))$, which implies that $\left| \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x)) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x)) \right| = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x)) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x))$. We define a variable $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^r$ such that $x^* := \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x))$ and a function $\psi^i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^i$ such that $\psi^i(x) := \arg \min_{\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}^i} d(x, \tilde{x})$ for each $i = r, q$. Then, $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x)) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x)) = f(x^*) + r(x^*) - \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x)) \leq f(x^*) + r(x^*) - f(\psi^q(x^*)) - q(\psi^q(x^*)) \leq L_f \cdot d(x^*, \psi^q(x^*)) + |r(x^*) - q(\psi^q(x^*))| \leq L_f \cdot \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{X}^r, \mathcal{X}^q) + \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}^r \cup \mathcal{X}^q} |r(\psi^r(x)) - q(\psi^q(x))| \leq L_f \cdot \mathcal{R}(r, q) + \mathcal{R}(r, q)$, where, in the first inequality, we use the fact that $q(\psi^q(x^*)) \neq -\infty$; in the second inequality, we use the Lipschitz continuity of f ; in the third inequality, we use the definition of the Hausdorff metric from (1) and the fact that $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}^r} |r(x) -$

$q(\psi^q(x))| = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}^r \cup \mathcal{X}^q} |r(\psi^r(x)) - q(\psi^q(x))|$; and in the fourth inequality, we use (21) from Definition 5. *Case 2:* $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + r(x)) < \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (f(x) + q(x))$, where the result holds using the same arguments as Case 1. \square

Next, we bound the maximum error when approximating the value functions in the optimal DP (4) - (5) with the value functions in the approximate DP (25) - (26).

Theorem 3. Let $L_{\hat{V}_{t+1}}$ be the Lipschitz constant of \hat{V}_{t+1} for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$. Then, for all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$|Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)| \leq \alpha_t, \quad (28)$$

$$|V_t(m_t) - \hat{V}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t))| \leq \alpha_t, \quad (29)$$

where $\alpha_t = \alpha_{t+1} + (2L_t + 1) \cdot \epsilon_t$, where $L_t := \max\{L_{\hat{V}_{t+1}}, L_{c_t}\}$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and $\alpha_T = (L_{c_T} + 1) \cdot \epsilon_T$.

Proof. For all $t = 0, \dots, T$, let $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$ be realizations of M_t and U_t , respectively. We prove both results by mathematical induction, starting with time step T . At T , we directly use (27) from Lemma 2 and (24) from Definition 6 to conclude that $|Q_T(m_T, u_T) - \hat{Q}_T(\hat{\sigma}_T(m_T), u_T)| \leq (L_{c_T} + 1) \cdot \epsilon_T$. Furthermore, minimizing both terms in the LHS of (28) yields $|V_T(m_T) - \hat{V}_T(\hat{\sigma}_T(m_T))| \leq \max_{u_T \in \mathcal{U}} |Q_T(m_T, u_T) - \hat{Q}_T(\hat{\sigma}_T(m_T), u_T)| \leq (L_{c_T} + 1) \cdot \epsilon_T$. This forms the basis of our mathematical induction. Then, at each $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we consider the induction hypothesis $|V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) - \hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}(m_{t+1}))| \leq \alpha_{t+1}$ and first prove (28). Using the triangle inequality, $|Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)| \leq \left| \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t)) - \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}(m_{t+1})) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t)) \right| + \left| \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t)) - \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \mid \hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)) \right|$. Here, for the first term in the RHS, $\left| \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t)) - \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}(m_{t+1})) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t)) \right| \leq \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} |V_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) - \hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}(m_{t+1}))| \leq \alpha_{t+1}$, where in the second inequality, we use the induction hypothesis. Furthermore, in the second term in the RHS, we directly use (27) from 2 and (23) from Definition 6 to conclude that $\left| \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \mid m_t, u_t)) - \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1}} (\hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \mid \hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)) \right| \leq (2L_t + 1) \cdot \epsilon_t$, where, $L_t = \max\{L_{\hat{V}_{t+1}}, L_{c_t}\}$ and $2L_t$ is the Lipschitz constant for the function $\phi(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}, x_t) := \hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t)$ with respect to the variables $(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}, x_t)$ for all $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$. Combining results for each term in the RHS completes the proof for (28) at time t . Next, we prove (29). Using the definition of the value functions in the LHS of (29), $|V_t(m_t) - \hat{V}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t))| = \left| \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t) \right| \leq \max_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} |Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)| \leq \alpha_t$, where in the second inequality, we use (28). This proves the induction hypothesis at time t . Thus, the results hold for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ using mathematical induction. \square

