

# Quantized Stationary Control Policies in Markov Decision Processes

Naci Saldi, Tamás Linder, Serdar Yüksel

## Abstract

For a large class of Markov Decision Processes, stationary (possibly randomized) policies are globally optimal. However, in Borel state and action spaces, the computation and implementation of even such stationary policies are known to be prohibitive. In addition, networked control applications require remote controllers to transmit action commands to an actuator with low information rate. These two problems motivate the study of approximating optimal policies by quantized (discretized) policies. To this end, we introduce deterministic stationary quantizer policies and show that such policies can approximate optimal deterministic stationary policies with arbitrary precision under mild technical conditions, thus demonstrating that one can search for  $\varepsilon$ -optimal policies within the class of quantized control policies. We also derive explicit bounds on the approximation error in terms of the rate of the approximating quantizers. We extend all these approximation results to randomized policies. These findings pave the way for applications in optimal design of networked control systems where controller actions need to be quantized, as well as for a new computational method for generating approximately optimal decision policies in general (Polish) state and action spaces for both discounted cost and average cost infinite horizon optimal control problems.

## Index Terms

Markov decision processes, stochastic control, approximation, quantization, stationary policies.

The authors are with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada, Email: {nsaldi,linder,yuksel}@mast.queensu.ca

This research was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada.

The material in this paper was presented in part at the 51st Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, Monticello, Illinois, Oct. 2013.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the theory of Markov decision processes (MDP), the set of control policies induced by measurable mappings from the state space to the action space is an important class since it is the smallest structured set of control policies in which one can find globally optimal policy for a large class of infinite horizon discounted cost (see., e.g., [1], [2]) or average cost optimal control problems (see, e.g., [3]–[5]). Such policies are usually called stationary policies in the literature [2]. Although this set is the smallest structured optimal class for MDPs, computing an optimal policy even in this class is in general computationally prohibitive for non-finite Polish (that is, complete, separable and metric) state and action spaces. Furthermore, with applications in networked control, transmission of such control actions to an actuator is not realistic when there is an information transmission constraint (physically limited by the presence of a communication channel) between a plant, a controller or an actuator.

Hence, it is of interest to approximate policies, in particular the optimal policy, in this class. From the computation point of view, Approximate Value Iteration (AVI) and Approximate Policy Iteration (API) algorithms are two powerful methods to approximate an optimal (deterministic stationary) policy for an MDP (see [6], [7], [8], [9] and references therein). In AVI, the idea is to compute approximately the value iteration function in each step of the value iteration algorithm. This way one can both approximately find the optimal value function and construct an approximately optimal (deterministic stationary) policy. Although, the main purpose of the API is the same as AVI (i.e., to approximate the optimal value function), the algorithm works differently. In each step, first an approximate value function for a given policy is computed. Then, an improved policy is generated using the approximate value function. The main drawback of these algorithms is the accumulation of the approximation error in each step.

Another well-known method for approximating an optimal (deterministic stationary) policy is *state aggregation*. In this method, similar states (e.g., with respect to cost and transition probabilities) are aggregated to form meta-states, and an optimal policy can then be calculated according to the reduced MDP (see [10]–[12] and references therein). The basic issue with this method is how to efficiently aggregate states and construct a reduced MDP from the original one.

For denumerable MDPs, several approaches have been developed to approximate the optimal

(deterministic stationary) policy. References [13]–[17] used the technique of truncating the state space when evaluating the value function in the value iteration algorithm. In these schemes, in each step the state space is truncated and the corresponding value function is calculated; this latter is proved to converge to the true value function. Then, using the truncated value function, approximately optimal policies are constructed. In [18] the idea of *embedding* is used to approximate an optimal (deterministic stationary) policy. Here, a finite state MDP is constructed, which has the same optimal cost as the original MDP and has an optimal policy which agrees with the optimal policy of the original MDP in the approximating set. This finite state MDP is said to be embedded in the original one. Reference [19] considers the approximation problem for denumerable continuous time MDPs. Here a convergence notion for control models is defined and is then used to show the convergence of optimal policies for the truncated MDPs to the optimal policy for the original MDP.

In all these works, optimal (deterministic stationary) policy is approximated by deterministic stationary policies induced by measurable functions having finite range on the action space. Motivated by this fact, in this paper we study the approximation of the deterministic stationary policies by deterministic stationary policies having finite range. We call such policies deterministic stationary quantizer policies because they are induced by quantizers from the state space to the action space. These policies are then used to approximate deterministic stationary policies. We show that there exists an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal deterministic stationary quantizer policy in the set of deterministic stationary policies. We also demonstrate that the difference between the cost of an optimal deterministic stationary policy and the cost of the approximating deterministic stationary quantizer policy can be upper bounded by a term depending on the rate of the quantizer. We also extend these results to approximating randomized stationary policies by randomized stationary quantizer policies. This extension is motivated by the fact that, for a large class of average cost optimization problems, it is not known whether one can restrict the optimal policies to deterministic and stationary policies, whereas the optimality of possibly randomized stationary policies can be established through the convex analytic method [3], [20]. Note that in our method, in order to approximate a deterministic stationary policy one must know the policy itself, unlike in the methods used to approximate the optimal policy in the literature. However, since we show the existence of the  $\varepsilon$ -optimal deterministic stationary quantizer policy and obtain an error bound depending on the resolution of the quantizer, one can search for approximately optimal

deterministic stationary policy within the quantized control policies having fixed number of output levels  $M$  by choosing sufficiently large  $M$ . Finding such efficient search (design) methods is the subject of future work.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II we review the definition of discrete time Markov decision processes (MDP) in the setting we will be dealing with. In Section III-A we consider the approximation problem for the total and discounted cost cases and the existence of an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal deterministic stationary quantizer policy is established using strategic measures (that is, measures on the sequence space of states and control actions). In Section III-B a similar approximation result is obtained for the average cost case using ergodic invariant probability measures of the induced Markov chains. In Section IV we derive quantitative bounds on the approximation error in terms of the rate of the approximating quantizers for both the discounted cost and the average cost. In Section V we extend the results in Sections III and IV to approximating randomized stationary policies by randomized stationary quantizer policies.

## II. MARKOV DECISION PROCESSES

We consider a discrete time Markov decision process (MDP) with components as follows.

- (i) The state space  $X$  is a complete, separable metric (Polish) space equipped with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ .
- (ii) The action space  $A$  is also a Polish space equipped with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(A)$ .
- (iii) The transition probability  $p$  is a stochastic kernel on  $X$  given  $X \times A$ , i.e.,  $p(\cdot | x, a)$  is a probability measure on  $X$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $a \in A$ , and  $p(B | \cdot, \cdot)$  is a measurable function from  $X \times A$  to  $[0, 1]$  for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ .
- (iv) The cost function  $w$  will be specified later.

The following notation is from [21]. Define the history spaces  $H_n = (X \times A)^n \times X$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  endowed with their product Borel  $\sigma$ -algebras generated by  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(A)$ . A *randomized policy*  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  is a sequence of stochastic kernels on  $A$  given  $H_n$ . A *deterministic policy*  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  is a sequence of stochastic kernels on  $A$  given  $H_n$  which are realized by a sequence of measurable functions  $\{f_n\}$  from  $H_n$  to  $A$ , i.e.,  $\pi_n(\cdot | h_n) = \delta_{f_n(h_n)}(\cdot)$  where  $f_n : H_n \rightarrow A$  measurable. A *randomized Markov policy* is a sequence of stochastic kernels  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  on  $A$  given  $X$ . A *deterministic Markov policy* is defined as sequence of stochastic kernels  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  on  $A$  given  $X$  which are realized by a sequence of measurable functions

$\{f_n\}$  from  $X$  to  $A$ , i.e.,  $\pi_n(\cdot|x) = \delta_{f_n(x)}(\cdot)$ , where  $f_n : X \rightarrow A$  is measurable. A *randomized stationary policy* is a sequence of stochastic kernels  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  on  $A$  given  $X$  such that  $\pi_n = \pi_m$  for  $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . A *deterministic stationary policy* is a constant sequence of stochastic kernels  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  on  $A$  given  $X$  such that  $\pi_n(\cdot|x) = \delta_{f(x)}(\cdot)$  for all  $n$  for some measurable function  $f : X \rightarrow A$ .

We denote by  $R\Pi$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $RM$ ,  $M$ ,  $RS$  and  $S$  the set of all randomized, deterministic, randomized Markov, deterministic Markov, randomized stationary and deterministic stationary policies, respectively. We have the following inclusions:  $R\Pi \supset RM \supset RS$ ,  $\Pi \supset M \supset S$ ,  $R\Pi \supset \Pi$ ,  $RM \supset M$  and  $RS \supset S$ .

Let  $B(E)$  denote the set of all bounded measurable real functions on a measurable space  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  and let  $C_b(E)$  denote the set of all bounded continuous real valued functions on a topological space  $E$  equipped with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ . Also let  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  denote the set of all probability measures on  $E$  and let  $\mathcal{M}(E)$  denote the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the weak topology on  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  [22]. If  $E$  is a Polish space, then  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  is metrizable with the Prokhorov metric which makes  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  into a Polish space [23]. Unless otherwise specified, the term "measurable" will refer to Borel measurability. Let  $E_n = \prod_{i=1}^n E_i$  ( $2 \leq n \leq \infty$ ) be a finite or a infinite product space. By an abuse of notation, any function  $g$  on  $\prod_{j=i_1}^{i_n} E_j$ , where  $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , is also treated as a function on  $E_n$  by identifying it with its natural extension to  $E_n$ .

According to the Ionescu Tulcea theorem [24], an initial distribution  $\mu$  on  $X$  and a policy  $\pi$  define a unique probability measure  $P_\mu^\pi$  on  $H_\infty = (X \times A)^\infty$ , which is called a *strategic measure* [21]. Thus  $P_\mu^\pi$  is symbolically given by

$$P_\mu^\pi(dx_0 da_0 dx_1 da_1 \dots) := \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} p(dx_n | x_{n-1}, a_{n-1}) \pi(da_n | h_n),$$

where  $h_n = (x_0, a_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, a_{n-1}, x_n)$  and  $p(dx_0 | x_{-1}, a_{-1}) = \mu(dx_0)$ . If  $\mu = \delta_x$  for some  $x \in X$ , we write  $P_x^\pi$  instead of  $P_{\delta_x}^\pi$ . For  $\Delta \subset R\Pi$  define  $L_\Delta := \{P_\mu^\pi : \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X), \pi \in \Delta\}$ . Then  $L_{R\Pi}$  is the set of all strategic measures. Clearly  $L_{R\Pi} \subset \mathcal{P}(H_\infty)$ . It is known that  $L_{R\Pi}$ ,  $L_\Pi$ ,  $L_{RM}$ ,  $L_M$ ,  $L_{RS}$  and  $L_S$  are all in  $\mathcal{M}(H_\infty)$  [21, Theorem 3.2]. Hence, the restriction of  $\mathcal{M}(H_\infty)$  to  $L_\Delta$ , for each of  $\Delta = R\Pi, \Pi, RM, M, RS, S$ , coincides with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $L_\Delta$  generated by the weak topology. The cost function  $w$  is defined to be a measurable function from  $L_{R\Pi}$  to  $[0, \infty]$ , i.e.,

$$w : L_{R\Pi} \rightarrow [0, \infty]. \quad (1)$$

Let  $c$  and  $c_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , be measurable functions from  $X \times A$  to  $[0, \infty]$ . The following are examples for the type of cost functions defined in (1) (see [25]). Here the expectations are taken with respect to strategic measures induced by the policies and initial distributions.

