

Distributionally Robust Safety Verification for Markov Decision Processes

Abhijit Mazumdar, Yuting Hou and Rafal Wisniewski, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a distributionally robust safety verification method for Markov decision processes where only an ambiguous transition kernel is available instead of the precise transition kernel. We define the ambiguity set around the nominal distribution by considering a Wasserstein distance. To this end, we introduce a *robust safety function* to characterize probabilistic safety in the face of uncertain transition probability. First, we obtain an upper bound on the robust safety function in terms of a distributionally robust Q-function. Then, we present a convex program-based distributionally robust Q-iteration algorithm to compute the robust Q-function. By considering a numerical example, we demonstrate our theoretical results.

Index Terms—Distributionally robust safety verification, robust Q-iteration, Markov decision process.

I. INTRODUCTION

Safety verification is vital to safety-critical systems, where unmodeled uncertainties and unpredictable variations can pose serious risks. Traditional approaches to probabilistic safety verification often assume that the system’s behavior can be precisely characterized by known probability distributions. However, accurately identifying these probability distributions in practical scenarios is often challenging due to limited data, environmental variability, or complex dynamics. Consequently, any safety guarantees based on approximate or estimated probability models may become invalid if there is a mismatch between the assumed and actual distributions governing the system’s transitions.

In stochastic optimization, distributionally robust optimization (DRO) has emerged as a powerful tool for providing reliable guarantees under model uncertainty. DRO frameworks account for this uncertainty by optimizing for the worst-case distribution within a specified ambiguity set—a collection of probability distributions that captures possible variations around the nominal model. By considering the worst-case scenario within this set, DRO ensures that the safety guarantees remain robust, even when the true distribution deviates from the computed or assumed one. This approach allows safety-critical systems to operate with greater resilience to uncertainties in their underlying probabilistic models. There are many approaches used in DRO such as Wasserstein distance-based [1]–[3], moment-based [4], Φ -divergence-based [5], [6], etc.

Related Literature: The concept of safety that we consider in this work is the so-called p -safe. It has been developed in [7] and extensively studied in [8]–[11]. A system is called

This work has been supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark (DRF) under Project SAFEmig (Project Number 3105-00173B).

All authors are with the Section of Automation & Control, Aalborg University, 9220 Aalborg East, Denmark (e-mail: {abma, yutingh, raf}@es.aau.dk). Corresponding author: Abhijit Mazumdar.

to be p -safe if the system states do not visit the dangerous states before reaching the control goal with a probability more than a given threshold p . In [12], considering a Markov decision process (MDP), the safety function is reformulated by expected cost and a recursive expression is presented using dynamic programming problem.

In solving DRO optimization, the ambiguity set plays an important role. Wasserstein metric, which is a distance on the space of probability distributions, has been widely used to construct ambiguity set. However, use of Wasserstein distance makes the original problem an infinite-dimensional optimization over probability measures. By using Kantorovich duality [1], [13] resolves the infinite-dimension issue in the worst-case problem and represents the worse-case problem by a finite-dimensional convex optimization. In the context of an MDP, [14] introduces a distributionally robust Bellman equation based on which, a robust value iteration algorithm and a robust policy iteration algorithm are developed. Considering Wasserstein ambiguity set, [15] presents a method for finding the robust optimal policy. To carry out safety assessment, [16] uses moment-based ambiguity to define the uncertain distribution, enabling safety verification under partially known disturbance distributions.

Our Contributions: In this paper, we consider an MDP with a known nominal transition probability and an ambiguity set. We aim to investigate probabilistic safety subject to imperfect knowledge about the true transition probability. Specifically, our goal is to compute the worst case probability of reaching an unsafe state of the MDP before visiting a goal state. To do so, we formulate the problem as a distributionally robust sequential optimization. We use Wasserstein distance to construct the ambiguity set [1]. To characterize distributionally robust safety, we introduce the robust safety function which is the worst case probability of reaching an unsafe state before visiting a goal state. We observe that the robust safety function is the solution of an infinite-dimensional DRO with Wasserstein ambiguity set. To convert the problem into a finite-dimensional convex program, we first observe that the robust safety function has the form of a value function. This allows us to find an upper bound of the robust safety function in terms of the robust Q-function. Then we derive a convex program for distributionally robust Q-function. Based on this convex program, we present a model-based distributionally robust Q-iteration algorithm to estimate an upper bound of the robust safety function.

