

Distributional dynamic risk measures in Markov decision processes ^{*}

Ziteng Cheng [†] and Sebastian Jaimungal [†]

Abstract.

Based on the concept of law-invariant convex risk measures, we introduce the notion of distributional convex risk measures and employ them to define distributional dynamic risk measures. We then apply these dynamic risk measures to investigate Markov decision processes, incorporating latent costs, random actions, and weakly continuous transition kernels. Furthermore, the proposed dynamic risk measures allows risk aversion to change dynamically. Under mild assumptions, we derive a dynamic programming principle and show the existence of an optimal policy in both finite and infinite time horizons. Moreover, we provide a sufficient condition for the optimality of deterministic actions. For illustration, we conclude the paper with examples from optimal liquidation with limit order books and autonomous driving.

Key words. Dynamic programming, Markov decision processes, Risk measures, Risk averse

AMS subject classifications. 90C39, 91G70

1. Introduction. Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) may be viewed as 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 in the vast area of MDPs may be founded in several textbooks, e.g., [7, 35, 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 convex risk measures [2, 23, 30]. A naïve combination of convex risk measures and discounted total costs, however, lacks time consistency, hindering the derivation of a corresponding DPP. Roughly speaking, time consistency refers to the property that smaller scores in future epochs guarantee a smaller score in the current epoch. We refer to [9] for a survey on various definitions of time consistency. There is a stream of literature (see, e.g., [25, 45, 43, 46, 28, 41, 19, 3]) that studies time consistency from multiple angles and/or attempts to integrate convex risk measures and their variations into MDPs. While here we are not concerned with model uncertainty, we would like to point out [8] and the references therein for a framework that handles model uncertainty in MDPs.

Here, we focus on the framework proposed in [46]. While a plethora of studies exist on conditional and dynamic risk measures, the problem of risk-averse MDPs and their corresponding DPP cannot be straightforwardly inferred from the established properties of these risk measures. Broadly speaking, DPPs transform a sequential optimization problem into the task of solving an operator Bellman equation. In the context of risk-averse MDPs, this de-

*

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, <http://sebastian.statistics.utoronto.ca>, ziteng.cheng@utoronto.ca).

mands separate research, as in general, a readily solvable DPP in terms of operator equations requires additional conditions beyond properties of conditional and dynamic risk measures. This is particularly true when considering the attainability of optimal actions. Below, we offer a concise review of the established DPPs that align with the general framework initiated by [46]. [46] considers deterministic costs, 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 [47] for the assumptions needed. [49] extends the infinite horizon DPP to unbounded costs as well as for average dynamic risk measures. The risk transition mappings involved are assumed to exhibit an analogue of a strong Feller property. [20] studies a similar infinite horizon DPP with unbounded costs under a different set of assumptions. Recently, [4] considers unbounded latent costs and establishes the corresponding finite and infinite horizon DPPs. They 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 coherency property. They also require the underlying MDP to exhibit a certain strongly continuous/semi-continuous transition mechanism. [21, 22] 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 [24] 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 finite and infinite horizon risk averse MDPs in a similar framework as above, but with latent costs and randomized actions, under a weakly continuous transition mechanism, subject to state-dependent dynamic risk measures. Below we provide a high level discussion on some of the open problems we address in this paper. We would like to note that in some of the earlier risk-averse MDP frameworks, latent costs were not considered. We believe that in many circumstances, latent costs can be used to take account for the risk related to factors such as time-discretization and processing delays. To the best of our knowledge, [4] is the first to consider latent costs within a risk-averse MDPs frameworks. Their dynamic risk measures, however, are constructed from compositions of static risk measures. A framework that allows for state-dependent risk measures allows for greater flexibility in adjusting the level of risk aversion depending on where one is in state space. Apart from the points mentioned above, it is worth questioning whether it is possible to modify the existing risk-averse MDP framework to account for the randomness in randomized actions in a risk-averse manner. We note that randomized actions are allowed in [20], but are evaluated in an arguably risk-neutral manner. Lastly, an adequate discussion on weakly continuous transition kernels is missing from the existing literature on risk averse MDPs. Weakly continuous transition kernels are often preferred in practice, as they provide the flexibility to consider transition dynamics that are partly random and partly deterministic. Moreover, they facilitate data-based modeling by removing the need to working with the density of the kernel or the underlying probability spaces, which typically requires additional model assumptions.

Our formulation of risk-averse MDPs is grounded in the concept of distributional convex risk measures. In our context, a distributional convex risk measure is essentially a reincar-

nation of a law-invariant convex risk measure, with the key difference being that it takes a probability on \mathbb{R} as its input instead of a random variable. We introduce the distributional dynamic risk measures as nested compositions of potentially state-dependent distributional convex risk measures. This framework seamlessly integrates latent costs and random actions through the concept of regular conditional distributions. Furthermore, the distributional setup provides an appropriate foundation for balancing various assumptions, including a weakly continuous transition kernels, while still ensuring the attainment of the optimal outcome. This, in turn, allows for greater flexibility in risk-averse modeling. It's important to note that, although the construction above may seem like a straightforward alteration of existing frameworks, it involves some unique technical aspects that have not been previously discussed. For simplicity, we consider bounded costs, which allows for conditional risk mappings that contain essential supremum as a major ingredient – a feature that is often omitted otherwise.

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

1. We introduce and explore the concept of distributional convex risk measures. Subsequently, we construct the distributional dynamic risk measure by compounding potentially state-dependent distributional convex risk measures in both finite and infinite horizon. The infinite horizon definition requires that the distributional convex risk measure involved are normalized. The regularities underpinning these constructions are examined in detail.
2. Under mild assumptions, we derive both finite and infinite horizon DPPs, for MDPs with latent costs and randomized actions as well as weakly continuous transition kernel, subject to the aforementioned distributional dynamic risk measures. We prove the existence of an optimal policy that is Markovian. Furthermore, we demonstrate that, in both finite and infinite horizons, the optimal Markovian policy is no worse than any other history-dependent policies. We refer to [Theorem 4.2](#), [Proposition 4.3](#) and [Theorem 5.5](#), [Proposition 5.7](#) for detailed statements.
3. In [Proposition 6.1](#), we provide a sufficient condition for the optimality of deterministic actions. This condition could be useful in scenarios where the agent prefers to avoid the complexity and unpredictability associated with randomized actions.

To demonstrate the practical application of the proposed framework of risk-averse MDPs, we also present two examples in [Section 7](#) on optimal liquidation with limit order books and autonomous driving. The optimal liquidation example, posed within a finite horizon context with discrete state and action spaces, underscores the potential of the framework to incorporate latent costs and adjust risk aversion in response to the evolving state. The autonomous driving example, posed within an infinite horizon context, showcases the framework's capability to handle a large and complex state space, a requirement often necessary for constructing more realistic models. It's worth noting that the autonomous driving example naturally necessitates certain degenerate transition mechanisms. While these are not compatible with strongly continuous transition kernels in general, they can be easily incorporated into a weakly continuous transition kernel as we do here.

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 distributional convex risk measure. Formulations for risk-

averse MDP are 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. In [Section 4](#), we derive the finite horizon DPP for Markovian actions and argue that Markovian actions can achieve the optimal. The analogous results for infinite horizon are presented in [Section 5](#). In [Section 6](#), we establish a sufficient condition on the optimality of deterministic actions. [Section 7](#) contains a variety of examples that serve to illustrate the concepts proposed in this study. We also provide an example illustrating the necessity of randomized actions and some technical lemmas in [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B](#), respectively. Finally, for reference, [Appendix C](#) 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, and probability, among others. We use the following notations for various spaces throughout the paper. We also provide in [Appendix C](#) a glossary of notations used throughout the paper, but introduce them as they arise.

- 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 $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}) := \sigma(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \cup \{\{+\infty\}, \{-\infty\}\})$.
- 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 $v = (v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$, and equip it with norm $\|v\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \mathbb{Y}} |v_t(y)|$, 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 suppose $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ does not have atoms. 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. For $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$, we define $\|Z\|_\infty := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(|Z| > r) = 0\}$.
- 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 sets. 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 $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, which models the state space. Let Ξ be the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. We endow Ξ with the 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 the σ -algebra containing sets of the form $\{\xi \in \Xi : \xi(A) \in B\}$ with $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$. In other words, $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$ is the smallest σ -algebra on Ξ such that the mapping $A \mapsto \xi(A)$ is $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$ - $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ measurable for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. Equivalently,¹ $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$ can be defined as the σ -algebra containing sets $\{\xi \in \Xi : \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\xi(dx) \in B\}$ for all

¹One direction is obvious because $\xi(A) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_A(x)\mu(dx)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. The other direction follows from an application of monotone class theorem for functions (cf. [27, Theorem 5.2.2]) on $\{f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) : \xi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\xi(dx) \text{ is } \mathcal{E}(\Xi)\text{-}\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \text{ measurable}\}$, where $\mathcal{E}(\Xi)$ is defined in the initial way, along with the fact that pointwise convergence preserves measurability (cf. [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29]).

- $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. In view of Lemma B.5, we have $\mathcal{B}(\Xi) = \mathcal{E}(\Xi)$.
- Let \mathbb{A} be another complete separable metric space equipped with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$, which models the action space. 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 B.5 again, we have $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$.
 - We consider policies subject to state dependent admissible domains of actions. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\mathcal{A}_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{A}}$ be 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 measures 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 $t \in \mathbb{N}$.
 - For a closed $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we let $\mathcal{P}(F)$ the set of probability measures on $(F, \mathcal{B}(F))$, endowed with weak topology. The corresponding Borel σ -algebra is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(F))$. Since $\mathcal{P}(F)$ is separable and metrizable (cf. [1, Section 15.3, Theorem 15.15]), invoking Lemma B.5 again, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(F))$ coincides with the evaluation σ -algebra $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}(F))$. When $F \subset \mathbb{R}$, we may treat $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ as an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ with support $\mu \subseteq F$. We let $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ consists of probability measures on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ with bounded support, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}([-n, n])$. Note that $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ is not complete under the metric induced by the weak topology. We also define $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}^2)$ in a similar manner.

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 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.

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 $\pi \in \Pi_t$.

By [31, Chapter I Section 3, Theorem 3] (see also [14, Theorem 10.4.8 and Example 10.4.9]), if Y is a complete separable metric space and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{B}(Y)$ 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 up to a \mathbb{P} -negligible set of $\omega \in \Omega$ (cf. [14, Lemma 10.4.3]). In view of Lemma B.5, $P^{Y|\mathcal{G}}$ 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 all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We also let $\mathfrak{A} := (A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an \mathbb{A} -valued \mathbb{G} -adapted process. \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{A} represent the underlying (state) 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 a mapping $h_B^t : (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ 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 $h_B^t(x, a)$ 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 $h_B(x, a)$ 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

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

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 a mapping $\pi_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\Lambda, \mathcal{E}(\Lambda))$ 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. Distributional convex risk measures. Let us first recall the definition of a (proper) convex risk measure on $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$.

Definition 2.2. $\rho : L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a convex risk measure if

- (i) (Translation invariance) $\rho(X + c) = \rho(X) + c$ for any $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (ii) (Monotonicity) $\rho(Z) \leq \rho(Z')$ for any $Z, Z' \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ with $Z \leq Z'$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.;
- (iii) (Convexity) $\rho(\theta Z + (1 - \theta)Z') \leq \theta\rho(Z) + (1 - \theta)\rho(Z')$ for any $Z, Z' \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

We say ρ is normalized if $\rho(0) = 0$, and ρ is law-invariant if $\mathcal{L}(Z) = \mathcal{L}(Z')$ implies $\rho(Z) = \rho(Z')$, where $\mathcal{L}(Z)$ stands for the law of Z .

We can employ a law-invariant convex risk measure ρ to define a convex risk measure that acts on probabilities on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$, by using quantile transform. More precisely, we consider a mapping, denoted by σ , from the $\mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ to $(-\infty, \infty]$ defined by $\sigma(\mu) := \rho(F_\mu^{-1}(U))$, where $F_\mu(r) := \mu((-\infty, r])$, $F_\mu^{-1}(u) := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : F_\mu(r) \geq u\}$, and $U \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$. The subsequent proposition provides further justification for this definition.