- i) Expected Finite Horizon Cost:  $E[\sum_{n=0}^N c_n(x_n, a_n)]$  for some  $N < \infty$ .
- ii) Expected Total Cost:  $E[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n(x_n, a_n)]$ .
- iii) Expected Discounted Cost:  $E[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n c(x_n, a_n)]$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ .
- iv) Expected Average Cost:  $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} E[\sum_{n=0}^N c(x_n, a_n)]$ .

Note that both the expected finite horizon cost and the expected discounted cost are special cases of the expected total cost.

A measurable function  $q : X \rightarrow A$  is called a *quantizer* from  $X$  to  $A$  if the range of  $q$ , i.e.,  $q(X) = \{q(x) \in A : x \in X\}$ , is finite. The elements of  $q(X)$  (i.e., the possible values of  $q$ ) are called the *levels* of  $q$ . The rate  $R$  of a quantizer  $q$  is defined as the logarithm of the number of its levels:  $R = \log_2 |q(X)|$ . Note that  $R$  (approximately) represents the number of bits needed to losslessly encode the output levels of  $q$  using binary codewords of equal length. Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  denote the set of all quantizers from  $X$  to  $A$ . In this paper we introduce a new type of policy called a *deterministic stationary quantizer policy*. Such a policy is a constant sequence  $\pi = \{\pi_n\}$  of stochastic kernels on  $A$  given  $X$  such that  $\pi_n(\cdot | x) = \delta_{q(x)}(\cdot)$  for all  $n$  for some  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Let  $S\mathcal{Q}$  denote the set of all deterministic stationary quantizer policies.

One of the main goals in this paper is to find conditions on the spaces  $X$  and  $A$ , initial distribution  $\mu$ , the stochastic kernel  $p$ , and the cost function  $w$  such that the following statements hold:

- (P1) For any given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\pi^* \in S\mathcal{Q}$  satisfying  $w(P_{\mu}^{\pi^*}) < \inf_{\pi \in S} w(P_{\mu}^{\pi}) + \varepsilon$ .
- (P2) For any  $\pi \in S$  there exists an approximating sequence  $\{\pi^k\} \in S\mathcal{Q}$  such that the difference  $|w(P_{\mu}^{\pi}) - w(P_{\mu}^{\pi^k})|$  can be upper bounded by a term depending on the rates of quantizers inducing  $\{\pi^k\}$ .

Similar results will be established for *randomized* stationary quantizer policies in Section V.

### III. APPROXIMATION OF DETERMINISTIC STATIONARY POLICIES

A sequence  $\{\mu_n\}$  of measures on a measurable space  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  is said to converge setwise [26] to a measure  $\mu$  if  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{E}$ , or equivalently,  $\int g d\mu_n \rightarrow \int g d\mu$  for all  $g \in B(E)$ . In this section, we will impose the following assumptions:

- (a) The stochastic kernel  $p(\cdot|x, a)$  is setwise continuous in  $a \in A$ , i.e., if  $a_n \rightarrow a$ , then  $p(\cdot|x, a_n) \rightarrow p(\cdot|x, a)$  setwise for all  $x \in X$ .
- (b)  $A$  is compact.

We now define the  $ws^\infty$  topology on  $\mathcal{P}(H_\infty)$  which was first introduced by Schäl in [27]. Let  $\mathcal{C}(H_0) = B(X)$  and let  $\mathcal{C}(H_n)$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) be the set of real valued functions  $g$  on  $H_n$  such that  $g \in B(H_n)$  and  $g(x_0, \cdot, x_1, \cdot, \dots, x_{n-1}, \cdot, x_n) \in C_b(A^n)$  for all  $(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in X^{n+1}$ . The  $ws^\infty$  topology on  $\mathcal{P}(H_\infty)$  is defined as the smallest topology which renders all mappings  $P \mapsto \int_{H_\infty} g dP$ ,  $g \in \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{C}(H_n)$ , continuous. Similarly, the weak topology on  $\mathcal{P}(H_\infty)$  can also be defined as the smallest topology which makes all mappings  $P \mapsto \int_{H_\infty} g dP$ ,  $g \in \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty C_b(H_n)$ , continuous [27, Lemma 4.1]. A theorem due to Balder [28, page 149] and Nowak [29] states the weak topology and the  $ws^\infty$  topology on  $L_{R\Pi}$  are equivalent. Hence, the  $ws^\infty$  topology is metrizable with the Prokhorov metric on  $L_{R\Pi}$ .

The following theorem is a Corollary of [30, Theorem 2.4] which will be used in this paper frequently. It is a generalization of the dominated convergence theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  be a measurable space and let  $\mu, \mu_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) be measures with the same finite total mass. Suppose  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  setwise,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(x) = h(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ , and  $h, h_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) are uniformly bounded. Then,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h_n d\mu_n = \int h d\mu$ .*

Since the action space  $A$  is compact and thus totally bounded, one can approximate any measurable function  $f : X \rightarrow A$  by a sequence of simple function  $\{q_k\} \in \mathcal{Q}$  (quantizers in our context) such that  $q_k$  converges *uniformly* to  $f$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . The following proposition will be proved using Theorem 3.1.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Assume (a) and (b) hold. Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f : X \rightarrow A$  and let  $\{q_k\}$  be the sequence of quantizers which converge uniformly to  $f$ . Let  $\{\pi^k\} \in S\mathcal{Q}$  be induced by  $\{q_k\}$ . Then,  $P_\mu^{\pi^k} \rightarrow P_\mu^\pi$  in  $ws^\infty$  topology for an arbitrary initial distribution  $\mu$ .*

*Proof:* We will prove that  $\int g dP_\mu^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \int g dP_\mu^\pi$  for any  $g \in \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{C}(H_n)$ . If  $g \in \mathcal{C}(H_n)$  for some  $n$ , then we have

$$\int_{H_\infty} g dP_\mu^{\pi^k} = \int_{H_n} g \prod_{i=1}^n p(dx_i | x_{i-1}, a_{i-1}) \delta_{q_k(x_{i-1})}(da_{i-1}) \mu(dx_0)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+1}} r_k \prod_{i=1}^n p(dx_i | x_{i-1}, q_k(x_{i-1})) \mu(dx_0),$$

and similarly

$$\int_{\mathbf{H}_\infty} g dP_\mu^\pi = \int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+1}} r \prod_{i=1}^n p(dx_i | x_{i-1}, f(x_{i-1})) \mu(dx_0),$$

where  $r_k := g(x_0, q_k(x_0), \dots, q_k(x_{n-1}), x_n)$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and  $r := g(x_0, f(x_0), \dots, f(x_{n-1}), x_n)$  on  $\mathbf{X}^{n+1}$ . Note that both  $r$  and  $r_k$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) are uniformly bounded. Since  $g$  is continuous in the "a" terms by definition and  $q_k$  converges to  $f$ , we have

$$r_k(x_0, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow r(x_0, \dots, x_n)$$

for all  $(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{X}^{n+1}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, if we can prove that

$$\prod_{i=1}^n p(dx_i | x_{i-1}, q_k(x_{i-1})) \mu(dx_0) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n p(dx_i | x_{i-1}, f(x_{i-1})) \mu(dx_0)$$

setwise as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , then by Theorem 3.1 we have  $\int_{\mathbf{H}_\infty} g dP_\mu^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbf{H}_\infty} g dP_\mu^\pi$  which will complete the proof.

We will prove this by induction. Clearly,  $p(dx_1 | x_0, q_k(x_0)) \mu(dx_0) \rightarrow p(dx_1 | x_0, f(x_0)) \mu(dx_0)$  setwise by assumption (a). Assume the claim is true for some  $n \geq 1$ . Let us define  $\gamma_k(\cdot) := p(dx_n | x_{n-1}, q_k(x_{n-1})) \cdots \mu(dx_0)$  and  $\gamma(\cdot) := p(dx_n | x_{n-1}, f(x_{n-1})) \cdots \mu(dx_0)$ , so  $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma$  setwise by the claim. For any  $h \in B(\mathbf{X}^{n+2})$  we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+2}} h \prod_{i=0}^n p(dx_{i+1} | x_i, q_k(x_i)) \mu(dx_0) = \int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+1}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbf{X}} h p(dx_{n+1} | x_n, q_k(x_n)) \right\} d\gamma_k \quad (2)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+2}} h \prod_{i=0}^n p(dx_{i+1} | x_i, f(x_i)) \mu(dx_0) = \int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+1}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbf{X}} h p(dx_{n+1} | x_n, f(x_n)) \right\} d\gamma \quad (3)$$

It is enough to prove that (2) converges to (3) as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Let us define  $l_k(x_0, \dots, x_n) := \int_{\mathbf{X}} h p(dx_{n+1} | x_n, q_k(x_n))$  and  $l(x_0, \dots, x_n) := \int_{\mathbf{X}} h p(dx_{n+1} | x_n, f(x_n))$ . Observe that  $l_k(x_0, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow l(x_0, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{X}^{n+1}$  by assumption (a). Also,  $l$  and  $l_k$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) are uniformly bounded functions on  $\mathbf{X}^{n+1}$  since  $h$  is bounded. Hence, since  $\gamma^k \rightarrow \gamma$  setwise, and by Theorem 3.1, we can conclude that  $\int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+1}} l_k d\gamma_k \rightarrow \int_{\mathbf{X}^{n+1}} l d\gamma$ , i.e., (2) converges to (3). Hence,  $p(dx_{n+1} | x_n, q_k(x_n)) \cdots \mu(dx_0) \rightarrow p(dx_{n+1} | x_n, f(x_n)) \cdots \mu(dx_0)$  setwise as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , completing the proof. ■



### A. Expected Total and Discounted Costs

Here we consider the first approximation problem **(P1)** for the expected total cost criterion  $E[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n(x_n, a_n)]$  and its special case, the expected discounted cost criterion  $E[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n c(x_n, a_n)]$ . Let  $E_{\mu}^{\pi}$  denote the expectation with respect to  $P_{\mu}^{\pi}$  on  $H_{\infty}$ . Define

$$w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi}) := E_{\mu}^{\pi} \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n(x_n, a_n) \right].$$

We impose the following assumptions in addition to assumptions (a) and (b):

- (c)  $c$  and  $c_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) are non-negative, bounded measurable functions satisfying  $c(x, \cdot)$ ,  $c_n(x, \cdot) \in C_b(A)$  for all  $x \in X$ .
- (d)  $\sup_{\pi \in S} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since the per stage cost functions  $c_n$  are non-negative, assumption (d) is equivalent to Condition (C) in [27, page 349]. Clearly, the expected discounted cost and expected finite horizon cost satisfy the assumption (d) under assumption (c).