Next, we bound the maximum difference in the performance of an approximate control strategy $\hat{\mathbf{g}}^* := (\hat{g}_0^*, \dots, \hat{g}_T^*)$ and optimal strategy \mathbf{g}^* . Recall that $\hat{g}_t^*(\hat{\pi}_t) = \arg \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t)$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. Then, the equivalent strategy $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_T)$, which utilizes the memory but yield the same actions and performance as $\hat{\mathbf{g}}^*$, is constructed as $g_t(m_t) := \hat{g}_t^*(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t))$ for all t . To compute the performance of \mathbf{g} (and consequently, of $\hat{\mathbf{g}}^*$), we define for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, for all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\Theta_t(m_t, u_t) := \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, m_{t+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+1}} (\Lambda_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, m_{t+1} | m_t, u_t)), \quad (30)$$

$$\Lambda_t(m_t) := \Theta_t(m_t, g_t(m_t)), \quad (31)$$

where, at time T , $\Theta_T(m_T, u_T) := \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | m_T, u_T))$ and $V_T(m_T) = \Theta_T(m_T, g_T(m_T))$. Recursively evaluating the value functions (30) - (31) computes the performance of \mathbf{g} as $\Lambda_0(m_0)$, where $m_0 = y_0$. Note that the performance of \mathbf{g}^* is simply the optimal value. Next, we bound the difference in the performances of \mathbf{g} and \mathbf{g}^* .

Theorem 4. *Let $L_{\hat{V}_{t+1}}$ be the Lipschitz constant of \hat{V}_{t+1} for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$. Then, for all $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$,*

$$|Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \Theta_t(m_t, u_t)| \leq 2\alpha_t, \quad (32)$$

$$|V_t(m_t) - \Lambda_t(m_t)| \leq 2\alpha_t. \quad (33)$$

where $\alpha_t = \alpha_{t+1} + (2L_t + 1) \cdot \epsilon_t$ with $L_t := \max\{L_{\hat{V}_{t+1}}, L_{c_t}\}$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and $\alpha_T = (L_{c_T} + 1) \cdot \epsilon_T$.

Proof. We begin by recursively defining the value functions which compute the performance of the strategy $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$. For all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and for each $\hat{\pi}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_t$ and $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$, let $\hat{\Theta}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t) := \max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1}} (\hat{\Lambda}_{t+1}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + c_t(x_t, u_t) + r_t(x_t, \hat{\pi}_{t+1} | \hat{\pi}_t, u_t))$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_t(\hat{\pi}_t) := \hat{\Theta}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, \hat{g}_t(\hat{\pi}_t))$; where, at time T , $\hat{\Theta}_T(\hat{\pi}_T, u_T) := \max_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}} (c_T(x_T, u_T) + r_T(x_T | m_T, u_T))$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_T(\hat{\pi}_T) := \hat{\Theta}_T(\hat{\pi}_T, \hat{g}_T(\hat{\pi}_T))$. Note that $\hat{\Theta}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t) = \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t)$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_t(\hat{\pi}_t) = \hat{V}_t(\hat{\pi}_t)$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T$, since $\hat{g}_t(\hat{\pi}_t) = \arg \min_{u_t \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\pi}_t, u_t)$. Next, we use the triangle inequality in the LHS of (32) at any t to write $|Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \Theta_t(m_t, u_t)| \leq |Q_t(m_t, u_t) - \hat{Q}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t)| + |\hat{\Theta}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t) - \Theta_t(m_t, u_t)| \leq \alpha_t + |\hat{\Theta}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t) - \Theta_t(m_t, u_t)|$, where, in the second inequality, we use (28) from Theorem 3. Then, to prove (32), it suffices to show that $|\hat{\Theta}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t), u_t) - \Theta_t(m_t, u_t)| \leq \alpha_t$. We can show this in addition to $|\hat{\Lambda}_t(\hat{\sigma}_t(m_t)) - \Lambda_t(m_t)| \leq \alpha_t$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ using mathematical induction and following the same arguments as in Theorem 3. \square

A. Examples of Approximate Information States

In this subsection, we present two examples of approximate information states constructed by state quantization. For the set of states \mathcal{X} , a subset $\hat{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ is a *set of quantized states* with parameter $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ if $\max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{\hat{x}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}} d(x_t, \hat{x}_t) \leq \gamma$ and $\mu(x_t) = \arg \min_{\hat{x}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}} d(x_t, \hat{x}_t)$ is the *quantization function*. We apply this approach to two cases.