Proposition 2.3. Let ρ be a law-invariant convex risk measure and σ be defined as above. Then, σ satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) $\sigma(\mu * \delta_c) = \sigma(\mu) + c$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$.³
- (b) For any $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$, $\mu((-\infty, r]) \geq \mu'((-\infty, r])$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $\sigma(\mu) \leq \sigma(\mu')$.
- (c) Consider a $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Denote the first and second marginal of ζ by ζ_0 and ζ_1 , respectively. For $\theta \in (0, 1)$, let $\zeta_\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ be characterized by

$$\zeta_\theta((-\infty, r]) = \zeta(\{(r_0, r_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (1 - \theta)r_0 + \theta r_1 \leq r\}).$$

Then, $\sigma(\zeta_\theta) \leq (1 - \theta)\sigma(\zeta_0) + \theta\sigma(\zeta_1)$.

Moreover, if ρ is normalized, then $\sigma(\delta_0) = 0$.

Conversely, suppose σ satisfies conditions (a) (b) (c) above. Then, $\rho(X) := \sigma(\mathcal{L}(X))$, $X \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ is a law-invariant convex risk measure. Moreover, if $\sigma(\delta_0) = 0$, then ρ is normalized.

Proof. First, suppose ρ is a convex risk measure. Note that $\sigma(\mu * \delta_c) = \rho(F_{\mu * \delta_c}^{-1}(U)) = \rho(F_\mu^{-1}(U) + c) = \sigma(\mu) + c$ due to the translation invariance of ρ , which proves (a). Regarding (b), we proceed with quantile transform. Note that $F_\mu^{-1} \geq F_{\mu'}^{-1}$ for $u \in [0, 1]$ because $F_\mu(r) \leq F_{\mu'}(r)$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, $F_\mu^{-1}(U) \geq F_{\mu'}^{-1}(U)$. Invoking the monotonicity of ρ , proves (b). For (c), we consider the multi-dimensional quantile transform. Let F_{ζ_0} be the CDF of ζ_0 and $F_{\zeta_{1|0}}$ be CDF of the second entry conditioned on the first entry. In view of existence of regular conditional probability discussed in Section 2.1, $F_{\zeta_{1|0}}$ is indeed well-defined. Let U_0, U_1 be independently $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$. By [40, Theorem 1], $(F_{\zeta_0}^{-1}(U_0), F_{\zeta_{1|0}}^{-1}(U_1 | F_{\zeta_0}^{-1}(U_0))) \sim \zeta$. It follows that $(1 - \theta)F_{\zeta_0}^{-1}(U_0) + \theta F_{\zeta_{1|0}}^{-1}(U_1 | F_{\zeta_0}^{-1}(U_0)) \sim \zeta_\theta$. Invoking the convexity of ρ , proves (c). Finally, if ρ is normalized, we have $\sigma(\delta_0) = \rho(0) = 0$.

Next, we prove the converse direction. By definition, ρ is law-invariant. Moreover, ρ is translation invariant and inherits the normalized property from a normalized σ . Regarding the monotonicity, as $Z \leq Z'$, we must have $\mathbb{P}(Z \leq r) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z' \leq r)$. It follows from (b) that

³* stands for convolution.

$\rho(Z) \leq \rho(Z')$. Finally, the convexity of ρ is again an immediate consequence of (c) and the definition. \blacksquare

In light of [Proposition 2.3](#), we introduce the following notion of distributional convex risk measure.

Definition 2.4. $\sigma : \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ is a distributional convex risk measure if it satisfies

- (i) $\sigma(\mu * \delta_c) = \sigma(\mu) + c$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) For any $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$, $\mu((-\infty, r]) \geq \mu'((-\infty, r])$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $\sigma(\mu) \leq \sigma(\mu')$.
- (iii) Consider a $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with bounded support. Denote the first and second marginal of ζ by ζ_0 and ζ_1 , respectively. For $\theta \in [0, 1]$, let $\zeta_\theta \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ be characterized by

$$\zeta_\theta((-\infty, r]) = \zeta(\{(r_0, r_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (1 - \theta)r_0 + \theta r_1 \leq r\}).$$

Then, $\sigma(\zeta_\theta) \leq \theta \sigma(\zeta_0) + (1 - \theta) \sigma(\zeta_1)$.

We say σ is normalized if $\sigma(\delta_0) = 0$.

Remark 2.5. We could replace all the \mathcal{P}_b in [Definition 2.4](#) with \mathcal{P} so that the definition covers probabilities that may not have bounded support. As, however, we subsequently assume boundedness, the regularities of such extended definition will be investigated in future work.

The following proposition provides a heuristic understanding of the underlying mechanism that allows us to incorporate weakly continuous dynamics into risk-averse MDPs.

Proposition 2.6. Let σ be a distributional convex risk measure. If $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ converges weakly to $\mu^0 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ and there is a bounded $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{support } \mu^n \subseteq B$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(\mu^n) \geq \sigma(\mu^0)$.

Proof. Let $\rho(Z) := \sigma(\mathcal{L}(Z))$, $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$. By [Proposition 2.3](#), ρ is a law-invariant convex risk measure. Next, in view of the Skorohod representation (cf. [14, Theorem 8.5.4]), there is a sequence $(Z^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathcal{L}(Z^n) = \mu^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(Z^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. Note that $\mathbb{P}(Z_n \in B) = 1$. Let Z^0 be the pointwise limit of $(Z^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. As almost sure convergence implies convergence in distribution, we have $\mathcal{L}(Z^0) = \mu^0$. Invoking the Fatou's property of ρ (cf. [37, Theorem 2.1]), we conclude that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(\mu^n) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(Z^n) \geq \rho(Z^0) = \sigma(\mu^0). \quad \blacksquare$$

Remark 2.7. Apart from [Proposition 2.3](#) and [Proposition 2.6](#), the distributional convex risk measure also inherits other properties from law invariant convex risk measure.

- By applying the Kusuoka representation on $\rho(Z) := \sigma(\mathcal{L}(Z))$, $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ (cf. [37, Theorem 2.1]), there is a convex $\beta : \mathcal{P}([0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\sigma(\mu) = \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}([0, 1])} \left\{ \int_{[0, 1]} \overline{\text{AV@R}}_\kappa(\mu) \eta(d\kappa) - \beta_t(\eta) \right\} \quad (2.6)$$

for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$, where

$$\overline{\text{AV@R}}_\kappa(\mu) := \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (z - q)_+ \mu(dz) \right\}, \quad \kappa \in (0, 1] \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\overline{\text{AV@R}}_0(\mu) := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mu((r, \infty)) = 0\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Note (2.7) follows from the extremal representation of average value-at-risk in [44], and (2.8) is the essential supremum of a real-valued random variable with distribution μ .

- Let $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$. We say μ is dominated by μ' in convex order if for any convex $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(r) \mu(dr) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(r) \mu'(dr)$. It follows immediately from (2.7) and (2.8) that for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, $\overline{\text{AV@R}}_{\kappa}$ is consistent with convex order. Consequently, σ is also consistent with convex order.

2.4. Distributional dynamic risk measures. In this section, we introduce distributional dynamic risk measures as a nested composition of distributional convex risk measures. To achieve this, we consider a distributional convex risk measure σ_0 and a family of distributional convex risk measures $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$. We make the following standing assumption throughout the paper.

Assumption 2.8. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathcal{P}(K) \mapsto \sigma_{t,x}(\mu) \in (-\infty, \infty]$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(K))$ - $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathbb{R}})$ measurable and for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a $b_t \geq 0$ such that $|\sigma_{t,x}(\delta_0)| \leq b_t$ for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

We refer to Section 7.1 for two examples of $\sigma_{t,x}$.

Let $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ be the discount factor. For $\mathfrak{Z} = (Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$, we first define the finite horizon distributional dynamic risk measure

$$\zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \begin{cases} \sigma_{t,x}(P^{W_t^T | \mathcal{U}_t}), & 0 < t < T, \\ \sigma_{T,x}(P^{Z_T | \mathcal{U}_T}), & t = T, \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

where for $0 < t < T$

$$W_t^T = Z_t + \gamma \zeta_{t+1, X_{t+1}, T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}).$$

For $t = 0$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\zeta_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \sigma_0(\mathcal{L}(Z_0 + \gamma \zeta_{1, X_1, T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}))).$$

Notably, the x entry in $\sigma_{t,x}$ provides us with the flexibility of adjusting risk aversion based on the value of the state process \mathfrak{X} at that time. This allows for situational adaptation and varying degrees of risk aversion depending on the circumstances. In Lemma 2.9 below, we validate the definition in (2.9) for $0 < t < T$. The validity of $\zeta_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$ follows automatically once Lemma 2.9 is proved. Below, we say $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized if $\sigma_{t,x}$ is normalized for each $(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}$. Obviously, $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized if and only if $b_t = 0$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.9. Let $\mathfrak{Z} = (Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ and $t, T \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 < t < T$. We have $(x, \omega) \mapsto \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_t$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable and $\|W_t^T\|_\infty \leq \sum_{r=t}^T \gamma^{r-t} (b_t + \|Z_r\|_\infty)$. Consequently, if $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized, then $\|W_t^T\|_\infty \leq \sum_{r=t}^T \gamma^{r-t} \|Z_r\|_\infty$.

Proof. We start by analyzing the measurability of $(x, \omega) \mapsto \sigma_{T,x}(P^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}(\omega, \cdot))$. Note that $Z_T \in [-\|Z_T\|_\infty, \|Z_T\|_\infty]$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Then, by (2.1),

$$P^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T} \in \mathcal{P}([-\|Z_T\|_\infty, \|Z_T\|_\infty]), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.} \quad (2.10)$$

Let us momentarily consider a version of $P^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}$, denoted by $\bar{P}^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}$, such that (2.10) is true for all ω . For this version, in view of the discussion in Section 2.1, we have $\omega \mapsto \bar{P}^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}(\omega, \cdot)$ is \mathcal{U}_T - $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}([-\|Z_T\|_\infty, \|Z_T\|_\infty]))$ measurable and thus $(x, \omega) \mapsto \sigma_{T,x}(\bar{P}^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}(\omega, \cdot))$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_T$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Moreover, due to the uniqueness of regular conditional distribution discussed in Section 2.1, it is true for \mathbb{P} -almost every ω that for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\sigma_{T,x}(P^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}(\omega, \cdot)) = \sigma_{T,x}(\bar{P}^{Z_T|\mathcal{U}_T}(\omega, \cdot))$. Since \mathcal{F}_1 contains all the \mathbb{P} -negligible sets and $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{U}_T$, the measurability is de facto version independent. The above, together with (2.9), Definition 2.4 (i) and (ii), implies that

$$\left| \zeta_{T, X_T, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \right| \leq b_T + \|Z_T\|_\infty, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Consequently,

$$\left| W_{T-1}^T \right| = \left| Z_{T-1} + \gamma \zeta_{T, X_T, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \right| \leq \|Z_{T-1}\|_\infty + \gamma(b_T + \|Z_T\|_\infty), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.11)$$

Inducting backward with a similar reasoning, we conclude the proof. \blacksquare

The finite horizon distributional dynamic risk measure defined in (2.9) satisfies the time consistency property below.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $0 \leq s \leq t < T$. Consider $\mathfrak{Z} = (Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $\mathfrak{Z}' = (Z'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$. If $\mathbb{P}(Z_r = Z'_r) = 1$ for $r = s, \dots, t$ and $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{t+1, x, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{t+1, x, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}'), x \in \mathbb{X}) = 1$, then $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{s, x, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{s, x, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}'), x \in \mathbb{X}) = 1$.*

Proof. The proof is conceptually straightforward, with the exception of some technicalities needed to address the regular conditional distributions. It is sufficient to prove the case of $s = t > 0$ as the case of $s < t$ and/or $s = 0$ can be proved by induction. We fix T for the remainder of the proof. In view of (2.9), let $W_t = Z_t + \gamma \zeta_{t+1, X_{t+1}, T}^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathfrak{Z})$ and $W'_t = Z_t + \gamma \zeta_{t+1, X_{t+1}, T}^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathfrak{Z}')$. Let $\bar{P}^{(W_t, W'_t)|\mathcal{U}_t}$ be the regular conditional distribution of (W_t, W'_t) given \mathcal{U}_t . Since $W_t \leq W'_t$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., by (2.9), Definition 2.1 (iii), $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(w_1 - w_2) \bar{P}^{(W_t, W'_t)|\mathcal{U}_t}(dw_1 dw_2) = 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bar{P}^{W_t|\mathcal{U}_t}((-\infty, r]) \geq \bar{P}^{W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t}((-\infty, r]), r \in \mathbb{R}\right) = 1, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\bar{P}^{W_t|\mathcal{U}_t} := \bar{P}^{W_t, W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t}(\cdot \times \mathbb{R})$ and $\bar{P}^{W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t} := \bar{P}^{W_t, W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t}(\mathbb{R} \times \cdot)$ are the first and second marginal distribution of $P^{W_t, W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t}$, respectively. Note additionally that $\bar{P}^{W_t|\mathcal{U}_t}$ and $\bar{P}^{W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t}$ are respectively the regular conditional distributions of W_t and W'_t given \mathcal{U}_t . Since regular conditional distributions are unique up to a \mathbb{P} -negligible set, by (2.12) and Definition 2.4 (ii), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t, x, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{t, x, T}^{\mathbf{x}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}'), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_{t, x}(P^{W_t|\mathcal{U}_t}) \leq \sigma_{t, x}(P^{W'_t|\mathcal{U}_t}), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1. \quad \blacksquare$$

In what follows, we define the infinite horizon dynamic risk measure. Consider $\mathfrak{Z} = (Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|Z_t\|_\infty < \infty$. Additionally, we assume $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and suppose that $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. We note that $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ being normalized is not necessarily required for the construction of infinite horizon dynamic risk measure, but normalization greatly eases the analysis. We define

$$\zeta_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{0,T}(\mathfrak{Z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}), \quad (t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}. \quad (2.13)$$

The validity of the definitions in (2.13) are justified in Lemma 2.11 below. For the remainder of this paper, we default to the $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_t$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable version whenever we engage with $\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$.