We have the following proposition about the continuity of the expected total cost  $w_t$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Under assumptions (c) and (d), the mapping  $\pi \mapsto w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi})$  is sequentially continuous on  $L_{RII}$  under the  $ws^{\infty}$  topology for any initial distribution  $\mu$  on  $X$ .*

*Proof:* Assume that  $P_{\mu}^{\pi^k} \rightarrow P_{\mu}^{\pi}$  in the  $ws^{\infty}$  topology. By Tonelli's theorem, we can write  $w_t$  as  $w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi}$ . By assumption (c), since  $c_n \in \mathcal{C}(H_{n+1})$ , we have

$$\int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \quad (4)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $n$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi^k} - \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left| \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi^k} - \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \right| \\ & \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=0}^N \left| \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi^k} - \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \right| + 2 \sup_{\tilde{\pi} \in S} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\tilde{\pi}} \\ & = 2 \sup_{\tilde{\pi} \in S} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \int_{H_{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\tilde{\pi}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where (5) follows from (4). Since the last expression converges to zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  by assumption (d), the proof is complete.  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Under assumptions (a), (b), (c) and (d) for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\pi^* \in S\mathcal{Q}$  such that  $w_t(P_\mu^{\pi^*}) < \inf_{\pi \in S} w_t(P_\mu^\pi) + \varepsilon$ . Hence, (P1) is true under assumptions (a), (b), (c) and (d) for the expected total cost criterion.*

*Proof:* The statement directly follows from Propositions 3.1 and 3.2.  $\blacksquare$

In the rest of this section we consider the expected discounted cost criterion, i.e.,  $w_\beta(P_\mu^\pi) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} c(x_n, a_n) dP_\mu^\pi$ . Recall that  $w_\beta$  satisfies (d) under the assumption (c), so Theorem 3.2 holds for  $w_\beta$  under assumptions (a), (b), (c). However, we can also obtain Theorem 3.2 for  $w_\beta$  by considering occupation measures. For any initial distribution  $\mu$  and any policy  $\pi$  the occupation measure is defined as

$$\nu_\mu^\pi(B) := (1 - \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n P_\mu^\pi((x_n, a_n) \in B), \quad (6)$$

where  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A})$ . It is clear that  $\nu_\mu^\pi$  is a well defined probability measure on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$ . It is also immediate that  $w_\beta(P_\mu^\pi)$  can be written as an integral of  $\frac{1}{(1-\beta)}c$  with respect to the occupation measure  $\nu_\mu^\pi$ , i.e.,

$$w_\beta(P_\mu^\pi) = \frac{1}{(1 - \beta)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}} c(x, a) d\nu_\mu^\pi. \quad (7)$$

Similar to the  $ws^\infty$  topology, we now define the  $ws$  topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A})$  which was also introduced by M. Schäl in [27]. A sequence of probability measures  $\{\nu_k\}$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$  converges in the  $ws$  topology to a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $\int g d\nu_k \rightarrow \int g d\nu$  for all bounded measurable function  $g$  satisfying  $g(x, \cdot) \in C_b(\mathcal{A})$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $P_\mu^\pi, \{P_\mu^{\pi^k}\} \in L_{R\Pi}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ). If  $P_\mu^{\pi^k} \rightarrow P_\mu^\pi$  in the  $ws^\infty$  topology, then  $\nu_\mu^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \nu_\mu^\pi$  in the  $ws$  topology.*

*Proof:* Let  $g \in B(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A})$  satisfying  $g(x, \cdot) \in C_b(\mathcal{A})$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}} g d\nu_\mu^{\pi^k} = (1 - \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} g(x_n, a_n) dP_\mu^{\pi^k},$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}} g d\nu_\mu^\pi = (1 - \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} g(x_n, a_n) dP_\mu^\pi.$$

By the boundedness of  $g$  we have  $\sup_{\pi \in R\Pi} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{H_{\infty}} g(x_n, a_n) P_{\mu}^{\pi} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence we obtain

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{H_{\infty}} g(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{H_{\infty}} g(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi}$$

as in the proof of Proposition 3.2. This means that  $\nu_{\mu}^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \nu_{\mu}^{\pi}$  in the  $ws$  topology. ■

Let  $w_{o,\beta}$  denote the expected discounted cost function when it is written with respect to the occupation measure, i.e.,

$$w_{o,\beta}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi}) := \frac{1}{(1-\beta)} \int_{X \times A} c(x, a) d\nu_{\mu}^{\pi},$$

and note that  $w_{o,\beta}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi}) = w_{\beta}(P_{\mu}^{\pi})$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Under assumption (c) if a sequence of occupation measures  $\{\nu_{\mu}^{\pi^k}\}$  converges to an occupation measure  $\nu_{\mu}^{\pi}$  in the  $ws$  topology, then  $w_{o,\beta}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi^k}) \rightarrow w_{o,\beta}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi})$ .*

*Proof:* The proposition directly follows from the definition of the  $ws$  topology. ■

**Theorem 3.3.** *Under assumptions (a), (b) and (c) for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\pi^* \in S\mathcal{Q}$  such that  $w_{o,\beta}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi^*}) < \inf_{\pi \in S} w_{o,\beta}(\nu_{\mu}^{\pi}) + \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof:* The theorem is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4. ■

*Example 3.1.* Let us consider an additive-noise system given by

$$x_{n+1} = F(x_n, a_n) + v_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

where  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$  and the  $v_n$ 's are i.i.d. random vectors whose common distribution has a continuous, bounded, and strictly positive density  $g$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure. A non-degenerate Gaussian distribution satisfies this condition. We assume that the action space  $A$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for some  $d \geq 1$ , the one stage cost functions  $c$  and  $c_n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) satisfy assumption (c), and  $F(x, \cdot)$  is continuous for all  $x \in X$ . It is straightforward to show that assumption (a) holds under these conditions. Hence, under assumption (d) on the cost functions  $c_n$ , Theorem 3.2 holds for this system. Since discounted cost satisfies assumption (d), Theorem 3.3 also holds for this system.

### B. Expected Average Cost

In this section we consider the first approximation problem **(P1)** for the expected average cost function  $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} E \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} c(x_n, a_n) \right]$ . We are still assuming (a), (b), and (c). Recall that the goal is to obtain an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal deterministic stationary quantizer policy in the set of deterministic stationary policies for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In contrast to the expected total cost and discounted cost cases, the expected average cost is in general not sequentially continuous on the set of strategic measures  $L_{RH}$  for the  $ws^\infty$  topology under reasonable assumptions. Hence, in this case it is not convenient working with strategic measures.

Let  $J(\pi, \mu) = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} E_\mu^\pi \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} c(x_n, a_n) \right]$  denote the expected average cost associated with the initial distribution  $\mu$  and policy  $\pi$ . If  $\mu = \delta_x$ , we write  $J(\pi, x)$  instead of  $J(\pi, \delta_x)$ . Observe that any deterministic stationary policy  $\pi$ , induced by  $f$ , defines a stochastic kernel on  $\mathsf{X}$  given  $\mathsf{X}$ :

$$Q_\pi(\cdot | x) := \int_{\mathsf{A}} p(\cdot | x, a) \delta_{f(x)}(da) = p(\cdot | x, f(x)). \quad (8)$$

Define the function  $c_\pi$  on  $\mathsf{X}$  corresponding to policy  $\pi$  as follows:  $c_\pi(x) := \int_{\mathsf{A}} c(x, a) \delta_{f(x)}(da) = c(x, f(x))$ . Clearly,  $c_\pi$  is a bounded measurable function. Let  $Q_\pi^n$  denote the  $n$ -step transition probability for  $Q_\pi$ . Let us write  $Q_\pi^n g(x) := \int_{\mathsf{X}} g(y) Q_\pi^n(y | x)$  for any measurable function  $g$  on  $\mathsf{X}$ . If  $Q_\pi$  admits an ergodic invariant probability measure  $\nu_\pi$ , then by Theorem 2.3.4 and Proposition 2.4.2 in [26], there exists an invariant set with full  $\nu_\pi$  measure such that for all  $x$  in that set we have

$$J(\pi, x) = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathsf{H}_\infty} c(x_n, a_n) dP_x^\pi = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Q_\pi^n c_\pi(x) = \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_\pi(x) \nu_\pi(dx). \quad (9)$$

Let  $M_\pi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X})$  be the set of all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  such that convergence in (9) holds. Hence,  $\nu_\pi(M_\pi) = 1$  if  $\nu_\pi$  exists. By working with invariant probability measures for the induced stochastic kernels  $Q_\pi$  instead of strategic measures, we can derive an approximation result similar to Theorem 3.2 by invoking Theorem 3.1. However, to do that we need the setwise convergence of invariant probability measures  $\nu_\pi$  corresponding to stochastic kernels  $Q_\pi$ . The following results give sufficient conditions for this.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f$ . Let  $\{q_k\}$  and  $\{\pi^k\}$  be as before and let  $Q_\pi$  and  $Q_{\pi^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) be the corresponding stochastic kernels as defined in (8). Assume that*

- (i)  $Q_{\pi^k}$  has an invariant probability measure  $\nu_{\pi^k}$  for each  $k$ ,
- (ii)  $\{\nu_{\pi^k}\}$  is sequentially relatively compact for the setwise topology.

Then every setwise limit of the sequence  $\{\nu_{\pi^k}\}$  is an invariant probability measure for  $Q_\pi$ . In particular, if  $Q_\pi$  has a unique invariant probability measure, then every convergent subsequence of  $\{\nu_{\pi^k}\}$  converges to this invariant measure.