The following are our main contributions:

- 1) We extend the notion of probabilistic safety namely p -safety to its distributionally robust counterpart in the

context of MDPs.

- ii) We obtain an upper bound for robust safety function in terms of a distributionally robust Q-function for MDPs.
- iii) We develop a finite convex program formulation of the distributionally Q-function. Subsequently, we present a model-based robust Q-iteration algorithm for estimating an upper bound for the robust safety function.

The organization of the rest of the paper is as follows. In section II, we introduce the MDP and various definitions. We introduce Wasserstein metric to describe the distance of two probability distributions and use Kantorovich's duality to reformulate it. Then, we formally define robust p -safety. We present the main results of the paper in Section III. We provide an upper bound for the robust safety function in terms of the distributionally robust Q-function. The convex formulation of the robust Q-function is derived. Based on this result, we develop the distributionally robust Q-iteration, given the nominal distribution. In section IV, we demonstrate with an example how the value of the robust safety function changes as the radius of the Wasserstein ball increases. Finally, we present the concluding remark and our future work plan in section V.

Notations: For any set S , we use $\mathcal{M}(S)$ to denote the set of all Borel probability measure over S . For any real number x , by $|x|$ we denote its absolute value, while for a set S , $|S|$ denotes its cardinality. For any probability measure μ over a discrete set X , we use $L^1(\mu)$ to denote all functions that satisfies $\sum_{x \in X} |f(x)|\mu(x) < \infty$.

II. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a Markov decision process (MDP) with a set of finitely many states \mathcal{X} , a set of finitely many actions \mathcal{A} . We partition the set of state \mathcal{X} into three subsets: a set of all *goal* or *target* states E , a set of *forbidden* or *unsafe* states U , and a *taboo* set $H := \mathcal{X} \setminus (E \cup U)$. In our setup, the goal set E and the forbidden set U are terminal, meaning the process gets terminated at those states. We consider a sample space Ω of the form $\omega = (x_0, a_0, x_1, a_1, \dots) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A})^\infty$ with $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$. The sample space Ω is equipped with the σ -algebra \mathcal{F} generated by coordinate mappings: $X_t(w) = x_t$ and $A_t(w) = a_t$. With a slight abuse of notation, we use upper case X_t and A_t to denote random variables, while x_t and a_t represent their deterministic values, or realizations, at time step t . We use $\pi(a|x)$ to denote a stationary policy where $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$. From any state $x \in H$, the MDP makes a transition to the next state $y \in \mathcal{X}$ with a probability $P_{x,a}(y)$. We define the following set $\mathcal{P}_{x,a} := \{P_{x,a}(y)\}_{y \in \mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{P} := \{\mathcal{P}_{x,a}\}_{(x,a) \in H \times \mathcal{A}}$. Throughout the paper, we assume that the transition probabilities are time-invariant. We use $\mathbb{P}_\pi^\mathcal{P}[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{E}_\pi^\mathcal{P}[\cdot]$ to denote the probability measure and the expectation with respect to a fixed policy π and transition probability \mathcal{P} , respectively.

If the transition probability \mathcal{P} is precisely known, then probabilistic safety can be characterized by defining the *safety function* [12].

Definition 1 (Safety function): [12] Consider a fixed policy π and a fixed initial state $x \in H$. The safety function $S_\pi^\mathcal{P}(x)$ is defined as the probability that any realization

starting from the initial state x hits the unsafe set U before hitting the goal set E following policy π , i.e.,

$$S_\pi^\mathcal{P}(x) := \mathbb{P}_\pi^\mathcal{P}[\tau_U < \tau_E | X_0 = x],$$

where τ_S is the first hitting time of a set S . •

In reality, we may not have access to the precise transition probabilities of the MDP. Instead, we only have a nominal transition probability \mathcal{P} with a Wasserstein-type ambiguity set \mathcal{D}^δ as given below [1]:

$$\mathcal{D}^\delta := \bigtimes_{(x,a) \in H \times \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{D}_{x,a}^\delta, \\ \mathcal{D}_{x,a}^\delta := \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) \mid W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, \mathcal{P}_{x,a}) \leq \delta \right\},$$

where $W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, \mathcal{P}_{x,a})$ is the 1-Wasserstein distance and is of the following form.