1) *Perfectly observed systems:* Consider a system where $Y_t = X_t$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. Recall from Subsection III-D that the information state is simply $\Pi_t = X_t$ and it takes values in \mathcal{X} for all t . Then, an approximate information state for such a system can be defined as the quantized state $\hat{\Pi}_t := \mu(X_t)$. The corresponding constants in Definition 6 are $\epsilon_t = 4\gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma$ for all $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ and $\epsilon_T = 2\gamma$, where L_{f_t} is the Lipschitz constant for f_t . The derivation for ϵ_t can be found in Appendix B.

2) *Systems with action dependent costs:* For such systems, recall from Section III-D that an information state is given by the conditional range $\Pi_t = [[X_t | M_t]]$. We approximate the conditional range by quantizing each element in Π_t using a mapping $\nu : 2^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow 2^{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}$ such that $\nu(\Pi_t) := \{\mu(x_t) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}} | x_t \in \Pi_t\}$. Then, we can consider that $\hat{\Pi}_t = \nu(\Pi_t)$ is an approximate information state. We illustrate its performance in the next section using a numerical example.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

For our numerical example, we consider a problem where an agent pursues a target across a 9×9 grid with static obstacles. At each $t = 0, \dots, T$, the agent's position is denoted by X_t^{ag} and the target's position by X_t^{ta} , each of which takes values in the set of grid cells $\mathcal{X} = \{(-4, -4), (-4, -3), \dots, (3, 4), (4, 4)\} \setminus \mathcal{O}$, where $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{X}$ is a known set of obstacle cells. Let $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{N} = \{(-1, 0), (1, 0), (0, 0), (0, 1), (0, -1)\}$ and let $\mathcal{D} := \{(-1, 1), (1, 1), (1, -1), (-1, -1)\}$. Then, starting at $X_0^{\text{ta}} \in \mathcal{X}$, the target's position is updated as $X_{t+1}^{\text{ta}} = \delta(X_t^{\text{ta}} + W_t \in \mathcal{X}) \cdot (X_t^{\text{ta}} + W_t) + (1 - \delta(X_t^{\text{ta}} + W_t \in \mathcal{X})) \cdot X_t^{\text{ta}}$, where $W_t \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\delta(\cdot)$ is the delta measure which returns 1 if the condition in the argument holds and 0 otherwise. At each t , the agent observes their own position perfectly and the target's position as $Y_t = \delta(X_t^{\text{ta}} + N_t \in \mathcal{X}) \cdot (X_t^{\text{ta}} + N_t) + (1 - \delta(X_t^{\text{ta}} + N_t \in \mathcal{X})) \cdot X_t^{\text{ta}}$, where $N_t \in \mathcal{N}$. Then, the agent selects an action $U_t \in \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{D}$ and updates their position to $X_{t+1}^{\text{ag}} = \delta(X_t^{\text{ag}} + U_t \in \mathcal{X}) \cdot (X_t^{\text{ag}} + U_t) + (1 - \delta(X_t^{\text{ag}} + U_t \in \mathcal{X})) \cdot X_t^{\text{ag}}$. The agent incurs an interim cost $c_t(U_t) := 0.5 \cdot \delta(U_t \in \mathcal{D})$ only if it moves diagonally, and after T time steps, the agent incurs a cost $d(X_T^{\text{ta}}, X_T^{\text{ag}})$ corresponding to the distance remaining from the target at termination. We illustrate this formulation in Fig. 1(a), where: (1) the grey cells denote obstacles, (2) the grey triangle marks the initial position of the agent and the hatched region around it indicates the available actions, and (3) the grey circle marks the initial observation of the agent and the hatched region around it indicates the possible initial positions of the target.