*Proof:* Since  $\{\nu_{\pi^k}\}$  is sequentially relatively compact, there exists a subsequence  $\{\nu_{\pi^{k_l}}\}$  of  $\{\nu_{\pi^k}\}$  which converges setwise to some probability measure  $\nu_\pi$ . We will prove that  $\nu_\pi$  is an invariant probability measure for  $Q_\pi$ . For simplicity we write  $\{\nu_{\pi^l}\}$  instead of  $\{\nu_{\pi^{k_l}}\}$ . Let  $g \in B(X)$ . Then by assumption (i) we have

$$\int_X g(x) \nu_{\pi^l}(dx) = \int_X \int_X g(y) Q_{\pi^l}(dy|x) \nu_{\pi^l}(dx) = \int_X Q_{\pi^l}g(x) \nu_{\pi^l}(dx).$$

Observe that by assumption (a),  $Q_{\pi^l}g(x) \rightarrow Q_\pi g(x)$  for all  $x$ . Since  $Q_\pi g(x)$  and  $Q_{\pi^l}g(x)$  ( $l \geq 1$ ) are uniformly bounded and  $\nu_{\pi^l} \rightarrow \nu_\pi$  setwise, we have  $\int_X Q_{\pi^l}g(x) \nu_{\pi^l}(dx) \rightarrow \int_X Q_\pi g(x) \nu_\pi(dx)$  by Theorem 3.1. On the other hand since  $\nu_{\pi^l} \rightarrow \nu_\pi$  setwise we have  $\int_X g(x) \nu_{\pi^l}(dx) \rightarrow \int_X g(x) \nu_\pi(dx)$ . Thus  $\int_X Q_\pi g(x) \nu_\pi(dx) = \int_X g(x) \nu_\pi(dx)$ . Since  $g$  is arbitrary we have  $\nu_\pi Q_\pi = \nu_\pi$ , i.e.  $\nu_\pi$  is an invariant probability measure for  $Q_\pi$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 3.6.** Let  $\pi$ ,  $f$ ,  $Q_\pi$  and  $\{\pi^k\}$ ,  $\{q_k\}$ ,  $\{Q_{\pi^k}\}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) be as in the Proposition 3.5 and assume the following hold:

- (i)  $Q_\pi$  and  $Q_{\pi^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) have an invariant probability measures  $\nu_\pi$  and  $\nu_{\pi^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ),
- (ii) For all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,  $Q_{\tilde{\pi}}^n(B|x) \rightarrow \nu_{\tilde{\pi}}(B)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $\tilde{\pi} \in \{\pi, \pi^1, \pi^2, \dots\}$  for some  $x$ .

Then  $\nu_{\pi^k} \rightarrow \nu_\pi$  setwise.

*Proof:* Observe that for all  $x \in X$  and all  $n$ ,  $Q_{\pi^k}^n(\cdot|x) \rightarrow Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x)$  setwise since  $P_x^{\pi^k} \rightarrow P_x^\pi$  in the  $ws^\infty$  topology (see Proposition 3.1). Let  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  be given and fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By assumption (ii) we can choose  $N$  large enough such that  $|Q_{\tilde{\pi}}^N(B|x) - \nu_{\tilde{\pi}}(B)| < \varepsilon/3$  for all  $\tilde{\pi} \in \{\pi, \pi^1, \pi^2, \dots\}$ . For this  $N$ , choose  $K$  large enough such that  $|Q_{\pi^k}^N(B|x) - Q_\pi^N(B|x)| < \varepsilon/3$  for all  $k \geq K$ . Thus, for all  $k \geq K$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu_{\pi^k}(B) - \nu_\pi(B)| &\leq |\nu_{\pi^k}(B) - Q_{\pi^k}^N(B|x)| + |Q_{\pi^k}^N(B|x) - Q_\pi^N(B|x)| \\ &\quad + |Q_\pi^N(B|x) - \nu_\pi(B)| < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, we obtain  $\nu_{\pi^k}(B) \rightarrow \nu_\pi(B)$  which completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Recall that  $M_\pi$  is the set of all initial points  $x$  such that the convergence in (9) holds. The following assumptions will be imposed in the next theorem.

- (e) For any  $\pi \in S$ ,  $Q_\pi$  has an unique invariant probability measure  $\nu_\pi$ .
- (f1) The set  $\Gamma_S := \{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \nu Q_\pi = \nu \text{ for some } \pi \in S\}$  is relatively sequentially compact in the setwise topology.
- (f2) There exists  $x \in X$  such that for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,  $Q_\pi^n(B|x) \rightarrow \nu_\pi(B)$  uniformly in  $\pi \in S$ .
- (g)  $M := \bigcap_{\pi \in S} M_\pi \neq \emptyset$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let the initial distribution  $\mu$  be concentrated on some  $x \in M$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\pi^* \in S\mathcal{Q}$  such that  $J(\pi^*, x) < \inf_{\tilde{\pi} \in S} J(\tilde{\pi}, x) + \varepsilon$  under assumptions (e), (f1) (or (f2)), and (g).*

*Proof:* Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f$  such that  $J(\pi, x) < \inf_{\tilde{\pi} \in S} J(\tilde{\pi}, x) + \varepsilon/2$ . Let  $\{q_k\}$  be a sequence of quantizers converging uniformly to  $f$  and let  $\{\pi^k\}$  denote the corresponding policies. Let  $Q_\pi$  and  $Q_{\pi^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) be the corresponding stochastic kernels defined in (8). By assumption (e),  $Q_\pi$  and  $Q_{\pi^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) have unique, and so ergodic, invariant probability measures  $\nu_\pi$  and  $\nu_{\pi^k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ), respectively. Then, by assumption (f1) (or (f2)) and Proposition 3.5 (or 3.6) there exists a subsequence  $\{\nu_{\pi^{k_l}}\}$  such that  $\nu_{\pi^{k_l}} \rightarrow \nu_\pi$  setwise. Since  $x \in M$ , we have  $J(\pi^{k_l}, x) = \int_X c_{\pi^{k_l}} d\nu_{\pi^{k_l}}$  and  $J(\pi, x) = \int_X c_\pi d\nu_\pi$ . Observe that  $c_{\pi^{k_l}}(x) = c(x, q_{k_l}(x)) \rightarrow c(x, f(x)) = c_\pi(x)$  for all  $x$  by assumption (c). Hence, by Theorem 3.1 we have  $J(\pi^{k_l}, x) \rightarrow J(\pi, x)$ , so for sufficiently large  $l_0$  we have  $J(\pi^{k_{l_0}}, x) < J(\pi, x) + \varepsilon/2 < \inf_{\tilde{\pi} \in S} J(\tilde{\pi}, x) + \varepsilon$ . Letting  $\pi^* = \pi^{k_{l_0}} \in S\mathcal{Q}$  complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

In the rest of this section we will derive conditions under which assumptions (e), (f1), (f2), (g) hold. In particular, we will consider an additive-noise system to find sufficient conditions under which assumptions (e), (f1), (f2) and (g) hold.

To begin with, assumptions (e), (f2) and (g) are satisfied under any of the conditions  $Ri$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1, 1(a), 1(b), 2, \dots, 6\}$  in [31]. Moreover,  $M = X$  in (g) if at least one of the above conditions hold. The next step is to find sufficient conditions for assumptions (e), (f1) and (g) to hold. The following gives a sufficient condition for sequential relative compactness in setwise topology.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If the set of probability measures  $\Gamma$  on  $X$  is majorized by a finite measure  $\gamma$ , then  $\Gamma$  sequentially relatively compact in the setwise topology.*

*Proof:* This follows from Prokhorov's theorem and [26, Theorem 1.5.5]. ■

The following proposition gives a sufficient condition for the existence of an invariant probability measure for a stochastic kernel which is not necessarily Feller. It can be proved by modifying the proof of [32, Theorem 4.17].

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $Q$  be a stochastic kernel on  $X$  given  $X$ . If there exists  $\tilde{x}$  in  $X$  such that the sequence  $\{Q^n(\cdot | \tilde{x})\}$  is majorized by a finite measure  $\gamma$ , then  $Q$  has an invariant probability measure.*

*Proof:* Assume each term in the sequence  $\{Q^n(\cdot | \tilde{x})\}$  is majorized by the finite measure  $\gamma$ . Define  $Q^{(N)}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Q^n(\cdot | \tilde{x})$ . Clearly,  $Q^{(N)} \leq \gamma$  for all  $N$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.1 there exists a subsequence  $\{Q^{(N_k)}\}$  which converges to some probability measure  $\nu$  setwise. Let us write  $\{Q^{(k)}\}$  instead of  $\{Q^{(N_k)}\}$ . For any  $f \in B(X)$  observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_X f(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) - \int_X Qf(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_X f(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) - \int_X \int_X f(\hat{x}) Q(d\hat{x} | x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{N_k} \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N_k-1} \int_X f(x) Q^n(dx | \tilde{x}) - \sum_{n=0}^{N_k-1} \int_X f(x) Q^{n+1}(dx | \tilde{x}) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{N_k} \left| \int_X f(x) Q^0(dx | \tilde{x}) - \int_X f(x) Q^{N_k}(dx | \tilde{x}) \right| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

(where  $Q^0(dx | \tilde{x}) = \delta_{\tilde{x}}(dx)$ ) since  $f$  is bounded. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_X f(x) \nu(dx) - \int_X Qf(x) \nu(dx) \right| &\leq \left| \int_X f(x) \nu(dx) - \int_X f(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_X f(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) - \int_X Qf(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_X Qf(x) Q^{(k)}(dx | \tilde{x}) - \int_X Qf(x) \nu(dx) \right| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

by the fact  $Q^{(k)} \rightarrow \nu$  setwise and the preceding argument. Thus  $\int f(x) \nu(dx) = \int Qf(x) \nu(dx)$  for all  $f \in B(X)$  which implies that  $\nu$  is an invariant probability measure for  $Q$ . ■

Observe that the stochastic kernel  $p$  on  $X$  given  $X \times A$  can be written as a measurable mapping from  $X \times A$  to  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  if  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is equipped with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ , i.e.,

$$p(\cdot | x, a) : X \times A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X).$$

We impose the following assumption

(e1)  $p(\cdot | x, a) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  for all  $x \in X$ ,  $a \in A$  for some finite measure  $\gamma$  on  $X$ .