$$W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, \mathcal{P}_{x,a}) \\ := \left\{ \min_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})} \sum_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(y,z) |y-z| \right. \\ \left. \text{s.t. } \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(y,z) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}(y), \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(y,z) = \mathcal{P}_{x,a}(z) \right\}$$

The Wasserstein distance can be represented in a dual form using Kantorovich's duality as follows [2]:

$$W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, \mathcal{P}_{x,a}) \\ = \sup_{f \in L^1(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}), g \in L^1(\mathcal{P}_{x,a})} \left\{ \sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}(z_1) + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} g(z_2) \mathcal{P}_{x,a}(z_2) \right. \\ \left. \text{s.t. } f(z_1) + g(z_2) \leq |z_1 - z_2|, \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$$

Then, we get the following expression for the Wasserstein distance $W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, \mathcal{P}_{x,a})$:

$$W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, \mathcal{P}_{x,a}) \\ = \sup_{f \in L^1(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}), g \in L^1(\mathcal{P}_{x,a})} \left\{ \sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}(z_1) + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} g(z_2) \mathcal{P}_{x,a}(z_2) \right. \\ \left. \text{s.t. } g(z_2) \leq \inf_{z_1} (|z_1 - z_2| - f(z_1)), \forall z_2 \in \mathcal{X} \right\} \\ = \sup_{f \in L^1(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a})} \sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}(z_1) + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \inf_{z_1} (|z_1 - z_2| - f(z_1)) \mathcal{P}_{x,a}(z_2) \quad (1)$$

To characterize safety with ambiguous transition probability, we now introduce the distributionally robust safety function.

Definition 2 (Robust safety function): Consider a fixed policy π and a given nominal transition probability \mathcal{P} with an ambiguity set \mathcal{D}^δ . We define the distributionally robust safety function or simply robust safety function $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ as the worst-case probability that any realization starting from $X_0 = x \in H$ visits the forbidden set U before visiting the goal set E , i.e.,

$$S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) := \sup_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{P}_\pi^\mathcal{P}[\tau_U < \tau_E | X_0 = x]$$

We consider the following notion of distributionally robust probabilistic safety, namely robust p -safety. This definition is inspired by the p -safety notion for standard MDPs introduced in [12].

Definition 3 (Robust p -safety): Suppose policy π , robust-

ness parameter δ and the safety parameter $p \in (0, 1)$ are fixed. Hence,

A state $x \in H$ is called robust p -safe if $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) \leq p$. We call an MDP to be robust p -safe if $\max_{x \in H} S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) \leq p$. •

Our goal is to assess the robust p -safety of an MDP for a *evaluation policy* π . The nominal transition probability \mathcal{P} , robustness parameter δ , and a safety parameter p are given. The robust safety function, as presented in (2), is, in general, intractable to compute as it turns out to be an infinite-dimensional optimization over probability measure [1]. However, we aim to calculate the safety function in a tractable manner by converting the problem into a finite-dimensional dual problem. To this end, we use Kantorovich duality for Wasserstein distance.

III. DISTRIBUTIONALLY ROBUST SAFETY VERIFICATION

In this section, we present all the main results to evaluate robust p -safety.

We express the robust safety function as a worst-case finite horizon cost function as shown below.

Lemma 1: The robust safety function $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ can be expressed as follows:

$$S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(X_t, A_t) \middle| X_0 = x \right],$$

where, $\tau = \tau_{E \cup U}$ and $\kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(x, a) = \sum_{y \in U} \tilde{P}_{x,a}(y)$.