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|Z_t\|_\infty < \infty$, $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathbb{P}\left(\left(\zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right)_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ converges for any } x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1$. Moreover, there is a $\bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$ such that $\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) = \bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1$ and $(x, \omega) \mapsto \bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_t$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Finally, $\zeta_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$ converges as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\zeta_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$ is finite.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.9 and that $(\sigma_{t,x})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is normalized, $\|W_T^{T+r}\|_\infty \leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty$ for any $(T, r) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. By Definition 2.4 (i) (ii), we have $\|\zeta_{T,X_T,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\|_\infty \leq (1-\gamma)^{-1} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty$. Consequently,

$$Z_{T-1} - \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty \leq Z_{T-1} + \gamma \zeta_{T,X_T,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq Z_{T-1} + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By (2.9) and Definition 2.4 (i) (ii), with a similar reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 2.10, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{T-1,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty \leq \zeta_{T-1,x,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{T-1,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1.$$

We next proceed by backward induction. Suppose for some $t < T$, it is true for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty \leq \zeta_{t,x,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) + \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{t-1}^{T+r} &= Z_{t-1} + \gamma \zeta_{t,x,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \\ &\leq Z_{t-1} + \gamma \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) + \frac{\gamma^{T-(t-1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty = W_{t-1}^T + \frac{\gamma^{T-(t-1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $W_{t-1}^{T+r} \geq W_{t-1}^T - \gamma^{T-(t-1)}(1-\gamma)^{-1} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Handling the conditional distributions of W_{t-1}^{T+r} and W_{t-1}^T given \mathcal{U}_{t-1} with the same technique from the proof of Proposition 2.10, by Definition 2.4 (i) (ii), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t-1,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \frac{\gamma^{T-(t-1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty \leq \zeta_{t-1,x,T+r}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{t-1,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) + \frac{\gamma^{T-(t-1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1.$$

Therefore, for any $(t, T, r) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ with $t \leq T$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\zeta_{t,x,T+r}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right)_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ converges for any } x \in \mathbb{X}\right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{T \geq t} \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{\left|\zeta_{t,x,T+r}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right\}\right) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

In view of [Lemma 2.9](#), with similar reasoning as before, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{T \geq t} \left\{\left|\zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right\}\right) = 1,$$

which together with (2.14) implies the boundedness. Regarding the measurability, by (2.14) and the setting that \mathcal{F}_1 contains all the \mathbb{P} -negligible sets, we have

$$\mathcal{N} := \left\{\omega \in \mathbb{X} \times \Omega : \left(\zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right)_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ converges for any } x \in \mathbb{X}\right\}^c \in \mathcal{U}_t.$$

We let $\bar{\zeta}_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) := \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}^c} \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$ and define $\bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\zeta}_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$. Then, $\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) = \bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1$. Note the convergence in the definition of $\bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}$ is pointwise in $(x, \omega) \in \mathbb{X} \times \Omega$. This together with [Lemma 2.9](#) and the fact that pointwise convergence preserves measurability (cf. [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29]) implies that $\bar{\zeta}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{U}_t$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Finally, the statement for $\zeta_{0,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$ follows analogously. \blacksquare

To conclude this section, we demonstrate that $(\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma})_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ adheres to a similar recursive relationship and exhibits the same time consistency as its finite horizon counterpart.

Proposition 2.12. *Consider $\mathfrak{Z} = (Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}, \mathfrak{Z}' = (Z'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ with $\|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, \|\mathfrak{Z}'\|_\infty < \infty$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) = \sigma_{t,x}(P^{W_t^\infty | \mathcal{U}_t}), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1, \quad (2.15)$$

where $W_t^\infty = Z_t + \gamma \zeta_{t+1, X_{t+1}, \infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})$. Moreover, let $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If $\mathbb{P}(Z_r = Z'_r) = 1$ for $r = s, \dots, t$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{t+1,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{t+1,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}'), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1$, then $\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta_{s,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) \leq \zeta_{s,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}'), x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1$.

Proof. By (2.14) and the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigcap_{T \geq t} \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{\left|\zeta_{t,x,T+r}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right\} \\ & \subseteq \bigcap_{T \geq t} \left\{\left|\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathbf{x},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_\infty, x \in \mathbb{X}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z}) - \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_{\infty}, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\left|W_t^{\infty} - \left(Z_t + \gamma \zeta_{t+1, X_{t+1}, T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right)\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-(t+1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_{\infty}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.17)$$

By combining [Definition 2.4](#) (i) (ii), [\(2.9\)](#) and [\(2.17\)](#), with a similar reasoning as in the proof of [Proposition 2.10](#), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sigma_{t,x}(P^{W_t^{\infty}|\mathcal{Z}_t}) - \zeta_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-(t+1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_{\infty}, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1.$$

This together with [\(2.16\)](#) implies that for any $t < T$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sigma_{t,x}(P^{W_t^{\infty}|\mathcal{Z}_t}) - \zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{Z})\right| \leq \frac{(1+\gamma)\gamma^{T-(t+1)}}{1-\gamma} \|\mathfrak{Z}\|_{\infty}, x \in \mathbb{X}\right) = 1,$$

which proves [\(2.15\)](#). The proof for the remaining statement on time consistency can be directly derived from the arguments used in [Proposition 2.10](#), and is therefore omitted here. ■

2.5. Problem formulation. Here, we provide some standing assumptions and remarks on the key problem that we address: how can the distributional dynamic risk measure be optimised 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 [\[1, Section 18.1, Theorem 18.6\]](#), $\{(x, a) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A} : a \in \mathcal{A}_t(x)\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$). Throughout the rest of the paper, we make the following standing assumption.⁴

Assumption 2.13. *The family $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P}), \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{G}, \Psi\}$ satisfies the conditions below:*

- (i) *there exist ξ_1 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 ξ_1 is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ and P satisfies*
 - $P(t, x, a, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ for any $(t, x, a) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A}$;
 - $(x, a) \mapsto P(t, x, a, B)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ -measurable for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$;
- (ii) *for any Markovian policy $\rho = (\pi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Pi$, there is $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi$ such that [\(2.5\)](#) holds true for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.*

When \mathfrak{A} is associated with some Markovian policy $\rho \in \Pi$ via [\(2.5\)](#), we 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 force $C_0 \equiv 0$. Let us define $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) := (C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}))_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. Below is our main goal.

$$\text{For } T \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, \text{ find } \inf_{(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi} \zeta_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X},\gamma}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})), \text{ and the optimal policy if exists.} \quad (\text{P})$$

⁴For a nontrivial example, one can set $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{A} = \mathbb{R}$ 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 quantile transform (cf. [\[40, Theorem 1\]](#)). For examples of \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{A} that are complete separable metric spaces, we refer to [\[12\]](#).

For $T \in \mathbb{N}$, it is a finite horizon problem. For $T = \infty$, it is an infinite horizon problem and, as seen in [Section 2.4](#), the definition of $\zeta_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X},\gamma}$ is based on the assumptions that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized.

Remark 2.14. At times, the choice of discount factor in an infinite horizon can be controversial. One approach to address this is to consider the existence of a Markovian policy that is optimal for all $\gamma \in (\delta, 1)$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$, which is known as Blackwell optimality (cf. [\[11\]](#)). In a risk-neutral setting with discrete state and action spaces, Blackwell optimality does exist. The proof hinges on that the value function uniquely solves an affine equation; see also [\[42, Section 10.1\]](#), [\[32, Section 3.1\]](#). However, in a risk-averse setting, where the affine property is often absent, Blackwell optimality can be elusive. Another potentially promising approach to address uncertainty in the discount factor γ involves considering the limit of $\zeta_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X},\gamma}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{A}))$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 1$. In the risk-neutral setting with discrete state and action spaces, it has been shown that this limit while scaled properly coincides with average optimality (cf. [\[42, Corollary 8.2.5\]](#), [\[26\]](#)). However, the equivalence of this limit in current context remains unclear.

In what follows, we fix $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ for finite horizon problems and $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ for infinite horizon problems. The variable γ will subsequently be omitted from the notation $\zeta_{t,T}^{\mathbb{X},\gamma}$.

In addition to [Assumption 2.13](#), we invoke further technical assumptions for the derivation of the DPP to be rigorous.

Assumption 2.15. 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) for any compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_b(K)$ converging weakly to $\mu^0 \in \mathcal{P}(K)$ and $(x^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ that converges to $x^0 \in \mathbb{X}$, we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{t,x^n}(\mu^n) \geq \sigma_{t,x^0}(\mu^0)$;
(iv) the cost function C_t is lower semi-continuous and $\|C_t\|_{\infty} \leq b$ for some $b > 0$.

Note [Assumption 2.15](#) (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 2.16. The preceding assumptions do not lead to any contradiction. Indeed, several earlier assumptions can be derived from [Assumption 2.15](#). Specifically, according to [Assumption 2.15](#) (i), by [Assumption 2.15](#) (i), $(x, a) \mapsto P(t, x, a, \cdot)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ measurable. Combining this with [Lemma B.5](#) ensures that any probability measure P that satisfies [Assumption 2.15](#) (i) also meets the conditions on P as stated in [Assumption 2.13](#) (i). In our current framework where the input space \mathbb{X} is equipped with $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, the upper hemi-continuity in [Assumption 2.15](#) (ii) implies weak measurability, as delineated in [\[1, Section 17.2, Lemma 17.4 and Section 18.1, Lemma 18.2\]](#). Finally, [Assumption 2.15](#) (iii) implies the measurability in [Assumption 2.8](#) as $\{(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathcal{P}_K(\mu) : \sigma_{t,x}(\mu) \geq c\}$ is closed for any $c \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$.

3. Auxiliaries. Temporarily, let us restrict our attention to Markovian policies ρ and investigate the finite horizon $\mathcal{C}_{t,x,T}^{\mathbb{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^\rho, \mathcal{A}^\rho))$ introduced in (2.9). The Markovian nature of the controlled process provides a way to express $\mathcal{C}_{t,x,T}^{\mathbb{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^\rho, \mathcal{A}^\rho))$ as composition of operators, which in turn facilitates the derivation of a DPP. The various operators involved are introduced below.

For $t = 0$ we define a functional $H_0 : \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$H_0 v := \sigma_0(\tilde{P}_0^v), \quad (3.1)$$

where \tilde{P}_0^v is the distribution of $\gamma v(Y)$ and $Y \sim \xi_1$. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we define an operator $G_t^\lambda : \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ as

$$G_t^\lambda v(x) := \sigma_{t,x}(\tilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\tilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v$ is the distribution of $C_t(x, A, Y) + \gamma v(Y)$, and $A \sim \lambda$ and $Y \sim \int_{\mathcal{A}} P(t, x, a, \cdot) \lambda(da)$. More precisely,

$$\tilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v(B) = \int_{\mathcal{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (3.3)$$

Although H_0 and G_t^λ depend on γ through (3.3), as γ is fixed we omit γ from the notation of H_0 and G_t^λ . Furthermore, for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho \in \Pi$, we define an operator $H_t^\rho : \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ as

$$H_t^\rho v(x) := G_t^{\pi_t(x)} v(x). \quad (3.4)$$

We first delve into the fundamental properties of the operators introduced previously. [Lemma 3.1](#) and [Lemma 3.2](#) collectively confirm the range of G_t^λ and H_t^ρ , as specified in their respective definitions.