**Fact 3.1.** *Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f$  and let  $Q_\pi$  be the corresponding stochastic kernel defined as  $Q_\pi(\cdot | x) = p(\cdot | x, f(x))$ . Under assumption (e1),  $\{Q_\pi^n(\cdot | x)\}$  is majorized by  $\gamma$  for all  $x$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $x$  be an arbitrary point in  $X$ . Clearly  $Q_\pi(\cdot | x) = p(\cdot | x, f(x)) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  by (e1). Assuming  $Q_\pi^n(\cdot | x) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , we have  $Q_\pi^{n+1}(\cdot | x) = \int_X Q_\pi(\cdot | \tilde{x}) Q_\pi^n(d\tilde{x} | x) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  since  $Q_\pi(\cdot | \tilde{x}) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  for all  $\tilde{x}$ . Thus,  $Q_\pi^n(\cdot | x) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  for all  $n$ . ■

**Proposition 3.8.** *Suppose (e1) holds. Then, for any  $\pi \in S$ ,  $Q_\pi$  has an invariant probability measure  $\nu_\pi$  which is majorized by  $\gamma$ . Hence, (e1) implies assumption (f1) by Lemma 3.1. In addition, if these invariant measures are unique, then assumptions (e) and (g) also hold with  $M = X$  in (g).*

*Proof:* Fix any  $\pi \in S$ . The existence of an invariant probability measure for  $Q_\pi$  follows from Fact 3.1 and Proposition 3.7. If  $\nu_\pi$  is an invariant probability measure, then we have

$$\nu_\pi(\cdot) = \int_X Q_\pi(\cdot | x) \nu_\pi(dx) \leq \gamma(\cdot),$$

since  $Q_\pi(\cdot | x) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  for all  $x$ .

Observe that for each  $x \in X$ ,  $Q_\pi^{(N)}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Q_\pi^n(\cdot | x) \leq \gamma(\cdot)$  for all  $N$ . Furthermore, if the invariant measure  $\nu_\pi$  is unique, then every setwise convergent subsequence of  $\{Q_\pi^{(N)}\}$  must converge to  $\nu_\pi$  (see the proof of the Proposition 3.7). These two facts imply that  $Q_\pi^{(N)} \rightarrow \nu_\pi$  setwise. Hence,  $J(\pi, x) = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_X c_\pi(\tilde{x}) Q_\pi^{(N)}(d\tilde{x}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_X c_\pi(\tilde{x}) Q_\pi^{(N)}(d\tilde{x}) = \int_X c_\pi(\tilde{x}) \nu_\pi(d\tilde{x})$  for all  $x \in X$  since  $c_\pi$  is bounded and  $Q_\pi^{(N)} \rightarrow \nu_\pi$  setwise. Thus,  $M = X$ . ■

*Example 3.2.* Let us consider an additive-noise system in Example 3.1. We still assume that the noise  $v_n$  has a continuous, bounded, and strictly positive density  $g$ . We also assume that  $A$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for some  $d \geq 1$ , and the one stage cost function  $c$  satisfies assumption (c). Observe that for any  $\pi \in S$ , if  $Q_\pi$  has an invariant probability measure, then it has to be



unique [26, Lemma 2.2.3] since there cannot exist disjoint invariant sets due to the positivity of  $g$ . Hence if this system satisfies assumption (e1), then assumptions (e), (f1) and (g) with  $M = X$  hold by Proposition 3.8. Assumption (e1) holds if  $F$  is continuous and bounded [33, Example 2.7]. In particular, if  $\lambda$  is a Gaussian distribution, the boundedness of  $F$  is enough to hold assumption (e1). On the other hand, the boundedness of  $F$  also implies  $R1(a)$  in [31] which further implies assumptions (e), (f2) and (g) with  $M = X$  [31, Theorem 3.2]. Hence, if  $F$  is bounded, then (e), (f2) and (g) hold with  $M = X$ , and (e), (f1) and (g) hold with  $M = X$  if  $\lambda$  is also Gaussian. If  $F$  is bounded and continuous, then (e), (f1) and (g) hold with  $M = X$ . This means that Theorem 3.4 holds for this system if  $F$  is bounded.

#### IV. UPPER BOUNDS ON THE APPROXIMATION ERROR IN TERMS OF QUANTIZER RATE

In this section our aim is to find an upper bound, in terms of the rates of quantizers used, on how well deterministic stationary quantizer policies can approximate general deterministic stationary policies. Recall that the rate of a quantizer  $q$  is defined as the logarithm of the cardinality of its range, i.e.,  $R := \log_2 |q(X)|$ . Let  $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$  [26] denote the total variation distance between measures and let  $d_A$  denote the metric of the space  $A$ . We will use the following assumptions in this section:

- (h)  $A$  is infinite compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for some  $d \geq 1$ .
- (j)  $c$  is bounded and  $|c(x, \tilde{a}) - c(x, a)| \leq K_1 d_A(\tilde{a}, a)$  for all  $x$ , and some  $K_1 \geq 0$ .
- (k)  $\|p(\cdot | x, \tilde{a}) - p(\cdot | x, a)\|_{TV} \leq K_2 d_A(\tilde{a}, a)$  for all  $x$ , and some  $K_2 \geq 0$ .
- (l) For each deterministic stationary policy  $\pi$ , the stochastic kernel  $Q_\pi(dy|x)$  has a density  $g_\pi(y|x)$  with respect to a  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $m$  on  $X$ , and there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $C \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  such that  $m(C) > 0$  and

$$g_\pi(y|x) \geq \varepsilon \text{ for all } y \in C, x \in X, \pi \in S.$$

Indeed, assumption (l) is the same as condition  $R1(a)$  in [31] which was mentioned in Section III-B. However, we define it as a new assumption for the sake of completeness and clarity. In the following two section we will obtain bounds for the expected discounted cost and expected average cost criteria. Assumptions (h), (j) and (k) will be imposed for both cases, but (l) will only be assumed for the expected average cost case. The following example gives the sufficient conditions for the additive noise system under which (h), (j), (k) and (l) hold.

*Example 4.3.* Consider the additive-noise system in Example 3.1. In addition to the assumptions there, suppose the density  $g$  is Lipschitz on all compact subsets of  $\mathsf{X}$  and  $F(x, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz uniformly in  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ . Note that a Gaussian density has these properties. Let  $c(x, a) := \|x - a\|^2$ . Under these conditions, assumptions (j) and (k) hold for the additive system. If we further assume that  $F$  is bounded, then assumption (l) holds as well.

The following result is a consequence of the simple fact that if  $A$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  then there exist a constant  $\lambda > 0$  and finite subsets  $C_k \subset A$  with cardinality  $|C_k| \leq k$  such that  $\max_{x \in A} \min_{y \in C_k} d_A(x, y) \leq \lambda(1/k)^{1/d}$  for all  $k$ , where  $d_A$  is the Euclidean distance on  $A$  inherited from  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . This bound can be obtained, e.g., by finding a hypercube (with edges aligned with the coordinate axes) which contains  $A$  and choosing  $C_k$  as the rectangular grid obtained by intersecting this cube with the scaled integer lattice  $\frac{\Delta}{k^{1/d}}\mathbb{Z}^d$ , where  $\Delta$  denotes the side length of the cube. With this construction,  $\lambda = \sqrt{d\Delta}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be compact. Then for any measurable function  $f : \mathsf{X} \rightarrow A$  we can construct a sequence of quantizers  $\{q_k\}$  from  $\mathsf{X}$  to  $A$  with rates  $R_k := \log_2 |q_k(\mathsf{X})| = \log_2 k$  which satisfy  $\sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} d_A(q_k(x), f(x)) \leq \lambda(1/k)^{1/d}$  for some constant  $\lambda$ .*

In the rest of this section we are assuming that any deterministic stationary policy  $\pi$  induced by  $f$  is approximated by a sequence  $\{\pi^k\}$  of deterministic stationary quantizer policies which are induced by a sequence  $\{q_k\}$  of quantizers as in Lemma 4.2. By an abuse of notation, let  $P_\mu^\pi(dx_n)$  denote the marginal distribution of the state  $x_n$ . The following proposition is the key result in this section.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f$ . Let  $\{q_k\}$  be as in the Lemma 4.2 inducing policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . For any initial distribution  $\mu$  we have*

$$\|P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_n)\|_{TV} \leq \lambda K_2(2n - 1)(1/k)^{1/d} \quad (10)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$  under assumptions (h), (j) and (k).

*Proof:* We will prove this result by induction. Let  $\mu$  be an arbitrary initial distribution and fix  $k$ . For  $n = 1$  the claim holds by the following argument:

$$\|P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_1)\|_{TV} = 2 \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X})} \left| \int_{\mathsf{X}} p(B|x, f(x))\mu(dx) - \int_{\mathsf{X}} p(B|x, q_k(x))\mu(dx) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_{\mathbf{X}} 2 \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})} |p(B|x, f(x)) - p(B|x, q_k(x))| \mu(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{X}} \|p(\cdot|x, f(x)) - p(\cdot|x, q_k(x))\|_{TV} \mu(dx) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbf{X}} K_2 d_A(f(x), q_k(x)) \mu(dx) \text{ (by assumption (k))} \\
&\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbf{X}} K_2 d_A(f(x), q_k(x)) \leq (1/k)^{1/d} K_2 \lambda \text{ (by Lemma 4.2).}
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the bound  $\lambda K_2(2n-1)(1/k)^{1/d}$  is independent of the choice of initial distribution  $\mu$  for  $n = 1$ . Assume the claim is true for  $n \geq 1$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|P_\mu^\pi(dx_{n+1}) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_{n+1})\|_{TV} \\
&:= 2 \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})} |P_\mu^\pi(x_{n+1} \in B) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(x_{n+1} \in B)| \\
&= 2 \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})} \left| \int_{\mathbf{X}} P_{x_1}^\pi(x_n \in B) P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) - \int_{\mathbf{X}} P_{x_1}^{\pi^k}(x_n \in B) P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_1) \right| \\
&= 2 \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X})} \left( \left| \int_{\mathbf{X}} P_{x_1}^\pi(x_n \in B) P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) - \int_{\mathbf{X}} P_{x_1}^{\pi^k}(x_n \in B) P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) \right| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \int_{\mathbf{X}} P_{x_1}^{\pi^k}(x_n \in B) P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) - \int_{\mathbf{X}} P_{x_1}^{\pi^k}(x_n \in B) P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_1) \right| \right) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbf{X}} \|P_{x_1}^\pi(dx_n) - P_{x_1}^{\pi^k}(dx_n)\|_{TV} P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) + 2 \|P_\mu^\pi(dx_1) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_1)\|_{TV} \tag{11} \\
&\leq (1/k)^{1/d} (2n-1) K_2 \lambda + 2(1/k)^{1/d} K_2 \lambda \tag{12} \\
&= \lambda K_2 (2(n+1) - 1) (1/k)^{1/d} \lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Here (11) follows since

$$\left| \int_{\mathbf{X}} h(x) \mu(dx) - \int_{\mathbf{X}} h(x) \eta(dx) \right| \leq \|\mu - \eta\|_{TV} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{X}} |h(x)|$$

and (12) follows since the bound  $\lambda K_2(2n-1)(1/k)^{1/d}$  is independent of the initial distribution. ■

#### A. Upper Bound for the Expected Discounted Cost

In this case, for any initial distribution  $\mu$  and any  $\pi \in S$ , induced by  $f$ , the expected discounted cost can be written as

$$w_\beta(P_\mu^\pi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, f(x_n)) P_\mu^\pi(dx_n). \tag{13}$$

We will write  $w_\beta(\pi)$  instead of  $w_\beta(P_\mu^\pi)$ . The following theorem essentially follows from Proposition 4.9.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f$ . Let  $\{q_k\}$  be a sequence of quantizers with rates  $R_k = \log_2 k$  as in the Lemma 4.2, inducing policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . For any initial distribution  $\mu$ , we have*

$$|w_\beta(\pi) - w_\beta(\pi^k)| \leq K(1/k)^{1/d}, \quad (14)$$

where  $K = \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta}(K_1 - \beta K_2 M + \frac{2\beta M K_2}{1-\beta})$  with  $M := \sup_{(x,a) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{A}} |c(x,a)|$  under assumptions (h), (j) and (k). Hence, (P2) is true under assumptions (h), (j) and (k) for the expected discounted cost criterion.