Proof: The safety function $S_\pi^{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ can be expressed as follows [12],

$$S_\pi^{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\mathcal{P}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \kappa^{\mathcal{P}}(X_t, A_t) \middle| X_0 = x \right],$$

where, $\kappa^{\mathcal{P}}(x, a) = \sum_{y \in U} P_{x,a}(y)$.

Now, from the definition of the robust safety function,

$$S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} S_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(x) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(X_t, A_t) \middle| X_0 = x \right]$$

We could also express the robust safety function $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ in an alternative form. •

Lemma 2: The robust safety function $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ can be expressed as:

$$S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} c_{t+1} \middle| X_0 = x \right],$$

where,

$$c_{t+1} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } X_{t+1} \in U \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: For each $t \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} [c_{t+1} \middle| X_0 = x] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} [c_{t+1} \middle| X_t, A_t] \middle| X_0 = x \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} [\kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(X_t, A_t) \middle| X_0 = x] \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} c_{t+1} \right] = \mathbb{E}_\pi^{x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(X_t, A_t) \middle| X_0 = x \right] \stackrel{(a)}{=} S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$$

Equality (a) follows from Lemma 1. ■

We notice that the robust safety function $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ can be thought of as a value function. To this end, we define a distributionally robust Q-function for each state-action pair and relate it with the robust safety function.

Definition 4: [Robust Q-function] Suppose $X_0 = x$ and $A_0 = a$. Then, the distributionally robust Q-function $Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ for each $(x, a) \in H \times \mathcal{A}$ is defined as

$$Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) := \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} c_{t+1} \middle| X_0 = x, A_0 = a \right],$$

where, c_{t+1} is as defined in Lemma 2. •

The following result provides an upper bound for the robust safety function.

Lemma 3: The robust safety function can be expressed in terms of the robust Q-function as follows:

$$S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) \leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$$

Proof: From Lemma 2 and Definition 4,

$$\begin{aligned} & S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x) \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} c_{t+1} \middle| X_0 = x \right] \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) \left[\mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} c_{t+1} \middle| X_0 = x, A_0 = a \right] \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} c_{t+1} \middle| X_0 = x, A_0 = a \right] \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1: We express the robust safety function in terms of the robust Q-function for the following reasons. With the ambiguity set around the nominal $P_{x,a}(y)$, it is much easier and natural to deal with $Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ than with $S_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$. We will observe that in the convex program formulation of the Q-function.

We now show that the robust Q-function $Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(\cdot)$ can also be computed recursively using dynamic programming.

Lemma 4: The robust Q-function $Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) &= \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{D}_{x,a}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}} \left[c(x, a, y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') \middle| X_0 = x, A_0 = a, y \sim \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}, a' \sim \pi(a'|y) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $c(x, a, y) = 1$ if $y \in U$, else $c(x, a, y) = 0$.

Proof: Using Lemma 1, we can express the robust Q-function as follows:

$$Q_\pi^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta} \mathbb{E}_\pi^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(X_t, A_t) \middle| X_0 = x, A_0 = a \right].$$

Then, similar to Lemma 2 in [17], we can further express $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ recursively as:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) &= \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{D}_{x,a}^{\delta}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{x,a}}^{\tilde{P}_{x,a}} \left[\kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(x, a) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') | X_0 = x, A_0 = a, y \sim \tilde{P}_{x,a}, a' \sim \pi(a'|y) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Since, $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{x,a}}^{\tilde{P}_{x,a}} [c(x, a, y) | X_0 = x, A_0 = a, y \sim \tilde{P}_{x,a}] = \kappa^{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}(x, a)$, we get the desired result. ■

Following result demonstrate that the robust Q-function is time-invariant in nature.

Lemma 5: Suppose at a time step t , $X_t = x$ and $A_t = a$. Then, the robust Q-function $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) &= \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{D}_{x,a}^{\delta}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{x,a}}^{\tilde{P}_{x,a}} \left[c(x, a, y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a) | X_t = x, A_t = a, y \sim \tilde{P}_{x,a}, a' \sim \pi(a'|y) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $c(x, a, y)$ as defined in Lemma 4.

Proof: The proof follows from the fact that the transition probabilities are time invariant. ■

A. Convex program formulation of the robust Q-function and Model-based robust Q-iteration:

In the following lemma, we express the robust Q-function as a finite-dimensional optimization problem. To this end, we make use of the Kantorovich duality result for Wasserstein distance computation.