Lemma 3.1. *The following is true for any $(t, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N} \times \Lambda$:*

(a) *Suppose [Assumption 2.15](#) (iv) holds. If $v^1, v^2 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ and $v^1 \leq v^2$, then $G_t^\lambda v^1 \leq G_t^\lambda v^2$. Moreover, if $\sigma_{t,x}$ is normalized for $x \in \mathbb{X}$, then $G_t^\lambda v(x) \in [-b - \gamma \|v\|_\infty, b + \gamma \|v\|_\infty]$.*

(b) *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 hold analogously.

Proof. These are immediate consequences of [Definition 2.4](#). ■

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose [Assumption 2.15](#) (i) (iii) (iv) holds. 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. Consequently, the mapping $x \mapsto H_t^\rho v(x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable.*

Proof. Let $c = b + \|v\|_\infty$. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}([-c, c])$. Next, by [Lemma B.3](#) we have

$$(x, a) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(x, a, y) + v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy)$$

is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A}) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. By [Lemma B.5](#) (where we set $f((x, \lambda), a) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(x, a, y) + v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy)$ and $M(x, \lambda) = \lambda$),

$$(x, \lambda) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_B(C_t(x, a, y) + v(y)) P(t, x, a, dy) \lambda(da)$$

is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Lambda) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Thus, $(x, \lambda) \mapsto \widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Lambda) - \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}([-c, c]))$ measurable. Then, by the monotone class theorem (cf. [[13](#), Theorem 1.9.3 (ii)]), $(x, \lambda) \mapsto (x, \widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Lambda) - \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}([-c, c]))$ measurable. The first claim of the theorem then follows as compositions of measurable functions are measurable (cf. [[1](#), Section 4.5, Lemma 4.22]). The second statement follows analogously. \blacksquare

Next, we reformulate the finite horizon distributional dynamic risk measures as compositions of H_t^p operators. Let $O(x) := 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

[Lemma 3.3](#). *Under [Assumption 2.15](#) (iii) (iv), for any $0 < t \leq T < \infty$,*

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

and

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

Proof. It is straightforward to verify that $\widetilde{P}_{T, X_T^p, \pi_T(X_T^p)}^O$ is a regular conditional distribution of $C_T(X_T^p, A_T^p, X_{T+1}^p)$ given \mathcal{U}_T . By [\(2.9\)](#) and [\(3.4\)](#), we have

$$\zeta_{T, X_T^p, T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathbb{A}^p)) = \sigma_{T, X_T^p}(\widetilde{P}_{T, X_T^p, \pi_T(X_T^p)}^O) = H_T^p O(X_T^p), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Note that $\widetilde{P}_{T, X_{T-1}^p, \pi_{T-1}(X_{T-1}^p)}^{H_T^p O}$ is the regular conditional distribution of $C_{T-1}(X_{T-1}^p, A_{T-1}^p, X_T^p) + \gamma \zeta_{T, X_T^p, T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathbb{A}^p))$ given \mathcal{U}_{T-1} . By [\(2.9\)](#) and [\(3.4\)](#) again, we have

$$\zeta_{T-1, X_{T-1}^p, T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathbb{A}^p)) = \sigma_{T-1, X_{T-1}^p}(\widetilde{P}_{T-1, X_{T-1}^p, \pi_{T-1}(X_{T-1}^p)}^{H_T^p O}) = H_{T-1}^p \circ H_T^p O(X_{T-1}^p), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Proceeding by induction backwards, we conclude the proof. \blacksquare

Below, we show that the mapping $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda v(x)$ inherits the lower semi-continuity property from v .

[Lemma 3.4](#). *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. Under [Assumption 2.15](#) (i) (iii) (iv), 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. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_t^{\lambda^n} v(x^n) < G_t^{\lambda^0} v(x^0)$. By definition (see [\(3.2\)](#)), we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{t, x^n}(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v) < \sigma_{t, x^0}(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^0, \lambda^0}^v). \quad (3.5)$$

Next, there exists a subsequence $(x^{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{t, x^{n_k}} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^{n_k}, \lambda^{n_k}}^v \right) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{t, x^n} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v \right).$$

To ease the notation, without loss of generality, we assume $(\sigma_{t, x^n}(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges. Next, let $c = b + \gamma \|v\|_\infty$ and note that $\text{support } \widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v \subseteq [-c, c]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ due to [Assumption 2.15](#) (iv). Thus, by the Prokhorov theorem (cf. [1, Section 15.6, Theorem 15.22]), $(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a weakly converging subsequence. Thus, without loss of generality, we assume $(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly and denote its limit by \overline{P}^0 . By [Lemma B.4](#) (f) and the fact that a CDF has at most countably many points of discontinuity, we have

$$\left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v((r, \infty)) = \overline{P}^0((r, \infty)) \right\} \text{ is dense in } \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover, note that $(x, a, y) \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x, a, y) + \gamma v(y))$ is lower semicontinuous. In view of [Assumption 2.15](#) (i), applying [Lemma B.6](#) repeatedly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v((r, \infty)) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x^n, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x^n, a, dy) \lambda^n(da) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{1}_{(r, \infty)}(C_t(x^0, a, y) + \gamma v(y)) P(t, x^0, a, dy) \lambda^0(da) \\ &= \widetilde{P}_{t, x^0, \lambda^0}^v((r, \infty)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Therefore, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v((-\infty, r]) \leq \widetilde{P}_{t, x^0, \lambda^0}^v((-\infty, r])$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}$. This together with (3.6) and the right continuity of CDF implies

$$\overline{P}^0((-\infty, r]) \leq \widetilde{P}_{t, x^0, \lambda^0}^v((-\infty, r]), \quad r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows from [Assumption 2.15](#) (iii) and [Definition 2.4](#) (ii) that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{t, x^n} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^n, \lambda^n}^v \right) \geq \sigma_{t, x^0} \left(\overline{P}^0 \right) \geq \sigma_{t, x^0} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t, x^0, \lambda^0}^v \right),$$

which contradicts (3.5). ■

Next, we introduce a contraction property below. This contraction property will prove useful when we establish the infinite horizon DPP in [Section 5](#).

[Lemma 3.5](#). *Suppose [Assumption 2.15](#) (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*

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

and

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

Proof. Note that $v^1 - \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty \leq v^2 \leq v^1 + \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty$. In view of (3.3), for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^1 - \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty}((-\infty, r]) \geq \widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^2}((-\infty, r]) \geq \widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^1 + \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty}((-\infty, r]).$$

The above together with Definition 2.4 (ii) implies that

$$\sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^1 - \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty} \right) \leq \sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^2} \right) \leq \sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^1 + \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty} \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}.$$

It follows from Definition 2.4 (i) and (3.3) that

$$\sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^1} \right) - \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty \leq \sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^2} \right) \leq \sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^{v^1} \right) + \gamma \|v^1 - v^2\|_\infty, \quad x \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Hence, recalling the definition of G_t^λ from (3.2), this proves the inequality with G_t^λ . The inequality with H_0 can be proved analogously. \blacksquare

4. Finite horizon dynamic programming principle. To obtain our main result concerning the finite horizon DPP, we require proving regularity of its various components. To do so, we introduce some new notations and some technical lemmas.

For $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$ we use a recursion to define the value functions as follows

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

and $J_{0,T}^p := H_0 J_{1,T}^p$. Note that, by Lemma 3.2, the mapping $x \mapsto H_t^p v(x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. As a direct consequence of Lemma 3.3, we have the following relationship between the distributional dynamic risk measure and the value functions:

$$\zeta_{0,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = J_{0,T}^p, \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_{t,\mathbb{X}^p,T}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p)) = J_{t,T}^p(X_t^p), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad t, T \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t < T. \quad (4.2)$$

We next define the risk-averse version of a Bellman operator, denoted S_t , which acts on $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, as

$$S_t v(x) := \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda v(x) = \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} \sigma_{t,x} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v \right), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.3)$$

For $t, T \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$J_{t,T}^* := \begin{cases} O, & t > T \\ S_t J_{t+1,T}^*, & t \leq T \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

and $J_{0,T}^* := H_0 J_{1,T}^*$. For definition (4.4) to be well defined, we must investigate the measurability of $J_{t+1,T}^*$ (boundedness is obvious from Lemma 3.1 (a)). The lemma below resolves this issue by establishing its lower semicontinuity.

Lemma 4.1. *Under Assumption 2.15, for any $t, T \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t < T$, $x \mapsto J_{t,T}^*(x)$ is lower semicontinuous on \mathbb{X} .*

Proof. Due to Assumption 2.15 (i) and Prokhorov theorem (cf. [1, Section 15.6, Theorem 15.22]), $\omega_t(x)$ is compact. If $t = T$, then $J_{t,T}^* = S_t O$ by (4.4), and the lower semi-continuity in $x \in \mathbb{X}$ follows from Assumption 2.15 (ii), Lemma 3.4, and Lemma B.7. We induce backward for $t < T$. As $J_{t,T}^* = S_t J_{t+1,T}^*$, invoking Assumption 2.15 (ii), Lemma 3.4, and Lemma B.7 again, we conclude the proof. \blacksquare

Below we present one of our main results – a finite horizon DPP.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$. Under Assumption 2.15, the following is true.*

(a) *For any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t,T}^*(x)$ 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*

$$\pi_t^*(x) \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,\infty}^*(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (4.5)$$

(b) *For $\mathfrak{p}^* = (\pi_t^*)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ satisfying (4.5) for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, we have $J_{t,T}^{\mathfrak{p}^*} = J_{t,T}^* = \inf_{\rho \in \Pi} J_{t,T}^\rho$ for $0 < t < T$, and $J_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{p}^*} = J_{0,T}^* = \inf_{(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho))$, i.e., \mathfrak{p}^* is the optimal Markovian policy.*

Proof. (a) We fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for the rest of the proof. By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.1, $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x)$ is lower semi-continuous. Due to Assumption 2.15 (ii), $\omega_t(x)$ is compact. It follows that for $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x)$ is not empty and closed. We claim that the lower semi-continuity of $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x)$ implies that for any closed $F \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \omega_t(x)$,

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

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

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

where $x \mapsto \min_{\lambda \in F} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x)$ is well defined and lower semi-continuous in $x \in \mathbb{X}$ due to Lemma 3.4, Lemma 4.1, Lemma B.7 and the fact that $F \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \omega_t(x)$ is compact and upper hemi-continuous. By Lemma 5.4 again that $J_{t,T}^*$ is lower semi-continuous, we yield that both $\min_{\lambda \in F} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*$ and $J_{t,T}^*$ are $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Consequently, $B_F \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. Recall 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 $x \mapsto \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x)$ has a $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) - \mathcal{B}(\Lambda)$ measurable selector. In view of Lemma B.5, such a selector is also $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ - $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda)$ measurable.

(b) Combining Lemma 3.1 (a) with (4.1) and (4.4), we obtain $J_{t,T}^*(x) \leq J_{t,T}^\rho(x)$ for any $t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\rho \in \Pi$. It follows from induction that, regardless of ρ ,

$$J_{0,T}^* \leq J_{0,T}^\rho = \rho_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{X}^\rho, \mathfrak{A}^\rho)),$$

where we use (3.3) to obtain the second equality. Next, by (4.4) and statement (a) we have

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

Inducing backward from $t = T$, in view of (4.1), we have $J_{t,T}^* = H_t^{\rho^*} \circ \dots \circ H_T^{\rho^*} O = J_{t,T}^{\rho^*}$ and $J_{0,T}^* = H_0 \circ H_1^{\rho^*} \circ \dots \circ H_T^{\rho^*} O = J_{0,T}^*$. Finally, by Lemma 3.3, we conclude the proof. \blacksquare

As the last result in this section, we argue that ρ^* introduced in Theorem 4.2 (b) is no worse than any other history-dependent policy.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$. Under Assumption 2.15, we have*

$$\inf_{(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p) \in \Psi} \varsigma_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X}^p}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p)) \leq \varsigma_{0,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \quad \text{for any } (\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}) \in \Psi.$$

Proof. Fix $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{C}) \in \Psi$ for the remainder of the proof. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}$ be the regular version of $\mathbb{P}(A_t \in \cdot | \mathcal{Z}_t)$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\cdot}(C_T(X_T, a, y)) P(T, X_T, a, dy) P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(da)$$

is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(C_t(X_T, A_T, X_{T+1}) \in \cdot | \mathcal{Z}_T)$. This together with (2.9) implies that

$$\sigma_{T,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) = \sigma_{T,x} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\cdot}(C_T(X_T, a, y)) P(T, X_T, a, dy) P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(da) \right).$$

Due to the definition of Ψ in Section 2.5, we have that

$$P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(B)|_{B=A_T(X_T)} = \int_{\mathfrak{A}} \mathbb{1}_{A_T(X_T)}(a) P^{A_T|\mathcal{Z}_T}(da) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