This setup constitutes a system with action dependent costs as described in Subsection III-D. For such a system, an information state at time t is $\Pi_t = (X_t^{\text{ag}}, \Lambda_t)$, where $\Lambda_t = [[X_t^{\text{ta}} | M_t]]$. We construct an approximation of Λ_t at each t using the quantization approach from Subsection IV-A. First, we define a static set of quantized states $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$, with $\gamma = 1$ and quantization function $\mu(x_t) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}$, using the initial observation of the agent, as illustrated using dots in Fig. 1(b). Note that we use a finer quantization around the point of initial observation and sparser quantization elsewhere. Then, the




Fig. 1. The gridworld pursuit problem with the initial conditions $x_0^{\text{ag}} = (1, 1)$ and $y_0 = (-1, -3)$.

approximate range at time t is $\hat{\Lambda}_t = \{\mu(x_t) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}} \mid x_t \in \Lambda_t\}$ and the approximate information state is $\hat{\Pi}_t = (X_t^{\text{ag}}, \hat{\Lambda}_t, Y_0)$. We include Y_0 in $\hat{\Pi}_t$ because it facilitates the update of $\hat{\Lambda}_t$ to $\hat{\Lambda}_{t+1}$. For six initial conditions, we computed the best control strategy using both the optimal DP and approximate DP for $T = 6$. In Fig. 2, we have tabulated the worst-case values (V_0 and \hat{V}_0) and run-times in seconds (Run.) for both DPs. We also evaluated the difference between *actual* costs incurred by the approximate strategy and the optimal strategy, respectively, by implementing both of them in 5000 simulations with randomly generated disturbances. We have marked these differences in Fig. 2 and indicated the frequency of each cost difference by the size of the disc marking it. While the approximate strategy is faster to compute than the optimal strategy for all cases, we note that it admits bounded deviations in actual costs.

Initial Conditions	Strategy IS	Strategy AIS				Cost differences for 5000 simulations							
		V_0	Run. (s)	\hat{V}_0	Run. (s)	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
(2, 3)	(-2, 4)	5	47.8	5	13.5				●	●			
(1, 1)	(-1, -3)	6	1343.1	6	471.3				●	●	●	●	●
(-4, 1)	(-3, -1)	3	524.5	4	235.5				●	●	●	●	●
(2, -3)	(0, 4)	8.5	188.2	8.5	34.2				●	●			
(-4, 4)	(-2, 2)	4	125.9	4.5	23.5				●	●	●	●	●
(-3, 3)	(3, -1)	9.5	330.1	8.5	35.8				●	●	●	●	●