Lemma 6: For each state-action pair $(x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$, the distributionally robust Q-function is the solution of:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \left[\lambda \delta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{l \in \mathcal{X}} \left(-\lambda |l - y| + c(x, a, l) + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(l, a') \pi(a'|l) \right) P_{x,a}(y) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Proof: From the definition, $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ is the solution of the above optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) &= \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{D}_{x,a}^{\delta}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{x,a}}^{\tilde{P}_{x,a}} \left[c(x, a, y) + Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') | Z_t^{x,a} \right] \\ &= \begin{cases} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{x,a}}^{\tilde{P}_{x,a}} \left[c(x, a, y) + Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') | Z_t^{x,a} \right] \\ \text{s.t. } W(\tilde{P}_{x,a}, P_{x,a}) \leq \delta \end{cases} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \begin{cases} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{x,a}}^{\tilde{P}_{x,a}} \left[c(x, a, y) + Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') | Z_t^{x,a} \right] \\ \text{s.t. } \sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{P}_{x,a}(z_1) \\ \quad + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \inf_{z_1} (\|z_1 - z_2\| - f(z_1)) P_{x,a}(z_2) \leq \delta; \forall f \in l^1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_t^{x,a} := \{X_t = x, A_t = a, y \sim \tilde{P}_{x,a}, a' \sim \pi(a'|y)\}$.

In the above expression, equality (a) is due to (1). Using the

standard duality in constrained optimization, we further get:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[c(x, a, y) + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') \pi(a'|y) \right] \tilde{P}_{x,a}(y) \\ &\quad - \lambda \left(\sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{P}_{x,a}(z_1) + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{z_1} (|z_1 - z_2| - f(z_1)) P_{x,a}(z_2) - \delta \right); \\ &\quad \forall f \in l^1 \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[c(x, a, y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') \pi(a'|y) - \lambda f(y) \right] \tilde{P}_{x,a}(y) \\ &\quad - \lambda \left(\sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{z_1} (|z_1 - z_2| - f(z_1)) P_{x,a}(z_2) - \delta \right); \forall f \in L^1 \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{x,a} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[c(x, a, y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') \pi(a'|y) - \lambda f(y) \right] \tilde{P}_{x,a}(y) \\ &\quad + \lambda \left(\sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{z_1} (-|z_1 - z_2| + f(z_1)) P_{x,a}(z_2) + \delta \right); \forall f \in L^1 \\ &\stackrel{a}{=} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \left[\lambda \delta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{l \in \mathcal{X}} \left(-\lambda |l - y| + c(x, a, l) + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(l, a') \pi(a'|l) \right) P_{x,a}(y) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

To get equality (a) in the above expression, we use the following analysis: since the expression is valid for all $f \in L^1$, we consider $f(y)$ such that $\lambda f(y) = -(c(x, a, y) + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(y, a') \pi(a'|y))$ for all $y \in \mathcal{X}$. This choice of $f(y)$ helps us to avoid $\tilde{P}_{x,a}(y)$ thus eliminating the inner optimization. ■

As a corollary to the above result, we can further rewrite the robust Q-function as a finite convex program, as presented below.

Corollary 1: The robust Q-function $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$, $(x, a) \in H \times \mathcal{A}$, is the optimal value of the following convex program:

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\lambda \geq 0, h(y) \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\lambda \delta + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} h(y) P_{x,a}(y) \right) \\ &\text{s.t. } \max_{l \in \mathcal{X}} \left(-\lambda |l - y| + c(x, a, l) + \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(l, a') \pi(a'|l) \right) \leq h(y); \forall y \in \mathcal{X} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

B. Distributionally robust Q-iteration

In order to compute the robust safety function $S_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$, we need to solve $|H| \times |\mathcal{A}|$ dimensional system of equations of the form (2). If the dimension of the state and action spaces is large, it will be very inefficient to solve it directly. Instead, similar to standard value iteration, we can compute $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ for all $(x, a) \in H \times \mathcal{A}$ by simultaneously updating $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ from some arbitrary initial value recursively until convergence from some initial $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$. This is the so-called value iteration algorithm. It has been demonstrated in [14] that in the robust value iteration algorithm, the robust value function (robust Q-function in our case) converges to

the true robust value function (true robust Q-function) similar to the standard value iteration algorithm.