(we also use [1, Section 18.1, Theorem 18.6] for the joint measurability of $\mathbb{1}_{A_T(x)}(a)$ as a function of (x, a)). It follows from (3.2) and (4.4) that $\sigma_{T,X_T,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{T,T}^*(X_T)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. We next proceed to pull back the time index by induction. Suppose for some $t \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$, we have $\varsigma_{t+1, X_{t+1}, T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{t+1, T}^*(X_{t+1})$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Then, by (2.9) and a similar reasoning leading to Proposition 2.10, we obtain

$$\varsigma_{t, X_t, T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) = \sigma_{t,x} \left(P^{C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}) + \gamma \varsigma_{t+1, X_{t+1}, T}^{\mathfrak{X}, \gamma}(\mathfrak{C}) | \mathcal{Z}_t} \right) \geq \sigma_{t, X_t} \left(P^{C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}) + \gamma J_{t+1, T}^*(X_{t+1}) | \mathcal{Z}_t} \right), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Note that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \mathbb{1}_{\cdot}(C_t(X_t, a, y) + \gamma J_{t+1, T}^*(y)) P(t, X_t, a, dy) P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(da)$$

is a regular version of $P^{C_t(X_t, A_t, X_{t+1}) + \gamma J_{t+1, T}^*(X_{t+1}) | \mathcal{Z}_t}$. By the fact that $P^{A_t|\mathcal{Z}_t}(B)|_{B=A_t(X_t)} = 1$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., (3.2) and (4.4) again, we have $\varsigma_{t, X_t, T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{t, T}^*(X_t)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. As a result of the induction above, $\varsigma_{1, X_1, T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{1, T}^*(X_1)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. With similar reasoning, we obtain $\varsigma_{0, T}^{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})) \geq J_{0, T}^*$. Finally, invoking Theorem 4.2 (b) completes the proof. \blacksquare

5. Infinite horizon dynamic programming principle. As discussed in Section 2.4, we make the additional assumptions that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized to allow the infinite horizon object $\zeta_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}}$ to be well defined. We adhere to these assumptions throughout this section. Recall that $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized if $\sigma_{t,x}$ is normalized for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}$.

To establish an infinite horizon DPP for (P), we first study the value functions associated with a Markovian policy ρ . Recall the definitions of G_t, H_t^ρ and $J_{t,T}^*$ from (3.2), (3.4), and (4.4), respectively. We justify the definition of

$$J_{0,\infty}^\rho := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_{0,T}^\rho \quad \text{and} \quad J_{t,\infty}^\rho(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_{t,T}^\rho(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{X} \quad (5.1)$$

in Lemma 5.1 below, which in term reveals the relationship between $J_{t,\infty}^\rho$ and $J_{t+1,\infty}^\rho$. Moreover, Lemma 5.1 together with Lemma 2.11 implies that

$$\sigma_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^\rho, \mathcal{A}^\rho)) = J_{0,\infty}^\rho \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{t,\mathbb{X}_t^\rho}^{\mathbb{X}^\rho}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^\rho, \mathcal{A}^\rho)) = J_{t,\infty}^\rho(X_t^\rho), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.2)$$

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. Under Assumption 2.15 (iv), for any $\rho \in \Pi$, we have $(J_{0,T}^\rho)_{T \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges and $(J_{t,T}^\rho)_{T \in \{t, t+1, \dots\}}$ converges uniformly for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover,*

$$J_{t,\infty}^\rho := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J_{t,T}^\rho = \begin{cases} H_t^\rho J_{t+1,\infty}^\rho, & t \in \mathbb{N}, \\ H_0 J_{1,\infty}^\rho, & t = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

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

Proof. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. First, by Assumption 2.15 (iv) and Lemma 3.1 (a), we have

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

i.e., $\|H_{T+r}^\rho O\|_\infty \leq b$. Then, by Assumption 2.15 (iv) and Lemma 3.1 (a),

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

i.e., $\|H_{T+r-1}^\rho \circ H_{T+r}^\rho O\|_\infty \leq b + \gamma b$. By induction, we have $\|H_{T+1}^\rho \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^\rho O\|_\infty \leq (1 - \gamma)^{-1} b$. Then, by Lemma 3.5 we obtain

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

which implies that $\|H_T^p O - H_T^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} b$. Inducing backward with [Lemma 3.5](#), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_t^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p O - H_t^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p \circ H_{T+r}^p O\|_\infty \\ & \leq \left\| G_T^{\pi_T(x)} \circ H_{t+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p O(x) - G_T^{\pi_T(x)} \circ H_{t+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O(x) \right\| \\ & \leq \gamma \left\| H_{t+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_T^p O(x) - G_T^{\pi_T(x)} \circ H_{t+1}^p \circ \dots \circ H_{T+r}^p O \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\gamma^{T-t}}{1-\gamma} b. \end{aligned}$$

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

Lastly, we prove (5.3). For this, consider $t \in \mathbb{N}$. In view of (4.1), [Lemma 3.5](#) 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 (5.3). The case of $t = 0$ can be proved similarly. \blacksquare

Next, we introduce below a proposition regarding the value of a Markovian policy ρ . First, let $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ be the set of $\mathbf{v} = (v_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $v_t : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|v_t\|_\infty < \infty$. For $\mathbf{v} \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, we define $\mathfrak{H}^p \mathbf{v} := (H_t^p v_{t+1})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. We then have the following.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. Under [Assumption 2.15 \(iv\)](#), for any Markovian policy $\rho \in \Pi$, \mathfrak{H}^p is a γ -contraction mapping on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$. Moreover, $(J_{t,\infty}^p)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the unique fixed point of \mathfrak{H}^p .*

Proof. In view of [Lemma 3.1](#) and [Lemma 3.2](#), \mathfrak{H}^p indeed maps from $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ to $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, and it is a γ -contraction due to [Lemma 3.5](#). As pointwise convergence preserves measurability (cf. [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29]), by combining [Lemma 3.2](#) with the convergence and the bound established in [Lemma 5.1](#), we have $(J_{t,\infty}^p)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$. It follows from (5.3) that $(J_{t,\infty}^p)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a fixed point of \mathfrak{H}^p . \blacksquare

To establish the infinite horizon DPP, we define the infinite horizon version of the optimal value function as

$$J_{0,\infty}^* := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J_{0,T}^*, \quad \text{and} \quad J_{t,\infty}^*(x) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J_{t,T}^*(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}, t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.4)$$

The definition is justified by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. Under [Assumption 2.15](#), for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $(J_{t,T}^*)_{T > t}$ converges uniformly and $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J_{t,\infty}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}$. Moreover, $(J_{0,T}^*)_{T \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges and $J_{0,\infty}^* \leq \frac{\gamma b}{1-\gamma}$.*

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

$$\|J_{t,T}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}. \quad (5.5)$$

To this end, observe that $\|J_{T-1,T}^*\|_\infty \leq b$ because $\|G_{T-1}^\lambda O\|_\infty \leq b$ due to Assumption 2.15 (iv) and Lemma 3.1 (a). By Assumption 2.15 (iv) and Lemma 3.1 (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, (5.5) follows by induction. Next, note for any $t \leq T$, by Lemma 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{t,T}^*(x) - J_{t,T+r}^*(x)| &= \left| \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x) - \inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T+r}^*(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T}^*(x) - G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,T+r}^*(x)| \leq \gamma \|J_{t+1,T}^* - J_{t+1,T+r}^*\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

In view of (4.4), (5.5) and (5.6) together imply $\|J_{t,T}^* - J_{t,T+r}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}$ for $t = T$. Pulling t backward with (5.6), we obtain

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

The above proves the uniform convergence of $(J_{t,T}^*)_{T>t}$. By combining the uniform convergence with (5.5), we have that $\|J_{t,\infty}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{b}{1-\gamma}$. The proof for $J_{0,\infty}^*$ follows similarly. \blacksquare

The following lower semi-continuity of $J_{t,\infty}^*$ is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 5.3.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. Under Assumption 2.15, 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 the DPP for the infinite horizon optimization in (P). We recall the definition of S_t^* from (4.3).

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. Under Assumption 2.15, 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 $J'_{t,\infty} = S_t J'_{t+1,\infty}$, 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

$$\pi_t^*(x) \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1,\infty}^*(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (5.7)$$

- (c) For $\mathfrak{p}^* = (\pi_t^*)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (5.7) for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $J_{t,\infty}^{\mathfrak{p}^*} = J_{t,\infty}^* = \inf_{\mathfrak{p} \in \Pi} J_{t,\infty}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and $J_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{p}^*} = H_0 J_{1,\infty}^* = \inf_{(\mathfrak{X}^{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{A}^{\mathfrak{p}}) \in \Psi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}^{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}^{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{A}^{\mathfrak{p}}))$.

Proof. (a) First, observe that by (4.4), Lemma 5.3 and (5.8), we have

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

The same is true for $(J'_{t,\infty})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. Next, by Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J^*_{t,\infty}(x) - J'_{t,\infty}(x)| &= |S_t J^*_{t+1,\infty}(x) - S_t J'_{t+1,\infty}(x)| = \left| \inf_{\lambda \in \partial_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J^*_{t+1,\infty}(x) - \inf_{\lambda \in \partial_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J'_{t+1,\infty}(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |G_t^\lambda J^*_{t+1,\infty}(x) - G_t^\lambda J'_{t+1,\infty}(x)| \\ &\leq \gamma \|J^*_{t+1,\infty} - J'_{t+1,\infty}\|_\infty, \quad \forall t, x \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J^*_{t,\infty} - J'_{t,\infty}\|_\infty \leq \gamma \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J^*_{t+1,\infty} - J'_{t+1,\infty}\|_\infty \leq \gamma \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J^*_{t,\infty} - J'_{t,\infty}\|_\infty. \quad (5.9)$$

We note that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J^*_{t,\infty} - J'_{t,\infty}\|_\infty < \infty$ due to Lemma 5.3 and the hypothesis that $(J'_{t,\infty})_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}; \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$. This together with (5.9) implies $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|J^*_{t,\infty} - J'_{t,\infty}\|_\infty = 0$. The proof of statement (a) is complete.

(b) By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 5.4, $(x, \lambda) \mapsto G_t^\lambda J^*_{t+1}(x)$ is lower semi-continuous. The remainder of the proof follows the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 4.2 (a).

(c) By Lemma 3.1 (a), (4.1) and (4.4), we obtain $J^*_{t,T}(x) \leq J^p_{t,T}(x)$ for any $t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\rho \in \Pi$. Then, by Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.3, we have $J^*_{t,\infty}(x) \leq J^p_{t,\infty}(x)$ 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 5.2 that $J^p_{t,\infty} = J^*_{t,\infty}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, we have that $J^p_{t,\infty} = J^*_{t,\infty} = \inf_{\rho \in \Pi} J^p_{t,\infty}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, this together with (3.1), (5.2) and (5.3) implies $J^p_{0,\infty} = H_0 J^*_{1,\infty} = \inf_{\rho \in \Pi} \rho_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}^p}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}^p, \mathcal{A}^p))$. ■

Remark 5.6. 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 (4.3) and (4.4) 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 5.3, J_t^* is also constant in t . The stationary versions of Theorem 5.5 following immediately.

To conclude this section, we argue that the Markovian ρ^* introduced in Theorem 5.5 (b) is also optimal among all history-dependent policies.

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose that $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized. Under Assumption 2.15, for any $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \in \Psi$ we have that*

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

Proof. Fix $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \in \Psi$ for the remainder of the proof. In view of Theorem 5.5 (c), it is sufficient to prove that $J^*_{0,\infty} \leq \zeta_{0,\infty}^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{A}))$. For this, note that by Theorem 4.2 (b) and Proposition 4.3, $J^*_{0,T} \leq \zeta_{0,T}^{\mathbb{X}}(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{A}))$. In view of Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 5.3, letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude the proof. ■

6. Optimality of deterministic Markovian action. As a final key result, we provide a sufficient condition such that the optimal policies are deterministic mappings of state to action. The crux of this result is quite straightforward: if $\sigma_{t,x}$ penalizes uncertainty from mixtures⁵, then deterministic actions may potentially reach the optimal outcome. For instance, when $\sigma_{t,x}$ stems from spectral risk measures, the conditions of [Proposition 6.1](#) are satisfied and the optimal policies are deterministic. For further details, we refer to [Remark 7.2](#).