Fig. 2. Results of numerical simulations for $T = 6$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we developed a general theory of information states and approximate information states to tractably compute control strategies in non-stochastic additive cost problems. We used the theoretical framework of cost distributions to present a general definition for information states that compute an optimal control strategy. We showed that specific information states proposed in previous research efforts emerge as special cases of our definition. Then, we extended this definition to approximate information states which can be used to compute approximate control strategies which admit a bounded worst-case performance loss. Finally, using a numerical simulation, we illustrated the trade-off between computational tractability and performance loss inherent in the application of approximate information states. Future work should consider the use of this theory in non-stochastic reinforcement learning problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. Malikopoulos, "On team decision problems with nonclassical information structures," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2022 (in press) arXiv:2101.10992.
- [2] P. R. Kumar and P. P. Varaiya, *Stochastic Systems: Estimation, Identification, and Adaptive Control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.
- [3] J. Subramanian, A. Sinha, R. Seraj, and A. Mahajan, "Approximate information state for approximate planning and reinforcement learning in partially observed systems," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 1–83, 2022.
- [4] A. Nayyar and D. Teneketzis, "Common knowledge and sequential team problems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 5108–5115, 2019.
- [5] A. Dave, N. Venkatesh, and A. A. Malikopoulos, "On decentralized control of two agents with nested accessible information," in *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3423–3430, IEEE, 2022.
- [6] M. Rasouli, E. Miehling, and D. Teneketzis, "A scalable decomposition method for the dynamic defense of cyber networks," in *Game Theory for Security and Risk Management*, pp. 75–98, Springer, 2018.
- [7] M. Giuliani, J. Lamontagne, P. Reed, and A. Castelletti, "A state-of-the-art review of optimal reservoir control for managing conflicting demands in a changing world," *Water Resources Research*, vol. 57, no. 12, p. e2021WR029927, 2021.
- [8] S. Mannor, D. Simester, P. Sun, and J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Bias and variance approximation in value function estimates," *Management Science*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 308–322, 2007.
- [9] M. R. James, J. S. Baras, and R. J. Elliott, "Risk-sensitive control and dynamic games for partially observed discrete-time nonlinear systems," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 780–792, 1994.
- [10] P. Bernhard, "Minimax - or feared value - L_1 / L_∞ control," *Theoretical computer science*, vol. 293, no. 1, pp. 25–44, 2003.
- [11] P. Bernhard, "A separation theorem for expected value and feared value discrete time control," *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, vol. 1, pp. 191–206, 1996.
- [12] G. N. Nair, "A nonstochastic information theory for communication and state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 1497–1510, 2013.
- [13] A. Rangi and M. Franceschetti, "Towards a non-stochastic information theory," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 997–1001, IEEE, 2019.
- [14] Y. Cong, X. Wang, and X. Zhou, "Rethinking the mathematical framework and optimality of set-membership filtering," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2544–2551, 2021.
- [15] P. Gradu, J. Hallman, and E. Hazan, "Non-stochastic control with bandit feedback," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 10764–10774, 2020.
- [16] M. Gagrani and A. Nayyar, "Decentralized minimax control problems with partial history sharing," in *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3373–3379, IEEE, 2017.
- [17] A. Dave, N. Venkatesh, and A. A. Malikopoulos, "On decentralized minimax control with nested subsystems," in *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3437–3444, IEEE, 2022.
- [18] D. Bertsekas and I. Rhodes, "Sufficiently informative functions and the minimax feedback control of uncertain dynamic systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 117–124, 1973.
- [19] T. Başar and P. Bernhard, *H-infinity optimal control and related minimax design problems: a dynamic game approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [20] A. Dave, N. Venkatesh, and A. A. Malikopoulos, "Approximate information states for worst-case control of uncertain systems," in *Proceedings of the 61th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022 (to appear) arXiv:2203.16418.
- [21] M. F. Barnsley, *Superfractals*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [22] V. Kolokoltsov and V. P. Maslov, *Idempotent analysis and its applications*, vol. 401. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997.
- [23] M. Akian, J.-P. Quadrat, and M. Viot, "Bellman processes," in *11th International Conference on Analysis and Optimization of Systems Discrete Event Systems*, pp. 302–311, Springer, 1994.

APPENDIX A - DERIVATION OF INFORMATION STATE FOR SYSTEMS WITH ACTION DEPENDENT COSTS

In this appendix, we derive the information states for partially observed systems with control dependent costs as described in Subsection III-D. We recall that for a general partially observed system, the information state at each $t = 0, \dots, T$ is given by the function $\Pi_t : \mathcal{X}_t \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [-a_t^{\max}, 0]$. Given a realization $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ of the memory M_t at any time t , it takes as its realization the functional form $p_t(X_t) = r_t(X_t|m_t)$. Next, we prove an important result to establish the information state.

Lemma 3. *Let the incurred cost at each $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ be $c_t(U_t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then, for any $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$, it holds that $r_t(x_t|m_t) = \mathbb{I}(x_t|m_t)$.*

Proof. Let $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ and $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ be realizations of the uncertain variables M_t and X_t , respectively, at each $t = 0, \dots, T$. Let $m_t = (y_{0:t}, u_{0:t-1})$ at time t . Then, we note that there exists a known function $\bar{c}_t : \prod_{\ell=0}^{t-1} \mathcal{U}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_t$ such that $a_t = \bar{c}_t(u_{0:t-1})$. We use this property to write that

$$\begin{aligned} r_t(x_t|m_t) &= \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(x_t, a_t|m_t)) - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(a_t|m_t)) \\ &= \bar{c}_t(u_{0:t-1}) + \mathbb{I}(x_t|y_{0:t}, u_{0:t-1}) - \bar{c}_t(u_{0:t-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{I}(x_t|y_{0:t}, u_{0:t-1}) = \mathbb{I}(x_t|m_t), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where, in the second equality, we use the fact that $\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(x_t, a_t|m_t)) = \max_{a_t \in \mathbb{I}([A_t|m_t])} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(x_t, a_t, m_t))$ and $\mathbb{I}([A_t|m_t]) = \{\bar{c}_t(u_{0:t-1})\}$. \square