*Proof:* For any fixed  $k$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |w_\beta(\pi) - w_\beta(\pi^k)| \\ &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, f(x_n)) P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, q_k(x_n)) P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_n) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \left( \left| \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, f(x_n)) P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) - \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, q_k(x_n)) P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, q_k(x_n)) P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) - \int_{\mathbf{X}} c(x_n, q_k(x_n)) P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_n) \right| \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \left( \sup_{x_n \in \mathbf{X}} |c(x_n, f(x_n)) - c(x_n, q_k(x_n))| + \|P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_n)\|_{TV} M \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \left( \sup_{x_n \in \mathbf{X}} d_A(f(x_n), q_k(x_n)) K_1 \right) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta^n \left( (1/k)^{1/d} (2n-1) K_2 \lambda M \right) \quad (15) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \left( (1/k)^{1/d} \lambda K_1 \right) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta^n \left( (1/k)^{1/d} (2n-1) K_2 \lambda M \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.2}) \\ &= (1/k)^{1/d} \lambda (K_1 - \beta K_2 M) \frac{1}{1-\beta} + (1/k)^{1/d} 2K_2 \lambda M \frac{\beta}{(1-\beta)^2} \\ &= (1/k)^{1/d} \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} (K_1 - \beta K_2 M + \frac{2\beta M K_2}{1-\beta}). \end{aligned}$$

Here (15) follows from Assumption (j) and Proposition 4.9. This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

### B. Upper Bound for the Expected Average Cost Case

For the expected average cost criterion we cannot apply the same method as for the discounted cost since the bound obtained there diverges as  $\beta$  approaches 1. However, as in Section III-B

we approach the problem by writing the expected average cost as an integral of the one stage cost function with respect to an invariant probability measure for the induced stochastic kernel. This way we obtain a bound on the difference between the actual and the approximated cost. However, the bound for this case will depend both on the rates of quantizers approximating the actual policy and an extra term which changes with the system parameters. However, as we show this extra term goes to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose (c) and (l) hold. Then, for any  $\pi \in S$  and  $x \in X$  we have*

$$J(\pi, x) = \int_X c_\pi(x) \nu_\pi(dx), \quad (16)$$

where  $\nu_\pi$  is the unique invariant probability measure for the induced stochastic kernel  $Q_\pi$  (see (8)).

*Proof:* By [31, Theorem 3.2], assumption (l) implies the *Uniform Ergodicity* property in [31, page 33]. The Uniform Ergodicity property implies the existence of a unique invariant probability measure  $\nu_\pi$  for the  $Q_\pi$  and it also implies that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P_x^\pi(dx_n) \rightarrow \nu_\pi(\cdot) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty \text{ setwise} \quad (17)$$

for all  $x \in X$  and all  $\pi \in S$ . Since  $c$  is bounded by assumption (c), (17) implies (16). ■

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose assumption (l) holds. Then for any  $\pi \in S$  and  $x \in X$ , we have*

$$\|Q_\pi^n(\cdot | x) - \nu_\pi(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq 2 \left( \frac{(2 - \varepsilon m(C))}{2} \right)^n$$

for all  $n$  where  $\nu_\pi$  is the unique invariant probability measure in Lemma 4.3.

*Remark 4.1.* Note that since  $\varepsilon \leq g_\pi(y|x)$  by assumption (l),  $\varepsilon m(C) \leq 1$  which implies  $\left( \frac{(2 - \varepsilon m(C))}{2} \right) \leq 1$ .

*Proof:* By assumption (l), for any  $\pi \in S$  and  $x \in X$  we have

$$Q_\pi(\cdot | x) \geq \gamma(\cdot), \quad (18)$$

where the measure  $\gamma$  is defined as  $\gamma(E) := \int_E \rho(x) m(dx)$  and  $\rho(x) := \varepsilon I_C(x)$ , with  $I_C(\cdot)$  denoting the indicator function of  $C$ . Clearly,  $\gamma(X) = \varepsilon m(C) > 0$ . Observe that (18) corresponds to condition (2) in [34, page 56]. By [34, Lemma 3.3] condition (2) implies condition (5) in [34, page 56] with the bound  $2 \left( \frac{(2 - \varepsilon m(C))}{2} \right)^n$ . This completes the proof. ■

Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 imply the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\pi \in S$  be induced by  $f$  and let  $\{q_k\}$  be a sequence of quantizers with rates  $R_k = \log_2 k$  as in the Lemma 4.2, inducing policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . Under assumptions (h), (j), (k), and (l), for any  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  we have*

$$|J(\pi, x) - J(\pi^k, x)| \leq 4M \left( \frac{2 - \varepsilon m(C)}{2} \right)^n + K_n (1/k)^{1/d} \quad (19)$$

for all  $n \geq 0$ , where  $K_n = ((2n - 1)K_2\lambda M + K_1\lambda)$  and  $M := \sup_{(x,a) \in \mathsf{X} \times \mathsf{A}} |c(x, a)|$ .

*Proof:* For any  $k$  and  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |J(\pi, x) - J(\pi^k, x)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_{\pi}(x) \nu_{\pi}(dx) - \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_{\pi^k}(x) \nu_{\pi^k}(dx) \right| \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.3}) \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_{\pi}(x) \nu_{\pi}(dx) - \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_{\pi^k}(x) \nu_{\pi}(dx) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_{\pi^k}(x) \nu_{\pi}(dx) - \int_{\mathsf{X}} c_{\pi^k}(x) \nu_{\pi^k}(dx) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} |c_{\pi}(x) - c_{\pi^k}(x)| + \|\nu_{\pi} - \nu_{\pi^k}\|_{TV} \sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} |c_{\pi^k}(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} K_1 d_A(f(x), q_k(x)) + \|\nu_{\pi} - \nu_{\pi^k}\|_{TV} M \quad (\text{by assumption (j)}) \\ &\leq (1/k)^{1/d} K_1 \lambda + \left( \|\nu_{\pi} - Q_{\pi}^n(\cdot | x)\|_{TV} + \|Q_{\pi}^n(\cdot | x) - Q_{\pi^k}^n(\cdot | x)\|_{TV} + \|Q_{\pi^k}^n(\cdot | x) - \nu_{\pi^k}\|_{TV} \right) M \\ &\leq (1/k)^{1/d} K_1 \lambda + \left( 4 \left( \frac{2 - \varepsilon m(C)}{2} \right)^n + (1/k)^{1/d} (2n - 1) K_1 \lambda \right) M \quad (20) \\ &= 4M \left( \frac{2 - \varepsilon m(C)}{2} \right)^n + \left( (2n - 1) K_2 \lambda M + K_1 \lambda \right) (1/k)^{1/d}, \end{aligned}$$

where (20) follows from Lemma 4.4, from the fact  $Q_{\pi}^n(\cdot | x) = P_x^{\pi}(dx_n)$  for all  $\pi$  and from Proposition 4.9. ■

Observe that depending on the values of  $\varepsilon$  and  $m(C)$ , we can first make the first term in (19) small enough by choosing sufficiently large  $n$ , and then for this  $n$  we can choose  $k$  large enough such that the second term in (19) is small. The following is an example of how to find  $\varepsilon$  and  $C$  in assumption (l).

*Example 4.4.* Let us again consider an additive-noise system in Example 3.1 with Gaussian noise. Let  $\mathsf{X} = \mathbb{R}$ . Assume  $F$  has a bounded range so that  $F(\mathbb{R}) \subset [-L, L]$  for some  $L > 0$ . Let  $m$  denote the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . For any  $\pi \in S$  induced by  $f$  and for any  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ ,  $Q_{\pi}(\cdot | x)$

is absolutely continuous with respect to  $m$  with density  $g_\pi(y|x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp^{-(y-F(x,f(x)))^2/2\sigma^2}$ . Hence, assumption (I) holds with  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp^{-(2L)^2/2\sigma^2}$  and  $C = [-L, L]$  for this system.

## V. APPROXIMATION OF RANDOMIZED STATIONARY POLICIES

In Section III we showed that any deterministic stationary policy can be approximated by a sequence of deterministic stationary quantizer policies which implies that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there always exists  $\varepsilon$ -optimal deterministic stationary quantizer policy  $\pi_\varepsilon$  in the set of deterministic stationary policies. Hence, if deterministic stationary policies are an optimal class for this MDP, then  $\pi_\varepsilon$  is  $\varepsilon$ -optimal in the set of all policies as well. Under the assumptions in Section III deterministic stationary policies are known to be an optimal class for the discounted cost [24].

However, for the average cost case there exist problem instances where it is not known whether one can, without any loss, restrict the search for optimal stationary policies to deterministic policies. In particular, through the convex analytic method [3]–[5], one establishes the optimality of deterministic and stationary policies by showing that these correspond to the set of extreme points in a properly defined set of ergodic occupation measures (see, e.g., [5, Proposition 9.2.5] for problems involving countable state spaces and [3], [35] for problems involving  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as the state space). For this reason, it is worth investigating the approximation of randomized stationary policies for the average cost optimization problems. For the sake of completeness we also derive results for the discounted cost, even though for this case optimal policies can be restricted to be stationary and deterministic (a common proof technique here is through contraction [2]).

We first consider the problem of approximating randomized stationary policies by *randomized stationary quantizer policies*. Then, we give quantitative bounds on the approximation error in terms of the rate of the approximating randomized quantizers. Throughout this section we skip over some proof details since these follow by applying same steps as in the proofs given in Section III and IV.