Proposition 6.1. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose [Assumption 2.15](#) holds and*

$$\sigma_{t,x}(\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2) \geq \min\{\sigma_{t,x}(\mu_1), \sigma_{t,x}(\mu_2)\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{X},$$

for any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Then, for any $T \in \mathbb{N}$ with $T > t$, 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

$$\pi_t^\delta(x) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, T}^*(x).$$

If in addition, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and that $(\sigma_{t,x})_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}}$ is normalized, then the above statements hold for $T = \infty$.

Proof. We present the proof for the case of $T < \infty$, as proof for the case of $T = \infty$ follows along the same reasoning. To begin, note that, by [\(3.2\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} G_t^{\theta\lambda^1 + (1-\theta)\lambda^2} v(x) &= \sigma_{t,x}(\tilde{P}_{t,x, \theta\lambda^1 + (1-\theta)\lambda^2}^v) = \sigma_{t,x}(\theta\tilde{P}_{t,x, \lambda^1}^v + (1-\theta)\tilde{P}_{t,x, \lambda^2}^v) \\ &\geq \min\{\sigma_{t,x}(\tilde{P}_{t,x, \lambda^1}^v), \sigma_{t,x}(\tilde{P}_{t,x, \lambda^2}^v)\} = \min\{G_t^{\lambda^1} v(x), G_t^{\lambda^2} v(x)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

for any $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, $\lambda^1, \lambda^2 \in \Lambda$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

It is sufficient to show that for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$ the set

$$D(x) := \{a \in \mathcal{A}_t(x) : G_t^{\delta a} J_{t+1, T}^*(x) = \min_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, T}^*(x)\}$$

is not empty and closed. Once we demonstrate this, we can apply an argument similar to that used in the proof of [Theorem 4.2 \(a\)](#) to affirm the existence of π_t^δ .

Let $\lambda^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, \infty}^*(x)$. For $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{A})$, with the convention that $\frac{0}{0} = 0$, we define

$$\lambda_A^* := \frac{\lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon \cap \cdot)}{\lambda^*(A_k^\varepsilon)}.$$

and claim that

$$\{\lambda_A^*, \lambda_{A^c}^*\} \cap \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, T}^*(x) \neq \emptyset. \quad (6.2)$$

⁵Indeed, the mixture $\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2$ arguably possesses a higher degree of uncertainty than one of μ_1 or μ_2 . This can be intuitively understood by considering that $\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2$ corresponds to the probability of drawing from either μ_1 or μ_2 , determined by the toss of a coin biased by the factor θ .

To see this, we note that if $\lambda_A^* = 1$ or $\lambda_{A^c}^* = 1$, we must have either $\lambda^* = \lambda_A^*$ or $\lambda^* = \lambda_{A^c}^*$, and (6.2) follows immediately. If none of $\lambda_A^* = 1$ and $\lambda_{A^c}^* = 1$ is true, then λ_A^* and $\lambda_{A^c}^*$ are bona fide probabilities, and $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(A)\lambda_A^* + \lambda^*(A^c)\lambda_{A^c}^*$. This together with (6.1) proves (6.2).

Since $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$ is compact (due to [Assumption 2.15](#) (ii)) thus totally bounded (cf. [1, Section 3.7, Theorem 3.28]), i.e., for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist finitely many ε -open balls that covers $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ and a partition $(A_k^\varepsilon)_{k=1}^{n_\varepsilon}$ of $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$ such that the radius of A_k^ε is no greater than ε . Invoking (6.2) repeatedly, there is $k = 1, \dots, n_\varepsilon$ such that $\lambda_{A_k^\varepsilon}^*$ attains the optimal. Consequently, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $a^m \in \mathcal{A}_t(x)$ and $\lambda^m \in \omega_t(x)$ such that support $\lambda^m \subseteq \mathcal{A}_t(x) \cap \overline{B}_{\frac{1}{m}}(a^m)$ and $\lambda^m \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} G_t^\lambda J_{t+1, T}^*(x)$, 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 assume $(a^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges and set $a^0 := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a^m$. Let $f \in C_b(\mathbb{A})$ and note f is uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{A}_t(x)$. Then, we have

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

i.e., $(\lambda^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to δ_{a^0} weakly. By [Lemma 3.4](#) and [Lemma 5.4](#), we obtain

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

and thus $\delta_{a^0} \in D(x)$. Along with the fact that $(\delta_{a^\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly if $(a^\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{A}$ converges, the closedness of $D(x)$ follows from [Lemma 3.4](#) and [Lemma 5.4](#) again. \blacksquare

7. Examples. In this section, we present several examples that illustrate the application of the theory developed in the previous sections. In [Section 7.1](#), we discuss a few possible choices for $\sigma_{t,x}$ and verify the technical assumptions required for the DPP to be applicable. Subsequently, in [Section 7.2](#), we provide a finite horizon example focusing on optimal liquidation with limit order books. Finally, an infinite horizon example on autonomous driving is presented in [Section 7.3](#).

7.1. Examples of $\sigma_{t,x}$. Below we present two examples of $\sigma_{t,x}$. The first one is essentially the distributional version of entropic risk measure. The second one draws inspiration from Kusuoka representation for convex risk measure (cf. [37, Theorem 2.1]).

7.1.1. Entropic risk measure. Consider $\tau : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and suppose that for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau(t, \cdot)$ is continuous. For $(t, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}$, we define

$$\sigma_{t,x}^E(\mu) := \frac{1}{\tau(t,x)} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(\tau(t,x)y) \mu(\mathrm{d}y), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}). \quad (7.1)$$

This may be interpreted as an entropic risk measure where the risk-aversion parameter τ varies with time and state. The verification that $\sigma_{t,x}^E$ with an arbitrarily fixed $(t,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}$ adheres to [Definition 2.4](#) can be established by drawing from the argument that demonstrates the conventional entropic risk measure as a convex risk measure (cf. [48, Example 6.20]). To verify [Assumption 2.15](#) (c), let $(x^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ converge to $x^0 \in \mathbb{X}$ and $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}_b(K)$ converge to $\mu^0 \in \mathcal{P}_b(K)$, where $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ is compact. Note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau(t, x^n)^{-1} = \tau(t, x^0)^{-1}$. Moreover, since $(x, y) \mapsto \exp(-\tau(t, x)y)$ is continuous on K , by [Lemma B.6](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-\tau(t, x^n)y) \mu^n(dy) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_K \exp(-\tau(t, x^n)y) \mu^n(dy) \\ &\geq \int_K \exp(-\tau(t, x^0)y) \mu^0(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-\tau(t, x^0)y) \mu^0(dy), \end{aligned}$$

By combining the above, we have verified [Assumption 2.15](#) (c). Finally, we note that $\sigma_{t,x}^E$ is normalized.

Remark 7.1. It follows from the concavity of \log that for any $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\sigma_{t,x}^E(\theta \mu_1 + (1 - \theta) \mu_2) \geq \theta \sigma_{t,x}^E(\mu_1) + (1 - \theta) \sigma_{t,x}^E(\mu_2).$$

Considering (3.2), this inequality shows that utilizing entropic risk measures, $\sigma_{t,x}^E$, promotes randomized actions as optimizers.

7.1.2. Kusuoka-type risk measure. Inspired by the Kusuoka representation of law invariant convex risk measure (cf. [37, Theorem 2.1]), we introduce the following Kusuoka-type distributional convex risk measure, where the set of spectral risk measures are allowed to vary with state.

Let $\mathcal{P}([0, 1])$ be the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$, endowed with the weak topology. 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 $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Suppose \mathcal{M}_t is lower hemi-continuous⁶, 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 $U_{\mathbb{M}} \cap \mathcal{M}_t(z) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, let $\beta_{t,x} : (\mathbb{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M})) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and assume that $(x, \eta) \mapsto \beta_{t,x}(\eta)$ is lower semi-continuous. For $(t, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X}$, we define

$$\sigma_{t,x}^K(\mu) := \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)} \left\{ \int_{[0,1]} \overline{\text{AV@R}}_{\kappa}(\mu) \eta(d\kappa) - \beta_{t,x}(\eta) \right\}, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}). \quad (7.2)$$

Note that $\sigma_{t,x}^K$ is normalized if and only if $\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)} \{-\beta(\eta)\} = 0$. Using the properties of $\overline{\text{AV@R}}$ (cf. [48, Section 6.2.4]), it is straightforward to check that, for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{A}$ arbitrarily fix, $\sigma_{t,x}$ satisfies [Definition 2.4](#). We use [Lemma B.8](#) to verify [Assumption 2.15](#) (iii). To this end let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be compact and consider

$$f((x, \mu), \kappa) = \overline{\text{AV@R}}_{\kappa}(\mu), \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(x, \mu) = \mathcal{M}_t(x),$$

⁶By [1, Section 17.2, Lemma 17.5 and Section 18.1, Lemma 18.2]), the lower hemi-continuity of \mathcal{M}_t implies weak measurability.

for $(x, \mu, \kappa) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathcal{P}(K) \times [0, 1]$. Note that f is constant in x . Additionally, ϕ is constant in μ , thus lower hemi-continuous. By [Proposition 2.6](#) and Fatou's lemma, $(x, \mu) \mapsto f((x, \mu), \kappa)$ is lower semi-continuous for any $\kappa \in [0, 1]$. By [Lemma B.1](#), for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$, $\kappa \mapsto AV@R_\kappa(\mu)$ is non-increasing and continuous on $[0, 1]$, thus $\kappa \mapsto f((x, \mu), \kappa)$ is non-increasing and continuous on $[0, 1]$ for any $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathcal{P}(K)$. By invoking [Lemma B.8](#), we confirm that $\sigma_{t,x}^K$ defined in [\(7.2\)](#) [Assumption 2.15](#) (iii).

In view of [\(7.2\)](#), when $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$ is a singleton, $\sigma_{t,x}^K$ represents the distributional version of spectral risk measure (cf. [\[48, Section 6.3.4\]](#)). We refer to [\[34\]](#) for relationship between spectral risk measures and distortion risk measures. From a constructive perspective, one motivation for considering a non-singleton $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$ is to incorporate robustness into the evaluation criteria. Indeed, in many cases, while a risk averse performance criterion is a desirable, it is not certain what specific form of risk aversion to employ, for examples, $0.8\mathbb{E} + 0.2 AV@R_{0.9}$ vs $AV@R_{0.5}$. The Kusuoka-type risk measure provide a venue to address this issue by robustifying the measure and selecting the worse outcome.

Remark 7.2. In this remark, we provide some discussions on the impact of $\mathcal{M}_t(x)$ on optimal actions.

- We claim that if \mathcal{M}_t is a singleton, then a deterministic Markovian action at time t may attain the optimal. In view of [Proposition 5.7](#), the following observations are sufficient. Note that for any $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R})$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{AV@R}_\kappa(\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2) &= \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ q + \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (z-q)_+ (\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2)(dz) \right\} \\ &\geq \theta \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \theta q + \theta \kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (z-q)_+ \mu_1(dz) \right\} + \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ (1-\theta)q + (1-\theta)\kappa^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{X}} (z-q)_+ \mu_2(dz) \right\} \\ &= \theta AV@R_\kappa(\mu_1) + (1-\theta) AV@R_\kappa(\mu_2) \geq \min\{AV@R_\kappa(\mu_1), AV@R_\kappa(\mu_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

As for $\kappa = 0$, note that $(\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2)((r, \infty)) = 0$ implies $\mu_i((r, \infty)) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, and thus

$$\overline{AV@R}_0(\theta\mu_1 + (1-\theta)\mu_2) \geq \min\{AV@R_0(\mu_1), AV@R_0(\mu_2)\}$$

- If \mathcal{M}_t is not a singleton, analogous to the scenario in [Appendix A](#), there exists certain circumstances where randomized actions are necessary to achieve optimality. The potential need for randomized action can be elucidated using the following two-player game heuristic. Recall the definitions of $\tilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v$ from [equation \(3.3\)](#). When considering $\inf_{\lambda \in \omega_t(x)} \sigma_{t,x}^K(\tilde{P}_{t,x,\lambda}^v)$, we can interpret $\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{M}_t(x)}$ as an adversarial agent who controls η . According to the order of inf and sup, this adversarial agent has access to λ . However, she must pick η without the knowledge of the realized action. For the original agent who controls λ , under certain circumstances, it is reasonable to employ randomized action to counteract the adversary. Lastly, it's important to note that, unlike the entropic risk measure, the Kusuoka-type risk measure does not always encourage randomized action, even if \mathcal{M}_t is not a singleton. The way different choices of \mathcal{M}_t affect the optimal action seems to be quite complex and will be explored in future work.