We now present a similar algorithm to evaluate the robust Q-function $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ with the known nominal probability distribution $\mathcal{P}_{x,a}$. In the following pseudo-code, for the ease of presentation, we use $Q^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ instead of $Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$.

Algorithm 1 : Distributionally robust Q-iteration for estimating the upper bound of robust safety function $S_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$

```

1: Input: Set of states  $\mathcal{X}$ , set of actions  $\mathcal{A}$ , nominal transition probabilities  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $c(x, a, y)$ , robustness parameter  $\delta$ , evaluation policy  $\pi$ , small threshold  $\theta$  for convergence
2: Initialize:  $Q^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) \leftarrow 0$  for all  $(x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$ 
3: repeat
4:    $\Delta \leftarrow 0$ 
5:   for each state  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  do
6:     for each action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  do
7:       Store current Q value:  $Q_{\text{old}}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) \leftarrow Q^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ 
8:       Update Q-value by solving (2)
9:        $\Delta \leftarrow \max(\Delta, |Q_{\text{old}}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a) - Q^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)|)$ 
10:    end for
11:  end for
12: until  $\Delta < \theta$ 
13: for each state  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  do
14:   Compute  $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) Q^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ 
15: end for
16: Output: Upper bound of robust safety function  $S_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ 

```

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We consider an MDP as shown in Fig. 1. with 11 states $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, \dots, 11\}$ and 2 actions $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2\}$, 2 goal states $E = \{8, 10\}$ and 2 forbidden or unsafe states $U = \{9, 11\}$. Each arrow in Fig. 1. corresponds to an action. The nominal transition probabilities $P_{x,a}(y)$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{1,1}(2) &= 0.4, & P_{1,1}(3) &= 0.6, \\
P_{1,2}(2) &= 0.6, & P_{1,2}(3) &= 0.4, \\
P_{2,1}(4) &= 0.5, & P_{2,1}(5) &= 0.5, \\
P_{2,2}(4) &= 0.7, & P_{2,2}(5) &= 0.3, \\
P_{3,1}(6) &= 0.4, & P_{3,1}(7) &= 0.6, \\
P_{3,2}(6) &= 0.6, & P_{3,2}(7) &= 0.4, \\
P_{4,1}(8) &= 0.5, & P_{4,1}(9) &= 0.5, \\
P_{4,2}(8) &= 0.8, & P_{4,2}(9) &= 0.2, \\
P_{5,1}(4) &= 0.4, & P_{5,1}(8) &= 0.6, \\
P_{5,2}(4) &= 0.6, & P_{5,2}(8) &= 0.4, \\
P_{6,1}(7) &= 0.5, & P_{6,1}(10) &= 0.5, \\
P_{6,2}(7) &= 0.55, & P_{6,2}(10) &= 0.45, \\
P_{7,1}(10) &= 0.7, & P_{7,1}(11) &= 0.3, \\
P_{7,2}(10) &= 0.3, & P_{7,2}(11) &= 0.7.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider that the evaluation policy π is a uniform policy for all states, i.e., $\pi(a|x) = 0.5$, and the safety parameter is $p = 0.5$. To evaluate robust p -safety, we compute the

upper bound of the robust safety function $S_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x)$ denoted by $\mathcal{J}(x) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$. TABLE I demonstrates the upper bound of the robust safety function concerning different δ . From TABLE I, we observe that with an ambiguity radius up to $\delta = 0.25$, the MDP is robust p -safe. However, for $\delta = 0.3$, safety can not be certified.