Throughout this section, we assume that conditions (a), (b), and (c) hold. Let  $\pi \in RS$  be induced by a stochastic kernel  $\eta(da|x)$  on  $A$  given  $X$ . By Lemma 1.2 in [36] there exists a measurable function  $f : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow A$  such that for any  $E \in \mathcal{B}(A)$

$$\eta(E|x) = m(\{z : f(x, z) \in E\}),$$

where  $m$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ . Equivalently, we can write  $\eta(E|x)$  as

$$\eta(E|x) = \int_{[0,1]} \delta_{f(x,z)}(E) m(dz). \quad (21)$$

Hence,  $\pi$  can be represented as an (uncountable) convex combination of deterministic stationary policies parameterized by  $[0,1]$ . For each  $z$ , let  $\{q_k(\cdot, z)\}$  denote the sequence of quantizers that uniformly converges to  $f(\cdot, z)$ . Note that such quantizers can be constructed so that the resulting function  $q_k(x, z)$  is measurable and  $|q_k(X, z)| = k < \infty$  for all  $z \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $\{\pi^k\}$  be the sequence of randomized stationary policies induced by the stochastic kernels

$$\eta_k(\cdot|x) := \int_{[0,1]} \delta_{q_k(x,z)}(\cdot) m(dz). \quad (22)$$

Let  $RSQ$  denote the set of all randomized stationary policies  $\pi \in RSQ$  that are induced by some  $\tilde{\eta}$  which can be written as

$$\tilde{\eta}(\cdot|x) := \int_{[0,1]} \delta_{q(x,z)}(\cdot) m(dz),$$

where  $q$  is measurable and satisfies  $|q(X, z)| = M$  for all  $z \in [0, 1]$  and for some  $M < \infty$ . We call  $RSQ$  the set of randomized stationary quantizer policies. Hence,  $\pi^k$  induced by  $\eta_k$  in (22) is in  $RSQ$  for all  $k$ .

Note that any  $\pi \in RS$  induced by a stochastic kernel  $\eta$  from  $X$  to  $A$ , defines a stochastic kernel on  $X$  given  $X$  given by

$$Q_\pi(\cdot|x) := \int_A p(\cdot|x, a) \eta(da|x). \quad (23)$$

Using (21), (23) can also be written in the form

$$Q_\pi(\cdot|x) = \int_{[0,1]} p(\cdot|x, f(x, z)) m(dz). \quad (24)$$

This representation can be used to prove the following result.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\pi \in RS$  be induced by  $\eta(\cdot|x) = \int_{[0,1]} \delta_{f(x,z)}(\cdot) m(dz)$  and let  $\{\pi^k\}$  be the approximating sequence of randomized stationary quantizer policies be induced by  $\eta_k(\cdot|x) = \int_{[0,1]} \delta_{q_k(x,z)}(\cdot) m(dz)$ . Under assumptions (a) and (b),  $P_x^{\pi^k}(dx_n) = Q_{\pi^k}^n(\cdot|x) \rightarrow P_x^\pi(dx_n) = Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x)$  setwise for all  $x \in X$  and  $n \geq 1$ . Hence, by dominated convergence theorem,  $P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_n) \rightarrow P_\mu^\pi(dx_n)$  setwise for all  $n$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .*



*Proof:* We prove the statement by induction. Fix  $x \in \mathbb{X}$ . For  $n = 1$  we have

$$Q_{\pi^k}(\cdot | x) = \int_{[0,1]} p(\cdot | x, \mathbf{q}_k(z, x)) m(dz). \quad (25)$$

Since  $p(\cdot | x, \mathbf{q}_k(x, z)) \rightarrow p(\cdot | x, \mathbf{f}(x, z))$  by assumption (a) and the fact  $\mathbf{q}_k(x, z) \rightarrow \mathbf{f}(x, z)$ , it can be proved that  $Q_{\pi^k}(\cdot | x)$  converges setwise to

$$Q_{\pi}(\cdot | x) := \int_{[0,1]} p(\cdot | x, \mathbf{f}(z, x)) m(dz)$$

by an application of the dominated convergence theorem. Hence, the statement holds for  $n = 1$ .

Assume the statement holds for some  $n \geq 1$ . Then we have

$$Q_{\pi^k}^{n+1}(\cdot | x) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} Q_{\pi^k}(\cdot | \tilde{x}) Q_{\pi^k}^n(d\tilde{x} | x) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{X}} Q_{\pi}(\cdot | \tilde{x}) Q_{\pi}^n(d\tilde{x} | x) = Q_{\pi}^{n+1}(\cdot | x)$$

setwise by Theorem 3.1. This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

For any initial distribution  $\mu$  and any  $\tilde{\pi} \in RS$  we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{H}^{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\tilde{\pi}} &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \int_{\mathbb{A}} c_n(x_n, a_n) \tilde{\eta}(da_n | x_n) P_{\mu}^{\tilde{\pi}}(dx_n) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} c_{n, \tilde{\pi}}(x_n) P_{\mu}^{\tilde{\pi}}(dx_n), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $c_{n, \tilde{\pi}}(x_n) := \int_{\mathbb{A}} c_n(x_n, a_n) \tilde{\eta}(da_n | x_n) = \int_{[0,1]} c_n(x_n, \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(x_n, z)) m(dz)$  by (21). Hence, for any  $n \geq 0$ , we have  $c_{n, \pi^k}(x_n) \rightarrow c_{n, \pi}(x_n)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  by dominated convergence theorem and assumption (c). Thus, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{H}^{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{H}^{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \quad (27)$$

by Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 5.5.

The following assumption is a version of assumption (d) adapted to the set of randomized stationary policies.

$$(d1) \quad \sup_{\pi \in RS} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{H}^{\infty}} c_n(x_n, a_n) dP_{\mu}^{\pi} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Under assumption (d1) it is straightforward to show that (27) implies  $w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi^k}) \rightarrow w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi})$  (see the proof of Proposition 3.2). Hence, we have the following result.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Under assumptions (a), (b), (c) and (d1), for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\pi^* \in RSQ$  such that  $w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi^*}) < \inf_{\pi \in RS} w_t(P_{\mu}^{\pi}) + \varepsilon$ .*

Recall the occupation measures defined in (6). Using Lemma 5.5 and applying the same steps as in the proof of Proposition 3.3, we can show that  $\nu_{\mu}^{\pi^k} \rightarrow \nu_{\mu}^{\pi}$  in  $ws$  topology under the

assumptions (a) and (b). It is also clear that expected discounted cost function  $w_{o,\beta}$  is continuous with respect to occupation measures in  $ws$  topology by assumption (c). Hence, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2.** *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\pi^* \in RS\mathcal{Q}$  such that  $w_{o,\beta}(P_{\mu}^{\pi^*}) < \inf_{\pi \in RS} w_{o,\beta}(P_{\mu}^{\pi}) + \varepsilon$  under assumptions (a), (b), (c).*

The next step is to obtain an approximation result for the expected average cost case. Observe that if we replace a deterministic stationary policy  $\pi$  and the corresponding sequence of deterministic stationary quantizer policies  $\{\pi^k\}$  with the randomized ones in Propositions 3.5 and 3.6, then the statements of these propositions are still valid.

Likewise, let us adapt assumptions (e), (f1), (f2) and (g) to the randomized stationary case as follows

- ( $\tilde{e}$ ) For any  $\pi \in RS$ ,  $Q_{\pi}$  has an unique invariant probability measure  $\nu_{\pi}$ .
- ( $\tilde{f}1$ ) The set  $\Gamma_{RS} := \{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \nu Q_{\pi} = \nu \text{ for some } \pi \in RS\}$  is relatively sequentially compact in the setwise topology.
- ( $\tilde{f}2$ ) There exists an  $x \in X$  such that for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,  $Q_{\pi}^n(B|x) \rightarrow \nu_{\pi}(B)$  uniformly in  $\pi \in RS$ .
- ( $\tilde{g}$ )  $M := \bigcap_{\pi \in RS} M_{\pi} \neq \emptyset$ .

By using the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 3.4 we can obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Suppose the initial distribution  $\mu$  is concentrated on some  $x \in M$ . Then, under assumptions ( $\tilde{e}$ ), ( $\tilde{f}1$ ) (or ( $\tilde{f}2$ )) and ( $\tilde{g}$ ), for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\pi^* \in RS\mathcal{Q}$  such that  $J(\pi^*, x) < \inf_{\tilde{\pi} \in RS} J(\tilde{\pi}, x) + \varepsilon$ .*

As in Section III-B, in the rest of this section we find conditions under which above assumptions hold.

**Proposition 5.10.** *Suppose (e1) holds. Then, for any  $\pi \in RS$ ,  $Q_{\pi}$  has an invariant probability measure  $\nu_{\pi}$  which is majorized by  $\gamma$ . Hence, (e1) implies assumption ( $\tilde{f}1$ ) by Lemma 3.1. In addition, if the invariant measures are unique, then assumptions ( $\tilde{e}$ ) and ( $\tilde{g}$ ) also hold with  $M = X$  in ( $\tilde{g}$ ).*

*Proof:* The proof follows verbatim the proof of Proposition 3.8. ■

**Proposition 5.11.** *Suppose (l) holds. Then, for any  $\pi \in RS$  there exists unique invariant probability measure  $\nu_\pi$  for  $Q_\pi$  such that  $\|Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x) - \nu_\pi(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha^n$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $n$ , where  $\alpha = \frac{2-\varepsilon m(C)}{2} < 1$ . Hence,  $(\tilde{e})$ ,  $(\tilde{f}2)$  and  $(\tilde{g})$  with  $M = X$  hold under assumption (l).*

*Proof:* (l) implies (2), and therefore (4), in [34, Lemma 3.3] giving

$$\sup_{(x,a),(y,b)} \|p(\cdot|x, a) - p(\cdot|y, b)\|_{TV} \leq 2\alpha \quad (28)$$

with  $\alpha = \frac{2-\varepsilon m(C)}{2}$ . Now we use the same steps as in the proof of [34, Lemma 3.3] to obtain the desired result. We first prove that  $\{Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x)\}$  is a Cauchy sequence with respect to the total variation norm for all  $x \in X$ . For all  $n, m \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x) - Q_\pi^{n+m}(\cdot|x)\|_{TV} &= 2 \sup_B |Q_\pi^n(B|x) - Q_\pi^{n+m}(B|x)| \\ &= 2 \sup_B \left| \int_X (Q_\pi^n(B|x) - Q_\pi^n(B|y)) Q_\pi^m(dy|x) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_B \sup_y |Q_\pi^n(B|x) - Q_\pi^n(B|y)| \\ &= \sup_y \|Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x) - Q_\pi^n(\cdot|y)\|_{TV} \\ &\leq 2^{-n+1} \sup_{x,y} \|Q_\pi(\cdot|x) - Q_\pi(\cdot|y)\|_{TV}^n \\ &\leq 2\alpha^n, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where (29) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x,y} \|Q_\pi(\cdot|x) - Q_\pi(\cdot|y)\|_{TV} &= \sup_{x,y} \left\| \int_{[0,1]} p(\cdot|x, f(x, z)) m(dz) - \int_{[0,1]} p(\cdot|y, f(y, z)) m(dz) \right\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \int_{[0,1]} \sup_{x,y} \|p(\cdot|x, f(x, z)) - p(\cdot|y, f(y, z))\|_{TV} m(dz) \\ &\leq 2\alpha \text{ by (28)} \end{aligned}$$

(we refer to the proof of [34, Lemma 3.3] for the justification of the other inequalities used). Hence,  $\{Q_\pi^n(\cdot|x)\}$  is a Cauchy sequence for all  $x \in X$ . The rest of the proof is the same as the proof of [34, Lemma 3.3]. ■

*Example 5.5.* Let us again consider the additive-noise system of Example 1. Recall that boundedness of  $F$  implies assumption (l) (or  $R1a$  in [31]), and continuity and boundedness of  $F$  implies assumption (e1). Hence, if  $F$  has a bounded range, then  $(\tilde{e})$ ,  $(\tilde{f}2)$  and  $(\tilde{g})$  with

$M = X$  hold by Proposition 5.11. If  $F$  is also continuous, then  $(\tilde{e})$ ,  $(\tilde{f}1)$  and  $(\tilde{g})$  with  $M = X$  hold by Proposition 5.10.