7.2. A finite horizon example: optimal liquidation. In this section, we showcase an example that demonstrates optimal liquidation with limit order book utilizing the proposed risk-averse MDP. We would draw attention to several works that offer different perspectives on trading with limit order books [33, 18, 6, 16, 15, 36, 29, 39]. We also refer to [17] for an overview of the clearing mechanism of limit order books. As all stock market activities occur discretely (e.g., tick size, integer trading volume), we construct the example with discrete state and action spaces. With discrete state and action spaces, [Assumption 2.15](#) is automatically satisfied. On the other hand, taking into account the inherent numeric structure of stock prices and other factors present in the stock market, formulating the problem into an MDP with continuous state and action spaces could provide sensible approximations. Doing so, however, demands more technicalities and will be studied elsewhere.

Consider a single stock market. We assume zero interest rate and we accordingly set $\gamma = 1$. Suppose an agent wishes to liquidate $u_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ amount of shares by the terminal time $T \in \mathbb{N}$. For simplicity, let $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, \dots, N_S\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ be the set of possible values of the price of a stock. At each time $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, potential sellers and buyers post their intended trading prices and volumes on the market. This results in a limit order book, $m = (m^0, m^1, \dots, m^{N_S})$, with each entry being an integer reflecting the aggregated volume submitted for trading at the corresponding price. Positive integers indicate a collective intention to sell while negative integers indicate a collective intention to buy. For example, $m^1 = 10$ signifies a collective intention to sell 10 units at price 1; $m^0 = -3$ signifies a collective intention to buy 3 units at price 0. A valid limit order book m must be such that there is a $\check{i} \in \{0, 0.5, 1.5, \dots, N_S - 0.5, N_S\}$ with $m_j \leq 0$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_S\}$ and $j < \check{i}$ and $m_j \geq 0$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_S\}$ with $j > \check{i}$. It is reasonable to assume that $m^0 = -\infty$. We thus let $\mathbb{M} \subset ((-\infty) \cup \mathbb{Z})^{N_S+1}$ be the set of valid limit order books with $m^0 = -\infty$ – i.e., that there is an infinite volume for purchasing the asset at price 0. The combination of the prices and allowed limit order books constitutes the state space $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{N}$.

Regarding the potential actions, the agent may post her intended volume for selling at each price, i.e., $a = (a^0, a^1, \dots, a^{N_S})$. As the agent aims to liquidate their shares, buying and short selling are not allowed. We set $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{N_S+1}$. At $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$, suppose the remaining units of stock is u , the admissible domain of actions is $\mathcal{A}_t(u) = \{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : \sum_{s=0}^{N_S} a^s \leq u\}$, i.e., they can post limit orders to sell in total at most the amount of shares remaining. At $t = T$, the agent must liquidate all u units of remaining stock, resulting in the singleton admissible domain of actions $\mathcal{A}_T(u) = \{(u, 0, \dots, 0)\}$. As the state space is $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{N}$, we can extend \mathcal{A}_t to accept the pair (m, u) as input but be constant in m .

Suppose the market generates the next limit order book, m_{t+1} , given the current state $(m_t, u_t) \in \mathbb{X}$ and (realized) action $a_t \in \mathbb{A}$ in a Markovian fashion prescribed by some probability on \mathbb{M} , $B \mapsto \hat{P}(t, (m_t, u_t), a_t, B)$ for $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. With the risk induced by time-discretization and processing delay in mind, we additionally assume that the clearing occurs between t and $t + 1$ in the following way:

- Let $\bar{m}_t = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2}(m_t + m_{t+1}) \right\rceil$, i.e., $\bar{m}_t^s = \left\lceil \frac{1}{2}(m_t^s + m_{t+1}^s) \right\rceil$ for $s = 0, \dots, N_S$.

- The remaining units to be liquidated at $t + 1$ is $u_{t+1} = u_t - \Delta(a_t, \bar{m}_t)$, where

$$\Delta(a, \bar{m}) = \sum_{s=0}^{N_s} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\bar{m}^s) \left((-\bar{m}^s) \wedge \left(-\sum_{r=0}^s a_t^r - \sum_{r=s+1}^{N_s} (\bar{m}^r)_- \right) \right)_+.$$

- The cash gained from action a_t is $g(a_t, \bar{m}_t)$, where

$$g(a, \bar{m}) = \sum_{s=0}^{N_s} s \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\bar{m}^s) \left((-\bar{m}^s) \wedge \left(-\sum_{r=0}^s a_t^r - \sum_{r=s+1}^{N_s} (\bar{m}^r)_- \right) \right)_+.$$

It is important to clarify that the clearing rules described above are stylized as, in the current model, there are no time stamps for limit order arrivals/cancellations. More detailed models can be formulated by making various assumptions on the timing of the orders. Following the set up above, we obtain the transition kernel

$$P(t, (m, u), a, D) = \int_{\mathbb{M}} \mathbb{1}_D \left(m, u - \Delta \left(a, \frac{1}{2}(m + y) \right) \right) \dot{P}(t, (m, u), a, dy), \quad D \subseteq \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{N}.$$

and stationary latent cost

$$C((m, u), a, (m', u')) = -g \left(a, \frac{1}{2}(m + m') \right).$$

At time $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$, suppose we are given a value function v for $t + 1$. Let λ be a probability measure on \mathbb{A} representing the randomized action. The above leads to the following regular conditional distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_{t, (m, u), \lambda}^v(B) &= \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathbb{M}} C \left((m, u), a, \left(m', u - \Delta \left(a, \frac{1}{2}(m + m') \right) \right) \right) + v \left(m', u - \Delta \left(a, \frac{1}{2}(m + m') \right) \right) \\ &\quad \dot{P}(t, (m, u), a, dm') \lambda(da). \end{aligned}$$

For the choice of $\sigma_{t,x}$, we may choose, e.g., the weighted average of entropic risk measure $\sigma_{t,x}^E$ and Kusuoka-type risk measure $\sigma_{t,x}^K$. The weight may vary across time and state depending on the agents specific requirements. For example, a simple time varying choice could be

$$\sigma_{t, (m, u)}(\mu) = \left(1 - \frac{t}{T} \right) \sigma_{t, (m, u)}^E(\mu) + \frac{t}{T} \sigma_{t, (m, u)}^K(\mu),$$

where $\sigma_{t, (m, u)}^E$ is defined in (7.1) with $\tau \equiv 1$, and $\sigma_{t, (m, u)}^K$ is defined (7.2) with $\beta_{t,x} \equiv 0$ for any (t, x) and

$$\mathcal{M}_t(m, u) = \mathcal{M}_t(u) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{0.5 \frac{u}{u_0}}, \delta_{\frac{u}{u_0}} \right\}.$$

Regarding the usage of $\sigma_{t,(m,u)}^E$, we underscore one particular viewpoint: in real-world scenarios, other market participants may infer and take advantage of an agent's intention to liquidate. While modeling this dynamic is complex, an alternative approach involves using the entropic risk measure to promote randomization, which could ultimately help reduce information leakage. As for $\sigma_{t,(m,u)}^K$, it encourages risk aversion when a substantial number of units remain, and gradually transits toward profit-seeking as the liquidation process progresses. Furthermore, as discussed in [Section 7.1.2](#), a non-singleton \mathcal{M}_t can be employed to manage uncertainty in risk evaluation criteria.

Finally, the optimal liquidation problem may be solved in a risk averse manner by using [Theorem 4.2](#). Let $O \equiv 0$. We start from $t = T$ with

$$J_{T,T}^*(m, u) = \sigma_{t,(m,u)} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,(m,u),\delta_{(u,0,\dots,0)}}^O \right).$$

For $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$, we find

$$J_{t,T}^*(m, u) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(A_t(u))} \sigma_{t,(m,u)} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,(m,u),\lambda}^{J_{t+1,T}^*} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_t(x) \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(A_t(u))} \sigma_{t,(m,u)} \left(\widetilde{P}_{t,(m,u),\lambda}^{J_{t+1,T}^*} \right), \quad x \in \mathbf{X}.$$

7.3. An infinite horizon example: auto-driving. In this example, we consider an autonomous driving scenario. For a comprehensive understanding on the role of risk aversion in autonomous robots, we direct the reader to [\[38\]](#) and [\[50\]](#). We refer to [\[51\]](#) for an overview of autonomous driving in real-world settings. In the subsequent discussion, we assume a perpetual driving experiment within a 2D environment.

We start by constructing the state space, with the vehicle's surroundings as a crucial component. The surroundings are modeled by a positive measure on the rectangle $R = [-W, W] \times [-L, L]$, with $W, L \geq 0$ representing the chosen width and length of the surrounding box. Coordinate $(0, 0)$ corresponds to the center of the agent's vehicle. We let $k \geq 0$ and define $\mathcal{M}_k(R)$ as the set of positive measures on $(R, \mathcal{B}(R))$ with $m(R) \leq k$ for any $m \in \mathcal{M}_k(R)$. We endow $\mathcal{M}_k(R)$ with the weak topology. A positive measure assigned to an area indicates obstacles in that area, such as other vehicles, boulders, or animals. In principle, the 2D shape of obstacles may be encoded into m to increase the realism of the model.

In addition to the surroundings, we may include other factors describing the vehicle's operating conditions into the state space. For simplicity, however, we consider only the 2D velocity vector and the deviation from the center of the road, assuming that the road is straight and has a constant width W_0 . We use $\mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ for the domain of the vehicle's velocity and $\mathbb{D} = [-W_0, W_0]$ for the domain of the vehicle's deviation from the center of the road.

To sum up, the state space is $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{M}_k(R) \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{D}$. We denote $x = (m, u, d) \in \mathbf{X}$.

We set $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{R}^2$ to reflect acceleration of the vehicle. The admissible action domain $\mathcal{A}(u)$ is stationary, depends only on the vehicle's velocity, and must be modeled in a way that satisfies [Assumption 2.15](#) (ii). For example, if $\mathcal{A}(u) = \{g_\alpha(u) : \alpha \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$ and $u \mapsto g_\alpha(u)$ is continuous and uniformly bounded for all α , then [Assumption 2.15](#) (ii) is satisfied. Furthermore, $\mathcal{A}(u)$ should respect road regulations. The detailed construction of $\mathcal{A}(u)$ is omitted.

We define $P(x, a, \cdot)$ as a time-homogeneous probability measure on $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X}))$ satisfying [Assumption 2.15](#) (i) and governing the state transition. In view of the physical nature em-

bedded in the problem, we impose the following constraint on the transition kernel

$$P\left((m, u, d), a, \mathcal{M}_b(R) \times \{u + a\Delta t\} \times \left\{d + u_1\Delta t + \frac{1}{2}a_1^2\Delta t^2\right\}\right) = 1,$$

where Δt is a parameter reflecting the resolution of time discretization. This constraint imposes a deterministic transition mechanism in the velocity and position of the vehicle, as the agent controls their acceleration and the physical laws of motion must be obeyed. This excludes the use of a strongly continuous transition kernel⁷, but is compatible with the weak continuity assumed in [Assumption 2.15](#) (i).

We next discuss the choice of cost and $\sigma_{t,x}$. In the perceptual driving experiment, it is appropriate to adopt time-homogeneous cost functions and $\sigma_{t,x}$. To account for time discretization and potential processing delays, we consider a latent cost function, such as

$$C(x, a, x') = C(x') = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(r)m'(dr), \quad g(r) = \check{k} \mathbb{1}_{(-W_v, W_v) \times (-L_v, L_v)}(r) + \exp(-\hat{k}r),$$

where $\check{k}, \hat{k} \geq 0$ are chosen parameters corresponding to a collision and caution, and $W_v, L_v \geq 0$ reflect the size of the agent's vehicle. Despite the indicator $\mathbb{1}_{(-W_v, W_v) \times (-L_v, L_v)}$, the cost is lower semi-continuous as required in [Assumption 2.15](#) (iv). Regarding σ_x , to encourage predictable driving behavior, in view of [Remark 7.2](#), we consider the Kusuoka-type risk measure in (7.2) with singleton \mathcal{M}_t . More precisely, we let σ_x take the form of a spectral risk measure

$$\sigma_{m,u,d}(\mu) = \int_{[0,1]} \text{AV@R}_\kappa(\mu) \eta_{m,u,d}(d\kappa).$$

Following the discussion in [Section 7.1.2](#), if $(m, u, d) \mapsto \eta_{m,u,d}$ is weakly continuous, then [Assumption 2.15](#) (iii) is satisfied. We can choose $\eta_{m,u,d}$ in a principled way, for example, by assigning more weight to small κ values when $|u|$ is large.