As a direct consequence of Lemma 3, for a given realization of the memory $m_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ at time t , the realization of the information state for a perfectly observed system is the function form of the indicator function $\mathbb{I}(X_t|m_t)$, where for all $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mathbb{I}(x_t|m_t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x_t \in \mathbb{I}([X_t|m_t]), \\ -\infty, & \text{if } x_t \notin \mathbb{I}([X_t|m_t]). \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

From (35), note that the functional form $\mathbb{I}(X_t|m_t) = \mathbb{I}(X_t|\mathbb{I}([X_t|m_t]))$, and thus, at each time $t = 0, \dots, T$, given the realized memory $m_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, it is sufficient to simply track the conditional range $\mathbb{I}([X_t|m_t])$ to derive the information state $r_t(X_t|m_t)$ for all $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. This implies that $\mathbb{I}([X_t|m_t])$ satisfies all the properties of an information state.

APPENDIX B - DERIVATION OF APPROXIMATE INFORMATION STATE FOR PERFECTLY OBSERVED SYSTEMS

In this appendix, we derive the values of ϵ_t for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ while using state quantization for a perfectly observed system, as described in Subsection IV-A. Recall that the set of quantized states is $\hat{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with a parameter γ and quantization function $\mu(x_t) = \arg \min_{\hat{x}_t \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}} d(x_t, \hat{x}_t)$ such that $d(x_t, \mu(x_t)) \leq \gamma$ for all $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$. Note that for any uncertain variable $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, the conditional range given $\mu(x_t)$ at any t is $\mathbb{I}([Z|\mu(x_t)]) = \cup_{\hat{x}_t \in \mathbb{I}([X_t|\mu(x_t)])} \mathbb{I}([Z|\hat{x}_t])$. Next, we state and prove the main result of this appendix.

Theorem 5. *For all $t = 0, \dots, T$, let $\mu : \mathcal{X}_t \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_t$ such that $\max_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t} d(x_t, \mu(x_t)) \leq \gamma$ and let L_{f_t} be the Lipschitz constant for f_t . Then, for all t , $\hat{\Pi}_t = \mu(X_t)$ is an approximate information state which satisfies (23) with $\epsilon_t = 4\gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma$ and (24) with $\epsilon_T = 2\gamma$.*

Proof. For all $t = 0, \dots, T$, let $m_t = (x_{0:t}, u_{0:t-1})$ be the realization of M_t and let the approximate information state be $\hat{x}_t = \mu(x_t)$. We first derive the value of ϵ_T in the RHS of (24). Note that at time T , $\mathbb{I}([X_T|m_T]) = \mathbb{I}([X_T|x_T]) = \{x_T\}$ and $\mathbb{I}([X_T|\hat{x}_T]) = \{x_T \in \mathcal{X} \mid d(x_T, \hat{x}_T) \leq \gamma\}$. Furthermore, $r_T(X_T|m_T) = r_T(X_T|x_T)$ because x_T is an information state. Then, we can expand the LHS in (24) using 22 as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{R}(r_T(X_T|x_T), r_T(X_T, \mu(x_T))) \\ &= \max \{ \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{I}([X_T|x_T]), \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])), \\ &\quad \max_{\tilde{x}_T \in \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])} |r_T(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|x_T) - r_T(\tilde{x}_T|\mu(x_T))| \}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

We will analyse the RHS of (36) term by term. For the first term, we use the definition of the Hausdorff metric from (1) to state that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{I}([X_T|x_T]), \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])) &= \max_{\tilde{x}_T \in \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])} d(x_T, \tilde{x}_T) \\ &\leq \max_{\tilde{x}_T \in \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])} (d(x_T, \mu(x_T)) + d(\mu(x_T), \tilde{x}_T)) \leq 2\gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where, in the first inequality we use the triangle inequality; and in the second inequality, we use the definition of the quantization function μ . For the second term in the RHS of (36), we use Definition 3 to write that

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{\tilde{x}_T \in \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])} |r_T(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|x_T) - r_T(\tilde{x}_T|\mu(x_T))| \\ &\leq \max_{\tilde{x}_T \in \mathbb{I}([X_T|\mu(x_T)])} \left| \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T), a_T|x_T)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_T, a_T|\mu(x_T))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max_{a_T \in \mathbb{I}([A_T|x_T])} a_T + \max_{a_T \in \mathbb{I}([A_T|\mu(x_T)])} a_T \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