#### A. Upper Bounds on the Approximation Error Based in Terms of Quantizer Rates

We assume that (h), (j) and (k) hold (see Section IV) in this section. By Lemma 4.2, for any  $z$  we can approximate  $f(\cdot, z)$  by a sequence of quantizers  $\{q_k(\cdot, z)\}$  such that  $|q_k(\cdot, z)| = k$  and  $\sup_{x \in X} d_A(q_k(x, z), f(x, z)) < (1/k)^{1/d} \lambda$ . The stochastic kernels  $\eta_k(\cdot | x) = \int_{[0,1]} \delta_{q_k(x,z)}(\cdot) m(dz)$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) induce randomized stationary quantizer policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . Thus for each  $k$ , all quantizers  $\{q_k(\cdot, z)\}_{z \in [0,1]}$  have rate  $R_k := \log_2 k$ . We will find an upper bound on the approximation error in terms of this fixed rate. We can prove the following result using the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.9.

**Proposition 5.12.** *Let  $\pi \in RS$  be induced by  $\eta$  and let  $\{\eta_k\}$  be as above, inducing policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . Under assumptions (h), (j) and (k) for any initial distribution  $\mu$  and all  $n \geq 1$  we have*

$$\|P_\mu^\pi(dx_n) - P_\mu^{\pi^k}(dx_n)\|_{TV} \leq (1/k)^{1/d} (2n - 1) K_2 \lambda.$$

Note that for any initial distribution  $\mu$  and any  $\pi \in RS$  induced by  $\eta$ , the discounted cost can be written as

$$w_\beta(P_\mu^\pi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta^n \int_X \int_A c(x_n, a_n) \eta(da_n | x_n) dP_\mu^\pi(x_n). \quad (30)$$

Using (30) and Proposition 5.12, it is straightforward to prove the following theorem (see the proof of Theorem 4.1).

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $\pi \in RS$  be induced by  $\eta$  and let  $\{\eta_k\}$  be as above, inducing policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . Under assumptions (h), (j) and (k) for any initial distribution  $\mu$  we have*

$$|w_{o,\beta}(\pi) - w_{o,\beta}(\pi^k)| \leq (1/k)^{1/d} K, \quad (31)$$

where  $K = \frac{\lambda}{1-\beta} (K_1 - \beta K_2 M + \frac{2\beta M K_2}{1-\beta})$  and  $M := \sup_{(x,a) \in X \times A} |c(x, a)|$ .

Observe that by Proposition 5.11, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 hold for randomized stationary policies as well, where  $c_\pi$  is now defined as

$$c_\pi(x) = \int_A c(x, a) \eta(da | x) = \int_{[0,1]} c(x, f(x, z)) m(dz).$$

Hence, Proposition 5.12 and the proof of Theorem 4.2 imply the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $\pi \in RS$  be induced by  $\eta$  and let  $\{\eta_k\}$  be as above, inducing policies  $\{\pi^k\}$ . Under assumptions (h), (j), (k) and (l) for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$  and all  $n \geq 1$*

$$|J(\pi, x) - J(\pi^k, x)| \leq 4M \left( \frac{2 - \varepsilon m(C)}{2} \right)^n + K_n (1/k)^{1/d}$$

where  $K_n = ((2n - 1)K_2\lambda M + K_1\lambda)$  and  $M := \sup_{(x,a) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{A}} |c(x, a)|$ .

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced stationary quantizer policies and showed under not too restrictive conditions that one can always find a deterministic stationary quantizer policy which is  $\varepsilon$  optimal, in terms of the cost, in the set of all deterministic stationary policies. We also found an upper bounds on the error for approximating optimal policies in terms of the rates of the quantizers. We then extended these results to randomized stationary quantizer policies which are used to approximate randomized stationary policies.

One direction for future work is to establish similar results for scenarios where the set of admissible quantizers have a certain structure, such as the set of quantizers having convex codecells [37], which may give rise to practical design methods. It would also be interesting to investigate the structural properties of an optimal policy in the set of deterministic stationary quantizer policies having fixed number of output points. Finally, if one can obtain further results on the structure of optimal policies (e.g., by showing that an optimal policy satisfies a Lipschitz property with a known bound on the constant), the results in this paper may be directly applied to obtain approximation bounds for quantized policies.

## REFERENCES

- [1] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. Lasserre, “Weak conditions for average optimality in Markov control processes,” *Systems Control Lett.*, vol. 22, pp. 287–291, 1994.
- [2] O. Hernandez-Lerma and J. Lasserre, *Discrete-time Markov control processes*. Springer, 1996.
- [3] V. Borkar, “Convex analytic methods in Markov decision processes,” in *Handbook of Markov Decision Processes*, E. Feinberg and A. Shwartz, Eds. Kluwer Academic Publisher, 2002.
- [4] A. S. Manne, “Linear programming and sequential decision,” *Management Science*, vol. 6, pp. 259–267, April 1960.
- [5] S. P. Meyn, *Control Techniques for Complex Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [6] A. Farahmand, R. Munos, and C. Szepesvari, “Error propagation for approximate policy and value iteration,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 568–576, 2010.

- [7] L. Busoniu, D. Ernst, B. Schutter, and R. Babuska, “Approximate dynamic programming with a fuzzy parametrization,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, pp. 804–814, 2010.
- [8] D. Bertsekas and J. Tsitsiklis, *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [9] J. Tsitsiklis and B. Roy, “Feature-based methods for large scale dynamic programming,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 22, pp. 59–94, 1996.
- [10] Z. Ren and B. Krogh, “State aggregation in Markov decision processes,” in *CDC 2002*, Las Vegas, December 2002.
- [11] C. Beck, S. Lall, T. Liang, and M. West, “Model reduction, optimal prediction, and the Mori-Zwanzig representation of Markov chains,” in *CDC 2009*, Shanghai, Dec. 2009, pp. 3282–3287.
- [12] R. Ortner, “Pseudometrics for state aggregation in average reward Markov decision processes,” in *Algorithmic Learning Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [13] B. Fox, “Finite-state approximations to denumerable state dynamic programs,” *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 34, pp. 665–670, 1971.
- [14] D. White, “Finite-state approximations for denumerable state infinite horizon discounted Markov decision processes,” *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 74, pp. 292–295, 1980.
- [15] —, “Finite-state approximations for denumerable state infinite horizon discounted Markov decision processes with unbounded rewards,” *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 186, pp. 292–306, 1982.
- [16] R. Cavazos-Cadena, “Finite-state approximations for denumerable state discounted Markov decision processes,” *Appl. Math. Optim.*, vol. 14, pp. 1–26, 1986.
- [17] O. Hernández-Lerma, “Finite-state approximations for denumerable multidimensional state discounted Markov decision processes,” *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 113, pp. 382–388, 1986.
- [18] A. Leizarowitz and A. Shwartz, “Exact finite approximations of average-cost countable Markov decision processes,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 1480–1487, 2008.
- [19] T. Prieto-Rumeau and J. Lorenzo, “Approximating ergodic average reward continuous-time controlled Markov chain,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 201–207, Jan. 2008.
- [20] A. Manne, “Linear programming and sequential decisions,” *Management Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 259–267, 1980.
- [21] E. Feinberg, “On measurability and representation of strategic measures in Markov decision processes,” *Statistics, Probability and Game Theory*, vol. 30, pp. 29–43, 1996.
- [22] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of probability measures*, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 1999.
- [23] K. Parthasarathy, *Probability Measures on Metric Spaces*. AMS Bookstore, 1967.
- [24] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. Lasserre, *Discrete-Time Markov Control Processes: Basic Optimality Criteria*. Springer, 1996.
- [25] E. Feinberg, “Controlled Markov processes with arbitrary numerical criteria,” *Theory Prob. Appl.*, vol. 27, pp. 486–502, 1982.
- [26] O. Hernández-Lerma and J. Lasserre, *Markov Chains and Invariant Probabilities*. Birkhauser, 2003.
- [27] M. Schäl, “On dynamic programming: compactness of the space of policies,” *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 345–364, 1975.
- [28] E. Balder, “On the compactness of the space of policies in stochastic dynamic programming,” *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 141–150, 1989.
- [29] A. Nowak, “On the weak topology on a space of probability measures induced by policies,” *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math.*, vol. 36, pp. 181–186, 1988.

- [30] R. Serfozo, “Convergence of Lebesgue integrals with varying measures,” *Sankhya Ser.A*, pp. 380–402, 1982.
- [31] O. Hernández-Lerma, R. Montes-De-Oca, and R. Cavazos-Cadena, “Recurrence conditions for Markov decision processes with Borel state space: a survey,” *Ann. Oper. Res.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 29–46, 1991.
- [32] M. Hairer, “Ergodic properties of Markov processes,” *Lecture Notes*, 2006.
- [33] O. Hernández-Lerma and R. Romera, “Limiting discounted-cost control of partially observable stochastic systems,” *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 348–369, 2001.
- [34] O. Hernández-Lerma, *Adaptive Markov Control Processes*. Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [35] V. Borkar, A. Arapastathis, and M. K. Ghosh, *Ergodic Control of Diffusion Processes*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge Uni. Press, 2012.
- [36] I. Gihman and A. Skorohod, *Controlled Stochastic Processes*. Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [37] A. Györfy and T. Linder, “Codecell convexity in optimal entropy-constrained vector quantization,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1821–1828, July 2003.