To formulate the infinite horizon DPP via [Theorem 5.5](#), we select a discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. For $(m, u, d) \in \mathbb{X}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{A})$, and $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$ and

$$\tilde{P}_{(m,u,d),\lambda}^v(B) = \int_{\mathbb{A}} \int_{\mathcal{M}_k(R)} \mathbb{1}_B \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(r)m'(dr) + \gamma v(m', u', d') \right) P((m, u, d), a, dm') \lambda(da), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Here, $\tilde{P}_{(m,u,d),\lambda}^v$ is time-homogeneous as the transition kernel and cost does not depend on time. We solve the fixed point equation with unknown $v \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$:

$$v(m, u, d) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{A}(m,u,d))} \int_{[0,1]} \overline{\text{AV@R}}_\kappa(\tilde{P}_{(m,u,d),\lambda}^v) \eta_{m,u,d}(d\kappa), \quad (m, u, d) \in \mathbb{X}$$

for the optimal value function v^* , and find the corresponding optimal policy

$$\pi(m, u, d) \in \arg \min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{A}(m,u,d))} \int_{[0,1]} \overline{\text{AV@R}}_\kappa(\tilde{P}_{(m,u,d),\lambda}^v) \eta_{m,u,d}(d\kappa), \quad (m, u, d) \in \mathbb{X}.$$

In view of [Remark 5.6](#), the stationary setting above indeed allows certain stationary policies to attain the optimal.

⁷In the current context, a strongly continuous transition kernel means a kernel is set-wise continuous. For example, we consider $Q: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ strongly continuous if $x \mapsto [Q(x)](A)$ is continuous for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$.

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 recursive 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] E. BAYRAKTAR AND M. LUDKOVSKI, *Liquidation in limit order books with controlled intensity*, *Mathematical Finance*, 24 (2014), pp. 627–650.
- [7] D. P. BERTSEKAS AND S. E. SHREVE, *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete-Time Case*, Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [8] T. R. BIELECKI, T. CHEN, AND I. CIALENCO, *Risk-sensitive markov decision problems under model uncertainty: finite time horizon case*, arXiv:2104.06915, (2021).
- [9] 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).
- [10] P. BILLINGSLEY, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1999.
- [11] D. BLACKWELL, *Discrete dynamic programming*, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33 (1962), pp. 719–726.
- [12] D. BLACKWELL AND L. E. DUBINS, *An extension of skorohod's almost sure representation theorem*, *Proceeding of the American Mathematical Society*, 89 (1983).
- [13] V. I. BOGACHEV, *Measure Theory Volume I*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [14] V. I. BOGACHEV, *Measure Theory Volume II*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [15] A. CARTEA AND S. JAIMUNGAL, *Optimal execution with limit and market orders*, *Quantitative Finance*, 15 (2015), pp. 1279–1291.
- [16] Á. CARTEA AND S. JAIMUNGAL, *Risk metrics and fine tuning of high-frequency trading strategies*, *Mathematical Finance*, 25 (2015), pp. 576–611.
- [17] A. CARTEA, S. JAIMUNGAL, AND J. PENALVA, *Algorithmic and High-Frequency Trading (Mathematics, Finance and Risk)*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [18] Á. CARTEA, S. JAIMUNGAL, AND J. RICCI, *Buy low, sell high: A high frequency trading perspective*, *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 5 (2014), pp. 415–444.
- [19] 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).
- [20] S. CHU AND Y. ZHANG, *Markov decision processes with iterated coherent risk measures*, *International Journal of Control*, 88 (2014), pp. 2286–2293.
- [21] A. COACHE AND S. JAIMUNGAL, *Reinforcement learning with dynamic convex risk measures*, *Mathematical Finance*, (2021). Forthcoming. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.13414>.
- [22] A. COACHE, S. JAIMUNGAL, AND Á. CARTEA, *Conditionally elicitable dynamic risk measures for deep reinforcement learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14666, (2022).
- [23] F. DELBAEN, *Coherent risk measures on general probability spaces*, *Advances in Finance and Stochastics*, 9 (2002), pp. 1–37.
- [24] 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.
- [25] K. DETLEFSEN AND G. SCANDOLO, *Conditional and dynamic convex risk measures*, *Finance and Stochastics*, 9 (2005), pp. 539–561.
- [26] V. DEWANTO AND M. GALLAGHER, *Examining average and discounted reward optimality criteria in reinforcement learning*, *AI 2022: Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, (2022).
- [27] R. DURRETT, *Probability: Theory and Examples*, 2019.
- [28] D. FILIPOVIĆ, M. KUPPER, AND N. VOGELPOTH, *Approaches to conditional risk*, *SIAM Journal on Financial*

- Mathematics, 3 (2012), pp. 402–432.
- [29] J.-P. FOUQUE, S. JAIMUNGAL, AND Y. F. SAPORITO, *Optimal trading with signals and stochastic price impact*, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 13 (2022), pp. 944–968.
- [30] H. FÖLLMER AND A. SCHIED, *Convex measure of risks and trading constraints*, Finance and Stochastics, 6 (2002), pp. 429–447.
- [31] I. I. GIKHMAN AND A. V. SKOROKHOD, *The Theory of Stochastic Processes I*, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [32] J. GRAND-CLÉMENT AND M. PETRIK, *Reducing blackwell and average optimality to discounted mdps via the blackwell discount factor*, arXiv:2302.00036v1, (2023).
- [33] O. GUÉANT, C.-A. LEHALLE, AND J. FERNANDEZ-TAPIA, *Dealing with the inventory risk: a solution to the market making problem*, Mathematics and financial economics, 7 (2013), pp. 477–507.
- [34] H. GZYL AND S. MAYORAL, *On a relationship between distorted and spectral risk measures*, Faculty Working Papers from School of Economics and Business Administration, University of Navarra, 15 (2006).
- [35] O. HERNANDEZ-LERMA AND J. B. LASSERRE, *Discrete-Time Markov Control Processes: Basic Optimality Criteria*, Springer, New York, NY, 1996.
- [36] A. JACQUIER AND H. LIU, *Optimal liquidation in a level- i limit order book for large-tick stocks*, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 9 (2018), pp. 875–906.
- [37] E. JOUINI, W. SCHACHERMAYER, AND N. TOUZI, *Law invariant risk measures have the fatou property*, Advances in Mathematical Economics, (2006), pp. 49–71.
- [38] A. MAJUMDAR AND M. PAVONE, *How should a robot assess risk? Towards an axiomatic theory of risk in robotics*, Robotics Research, (2019), pp. 75–84.
- [39] S. NADTOCHIY AND Y. YIN, *Consistency of mle for partially observed diffusions, with application in market microstructure modeling*, arXiv:2201.07656, (2023).
- [40] G. L. O'BRIEN, *The comparison method for stochastic processes*, The Annals of Probability, 3 (1975), pp. 80–88.
- [41] G. C. PFLUG AND A. PICHLER, *Time-consistent decisions and temporal decomposition of coherent risk functionals*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 41 (2016).
- [42] M. L. PUTERMAN, *Markov Decision Processes*, Wiley-Interscience, 2005.
- [43] F. RIEDEL, *Dynamic coherent risk measures*, Mathematical Programming, Series B, 121 (2004), pp. 185–200.
- [44] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR AND S. URYASEV, *Optimization of conditional value-at-risk*, Journal of Risk, 2 (2000), pp. 21–42.
- [45] E. ROSAZZA GIANIN, *Risk measures via g -expectations*, Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 39 (2006), pp. 19–34.
- [46] A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Risk-averse dynamic programming for markov decision processes*, Mathematical Programming, Series B, 125 (2010), pp. 235–261.
- [47] A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Erratum to: Risk-averse dynamic programming for markov decision processes*, Mathematical Programming, Series A, 145 (2014), pp. 601–604.
- [48] A. SHAPIRO, D. DENTCHEVA, AND A. RUSZCZYŃSKI, *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory, Third Edition*, Springer, 2021.
- [49] Y. SHEN, W. STANNAT, AND K. OBERMAYER, *Risk-sensitive markov control processes*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 51 (2013), pp. 3652–3672.
- [50] Y. WANG AND M. P. CHAPMAN, *Risk-averse autonomous systems: A brief history and recent developments from the perspective of optimal control*, Artificial Intelligence, 311 (2022).
- [51] E. YURTSEVER, J. LAMBERT, A. CARBALLO, AND K. TAKEDA, *A survey of autonomous driving: Common practices and emerging technologies*, IEEE Access, 8 (2020), pp. 58443–58469.

Appendix A. Example illustrating the necessity of randomized actions. 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 $\theta \in [0, 1]$. We also consider randomly and independently choosing between control 0 and 1 with $1 - \theta$ and θ probability, respectively. Accordingly, we define

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

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

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

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

Appendix B. Technical Lemmas.

Lemma B.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 $\text{AV@R}_0(Z) := \|Z\|_\infty$. Then, $\overline{\text{AV@R}}_\kappa(Z)$ is non-increasing and continuous in $\kappa \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. See [48, Section 6.2.4, Remark 22]. ■

Lemma B.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 the fact that pointwise convergence preserves measurability [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29] and that \mathcal{A} contains all \mathbb{P} -negligible sets. ■

Lemma B.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 $M : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}))$, 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{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{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

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

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{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. [13, 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{X} - $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable. Finally, by monotone convergence and [1, Section 4.6, Lemma 4.29] again, we conclude the proof. ■

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

Lemma B.4. *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 $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{Y}))$;
- (f) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) = \mu(A)$ for any A with $\mu(\partial A) = 0$, where ∂A is the boundary of A .

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 B.5. *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 B.6. *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 [10, 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 B.4 (e), we yield

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

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

Lemma B.7. *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 B.8. Let \mathbb{Y} be a separable metric space, $\phi : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{M}}$ be lower hemi-continuous, $f \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Y} \times [0, 1], \mathcal{Y} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1]))$, and $\beta : \mathbb{Y} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be upper semi-continuous. 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,

$$y \mapsto \sup_{\eta \in \phi(y)} \left\{ \int_{[0,1]} f(y, \kappa) \eta(d\kappa) - \beta(y, \eta) \right\}$$

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 $\delta \in (\kappa^0, 1]$ 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 $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y^n, \kappa^n) \geq f(y^0, \kappa^0)$.

In view of Lemma B.6, $(y, \eta) \mapsto \int_{[0,1]} f(y, \kappa) \eta(d\kappa)$ is lower semi-continuous. It follows that $(y, \eta) \mapsto \int_{[0,1]} f(y, \kappa) \eta(d\kappa) - \beta(y, \eta)$ is also lower semi-continuous. Finally, in view of [1, Section 17.5, Lemma 17.29], the proof is complete. ■

Appendix C. Glossary of notations.

Notations	Definitions
\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0	$\{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. See Section 2 .
$\ell^\infty(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$	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 .
\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}	State and action spaces. See Section 2 .
Ξ, Λ	Set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{A})$. 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 $\pi_t : (\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})) \rightarrow (\mathbf{A}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}))$ such that $\pi_t(x) \in \omega_t(x)$. See Section 2 .
ρ, Π	Abbreviation of Markovian policy $(\pi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the set of ρ . See Section 2 .
$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathcal{P}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$	Set of probabilities on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and set of probabilities with bounded support. 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 .
σ	Distributional convex risk measure. See Definition 2.4 .
$\overline{\text{AV@R}}_\kappa$	Distributional average valued at risk. See (2.7) and (2.8) .
$\sigma_{t,x}$	Time-state dependent distributional convex risk measure. See Section 2.4 .
$\mathfrak{C}_{t,x,T}^{\mathfrak{X}}, \mathfrak{C}_{t,x,\infty}^{\mathfrak{X}}$	Distributional dynamic risk measures. See (2.9) and (2.13) .
Ψ	Subset of $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A})$. See Section 2.5 .
μ, P	Initial distribution of X_1 and transition kernel from (X_t, A_t) to X_{t+1} . See Assumption 2.13 .
$X_t^p, A_t^p, \mathfrak{X}^p, \mathfrak{A}^p$	Counterparts of $X_t, A_t, \mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{A}$ subject to Markovian policy ρ . See Section 2.5 .
C_t, \mathcal{C}	Cost function and abbreviation of $(C_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$. See Section 2.5 .
O	Function on \mathbf{X} that is constant 0.
$H_0, G_t^\lambda, H_t^p, S_t$	Operators acting on $\ell^\infty(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X}))$. See (3.1) , (3.2) , (3.4) and (4.3) .
$J_{t,T}^p, J_{t,T}^*$	Value functions of ρ and optimal value functions in finite horizon. See (4.1) and (4.4) .
$J_{t,\infty}^p, J_{t,\infty}^*$	Value functions of ρ and optimal value functions in infinite horizon. See (5.1) and (5.4) .