In the RHS of (38), note that \mathbb{I} is a conditional cost distribution on the uncertain variables in the argument. Thus, we can use the property of conditional cost distributions from Definition 1 to state that

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T), a_T|x_T)) \\ &\quad - \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_T, a_T|\mu(x_T))) \\ &= \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|a_T, x_T) + \mathbb{I}(a_T|x_T)) \\ &\quad - \max_{a_T \in \mathcal{A}_T} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_T|a_T, \mu(x_T)) + \mathbb{I}(a_T|\mu(x_T))) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \max_{a_T \in [[A_T|x_T]]} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|a_T, x_T)) \\
&\quad - \max_{a_T \in [[A_T|\mu(x_T)]]} (a_T + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_T|a_T, \mu(x_T))), \\
&= \max_{a_T \in [[A_T|x_T]]} a_T + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|x_T) \\
&\quad - \max_{a_T \in [[A_T|\mu(x_T)]]} a_T - \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_T|\mu(x_T)), \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the second equality, we use (10); and in the third equality, because $\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T) = \min_{\bar{x}_T \in [[X_T|x_T]]} d(x_T, \bar{x}_T) = x_T$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|a_T, x_T) = \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|x_T) = 0, \tag{40}$$

and because $a_T \in [[A_T|\bar{x}_T]]$ for all $\bar{x}_T \in [[X_T|\mu(x_T)]]$ when $a_T \in [[A_T|\mu(x_T)]] = \cup_{\bar{x}_T \in [[X_T|\mu(x_T)]]} [[A_T|\bar{x}_T]]$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
[[X_T|a_T, \mu(x_T)]] &= \{\bar{x}_T \in \mathcal{X} | d(\bar{x}_T, \mu(x_T)) \leq \gamma, \\
&\quad a_T \in [[A_T|\bar{x}_T]]\} \\
&= \{\bar{x}_T \in \mathcal{X} | d(\bar{x}_T, \mu(x_T)) \leq \gamma\} = [[X_T|\mu(x_T)]]. \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

On substituting (39) into (38), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\tilde{x}_T \in [[X_T|\mu(x_T)]]} |r_T(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|x_T) - r_T(\tilde{x}_T|\mu(x_T))| \\
&= \max_{\tilde{x}_T \in [[X_T|\mu(x_T)]]} |\mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_T}(\tilde{x}_T)|x_T) - \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_T|\mu(x_T))| = 0. \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, substituting both (37) and (42) into (36), we can conclude that $\epsilon_T = \max\{2\gamma, 0\} = 2\gamma$.

Next, to derive the value of ϵ_t for any $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, we expand the LHS of (23) using Definition 3 as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{R}(r_t(X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t), r_t(X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t)) \\
&= \max \left\{ \mathcal{H}([X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t], [X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]), \right. \\
&\quad \max_{(\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}_{t+1}) \in [[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]]} |r_t(\psi^{x_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}_{t+1})|x_t, u_t) \\
&\quad \left. - r_t(\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t) \right\}. \tag{43}
\end{aligned}$$

Once again, we analyze the RHS of (43) term by term. For the first term, we use the definition of the Hausdorff metric and rearrange some terms to write that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{H}([X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t], [X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]) \\
&\leq \max \left\{ \min_{\tilde{x}_t \in [[X_t|\mu(x_t)]]} (d(x_t, \tilde{x}_t)) \right. \\
&\quad + \max_{\tilde{x}_{t+1}^1 \in [[\hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t]]} \min_{\tilde{x}_{t+1}^2 \in [[\hat{X}_{t+1}|\tilde{x}_t, u_t]]} d(\tilde{x}_{t+1}^1, \tilde{x}_{t+1}^2), \\
&\quad \max_{\tilde{x}_t \in [[X_t|\mu(x_t)]]} (d(x_t, \tilde{x}_t)) \\
&\quad \left. + \max_{\tilde{x}_{t+1}^2 \in [[\hat{X}_{t+1}|\tilde{x}_t, u_t]]} \min_{\tilde{x}_{t+1}^1 \in [[\hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t]]} d(\tilde{x}_{t+1}^1, \tilde{x}_{t+1}^2) \right\}. \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