Fig. 1: Example MDP Diagram with Goal and Forbidden States

Values of $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|x) Q_{\pi}^{\delta, \mathcal{P}}(x, a)$ for different δ

δ	$\mathcal{J}(1)$	$\mathcal{J}(2)$	$\mathcal{J}(3)$	$\mathcal{J}(4)$	$\mathcal{J}(5)$	$\mathcal{J}(6)$	$\mathcal{J}(7)$
0	0.1734	0.0800	0.2669	0.1000	0.0500	0.1837	0.3500
0.05	0.2290	0.1301	0.3100	0.1345	0.1017	0.2267	0.3782
0.1	0.2844	0.1826	0.3522	0.1703	0.1555	0.2703	0.4068
0.15	0.3388	0.2371	0.3935	0.2077	0.2115	0.3147	0.4359
0.2	0.3917	0.2933	0.4338	0.2466	0.2698	0.3599	0.4655
0.25	0.4426	0.3509	0.4732	0.2870	0.3304	0.4059	0.4957
0.3	0.4912	0.4095	0.5116	0.3289	0.3934	0.4526	0.5263

TABLE I

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We addressed the problem of distributionally robust safety verification for Markov Decision Processes (MDPs). Specifically, we introduced the concept of robust probabilistic safety, termed robust p -safety, which generalizes probabilistic safety to MDPs with uncertain transition probabilities. We defined a robust safety function and derived an upper bound for it in terms of a robust Q-function to evaluate robust safety. We then presented a method to compute this robust Q-function by solving a finite convex optimization problem. Building on this, we developed a recursive algorithm based on robust Q-iteration to iteratively compute an upper bound on the robust safety function.

Future work will extend this framework to MDPs with larger state-action spaces and potentially continuous state spaces. Additionally, an interesting direction for further research is the development of online algorithms that can perform robust safety verification without reliance on a nominal model.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Mohajerin Esfahani and D. Kuhn, "Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 171, no. 1, pp. 115–166, 2018.
- [2] R. Gao and A. Kleywegt, "Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with Wasserstein distance," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 603–655, 2023.
- [3] Z. Yu, L. Dai, S. Xu, S. Gao, and C. P. Ho, "Fast bellman updates for Wasserstein distributionally robust MDPs," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [4] B. Hao, K. Cai, Y.-P. Fang, A. Fadil, and D. Feng, "A moment-based distributionally robust optimization model for air traffic flow management," in *2021 IEEE/AIAA 40th Digital Avionics Systems Conference (DASC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [5] J. Wu, J. Chen, J. Wu, W. Shi, X. Wang, and X. He, "Understanding contrastive learning via distributionally robust optimization," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [6] D. Love and G. Bayraksan, "A classification of phi-divergences for data-driven stochastic optimization," in *IIE Annual Conference. Proceedings*. Institute of Industrial and Systems Engineers (IISE), 2014, p. 2780.
- [7] R. Wisniewski, M. L. Bujorianu, and C. Sloth, " p -safe analysis of stochastic hybrid processes," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 5220–5235, 2020.
- [8] R. Wisniewski and L.-M. Bujorianu, "Safety of stochastic systems: An analytic and computational approach," *Automatica*, vol. 133, p. 109839, 2021.
- [9] M. L. Bujorianu, R. Wisniewski, and E. Boulougouris, "Stochastic safety for random dynamical systems," in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1340–1345.
- [10] —, "p-safety and stability," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 665–670, 2021.
- [11] —, "Stochastic safety for markov chains," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 427–432, 2020.
- [12] R. Wisniewski and M. L. Bujorianu, "Probabilistic safety guarantees for Markov decision processes," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [13] L. V. Kantorovich and S. Rubinshtein, "On a space of totally additive functions," *Vestnik of the St. Petersburg University: Mathematics*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 52–59, 1958.
- [14] G. N. Iyengar, "Robust dynamic programming," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 257–280, 2005.
- [15] I. Yang, "A convex optimization approach to distributionally robust Markov decision processes with Wasserstein distance," *IEEE control systems letters*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 164–169, 2017.
- [16] —, "A dynamic game approach to distributionally robust safety specifications for stochastic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 94, pp. 94–101, 2018.
- [17] A. Mazumdar, R. Wisniewski, and M. L. Bujorianu, "Safe reinforcement learning for constrained Markov decision processes with stochastic stopping time," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15928*, 2024.