In the first term in the RHS of (44), note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\tilde{x}_{t+1}^1 \in [[\hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t]]} \min_{\tilde{x}_{t+1}^2 \in [[\hat{X}_{t+1}|\tilde{x}_t, u_t]]} d(\tilde{x}_{t+1}^1, \tilde{x}_{t+1}^2) \\
&\leq \max_{w_t \in \mathcal{W}_t} d(\mu(f_t(x_t, u_t, w_t)), \mu(f_t(\tilde{x}_t, u_t, w_t))) \\
&\leq \max_{w_t \in \mathcal{W}_t} (d(\mu(f_t(x_t, u_t, w_t)), f_t(x_t, u_t, w_t)) \\
&\quad + d(f_t(x_t, u_t, w_t), f_t(\tilde{x}_t, u_t, w_t)) \\
&\quad + d(f_t(\tilde{x}_t, u_t, w_t), \mu(f_t(\tilde{x}_t, u_t, w_t)))) \\
&\leq \gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma + \gamma, \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the first inequality, we simply use the definition of \tilde{x}_{t+1}^1 and \tilde{x}_{t+1}^2 ; in the second inequality, we use the triangle inequality; and in the third inequality, we use the Lagrange continuity of f and the definition of the quantization function μ . This exact result also holds for the second term in the RHS of (44). Thus, we can substitute (45) in (44) to conclude that $\mathcal{H}([X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t], [X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]) \leq \max_{\tilde{x}_t \in [[X_t|\mu(x_t)]]} d(x_t, \tilde{x}_t) + 2\gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma \leq 4\gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma$.

For the second term in the RHS of (43), we use Definition 3 to write that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}) \in [[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]]} |r_t(\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1})|x_t, u_t) \\
&\quad - r_t(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t)| \\
&= \max_{(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}) \in [[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]]} \left| \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1})|a_t|x_t, u_t)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}, a_t|\mu(x_t), u_t)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \max_{a_t \in [[A_t|x_t, u_t]]} a_t + \max_{a_t \in [[A_t|\mu(x_t), u_t]]} a_t \right|. \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

In the RHS of (46), the first two terms can be expanded using Definition 1 in a manner similar to (39), to write that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1})|a_t|x_t, u_t)) \\
&\quad - \max_{a_t \in \mathcal{A}_t} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}, a_t|\mu(x_t), u_t)) \\
&= \max_{a_t \in [[A_t|x_t, u_t]]} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1})|a_t, x_t, u_t)) \\
&\quad - \max_{a_t \in [[A_t|\mu(x_t), u_t]]} (a_t + \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}|a_t, \mu(x_t), u_t)) \\
&= \max_{a_t \in [[A_t|x_t, u_t]]} a_t + \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1})|x_t, u_t) \\
&\quad - \max_{a_t \in [[A_t|\mu(x_t), u_t]]} a_t - \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t). \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality, because $\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\tilde{x}_t) = x_t$ and $\psi^{x_t, u_t}(\hat{x}_{t+1}) = \mu(f_t(x_t, u_t, \tilde{w}_t))$, where $\tilde{w}_t = \arg \min_{\tilde{w}_t \in \mathcal{W}} d(\hat{x}_{t+1}, f_t(x_t, u_t, \tilde{w}_t))$, it holds that $[[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|a_t, x_t, u_t]] = [[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|x_t, u_t]]$, and similarly, it holds that $[[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|a_t, \mu(x_t), u_t]] = [[X_t, \hat{X}_{t+1}|\mu(x_t), u_t]]$. On substituting (47) into (46),

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}) \in [[X_t, \tilde{X}_{t+1} | \mu(x_t), u_t]]} \left| r_t(\psi^{x_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}) | x_t, u_t) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - r_t(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1} | \mu(x_t), u_t) \right| \\
& = \max_{(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}) \in [[X_t, \tilde{X}_{t+1} | \mu(x_t), u_t]]} \left| \mathbb{I}(\psi^{x_t}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1}) | x_t, u_t) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \mathbb{I}(\tilde{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t+1} | a_t, \mu(x_t), u_t) \right| = 0, \quad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

and subsequently, substituting into (43) yields that $\epsilon_t = \max\{4\gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma, 0\} = 4\gamma + 2L_{f_t} \cdot \gamma$.

□