

PAC One-Step Safety Certification for Black-Box Discrete-Time Stochastic Systems

Taoran Wu^{1,2}, Dominik Wagner³, Jingduo Pan^{1,2}, Luke Ong³, Arvind Easwaran³, and Bai Xue^{1,2}

¹ KLSS and SKLCS, Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China {wutr,panjd,xuebai}@ios.ac.cn

² University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

³ Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
{luke.ong,dominik.wagner,arvinde}@ntu.edu.sg

Abstract. This paper investigates the problem of safety certification for black-box discrete-time stochastic systems, where both the system dynamics and disturbance distributions are unknown, and only sampled data are available. Under such limited information, ensuring robust or classical quantitative safety over finite or infinite horizons is generally infeasible. To address this challenge, we propose a data-driven framework that provides theoretical one-step safety guarantees in the Probably Approximately Correct (PAC) sense. This one-step guarantee can be applied recursively at each time step, thereby yielding step-by-step safety assurances over extended horizons. Our approach formulates barrier certificate conditions based solely on sampled data and establishes PAC safety guarantees by leveraging the VC dimension, scenario approaches, Markov’s inequality, and Hoeffding’s inequality. Two sampling procedures are proposed, and three methods are proposed to derive PAC safety guarantees. The properties and comparative advantages of these three methods are thoroughly discussed. Finally, the effectiveness of the proposed methods are demonstrated through several numerical examples.

Keywords: Probably Approximately Correct · One-step Safety Certification · Stochastic Discrete-time Systems · Black-box Models

1 Introduction

With the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence, the deployment of intelligent autonomous systems has significantly increased. Ensuring the safety of such systems is of great significance. A system is considered *safe* if its trajectories do not leave the safe set. In practice, however, system dynamics are often stochastic due to uncertainties and disturbances present in real-world environments, posing major challenges to such strong safety guarantees.

In recent years, several methods have been developed for safety/reach-avoid verification of stochastic systems. Notable approaches include abstraction-based techniques (e.g., [1,2]) and barrier certificates (e.g., [3–8]). However, these methods typically require accurate system dynamics and disturbance distributions,

which are often unavailable or too costly to obtain, leaving many systems effectively black-box. Although one can try to learn these models from data, doing so is difficult and time-consuming, and the resulting models are often too imprecise to support reliable formal guarantees. As a result, providing robust or quantitative safety guarantees over either finite or infinite horizons is especially challenging, and sometimes impossible, for black-box stochastic systems. Data-driven methods (e.g., [9,10]) have been proposed recently to provide safety guarantees for such systems, but they often rely on knowing the system’s Lipschitz constants, which are difficult to determine in practice. To address these challenges, and inspired by [11,12], this paper uses barrier certificates to provide formal one-step safety guarantees for black-box discrete-time stochastic systems, relying solely on sampled data instead of explicit models.

In this paper, we propose a data-driven framework for safety certification of black-box discrete-time stochastic systems. The system dynamics and disturbance distributions are assumed to be unknown, and only sampled data are available. Based on these samples, the proposed approaches establish formal one-step safety guarantees in the PAC sense by solving barrier certificate conditions. We investigate two sampling strategies in combination with two types of barrier certificates, robust and stochastic, resulting in three distinct forms of PAC safety certification, as formulated in Subsection 2.1. The first method solves a robust barrier certificate condition using one-to-one state-disturbance sample pairs. PAC safety certification is then established by combining VC dimension theory or scenario approaches with Markov’s inequality. The second method also solves a robust barrier certificate condition but employs one-to-many state-disturbance samples. The corresponding PAC safety certification is derived through scenario approaches, combined with Markov’s and Hoeffding’s inequalities. The third method addresses a stochastic barrier certificate condition using one-to-many state-disturbance samples, and the PAC safety certification is similarly established via scenario approaches, together with Markov’s and Hoeffding’s inequalities. The properties and respective advantages of these three methods are also discussed, and the appropriate choice depends on the specific problem setting. Finally, the effectiveness of the proposed approaches are demonstrated through several numerical examples.

The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

1. We propose three PAC methods for one-step safety certification of black-box discrete-time stochastic systems. To our knowledge, this is the first work to provide PAC guarantees for safety certification in such systems.
2. We correct the PAC statement in Theorem 4 of [12], although our present characterization is inspired by its original formulation. See Remark 4 in Subsection 4.1 for details.
3. We implement a prototype tool to support the proposed framework, available at <https://github.com/TaoranWu/PSC-BDSS>. The effectiveness of our approach is demonstrated through several numerical examples.

Related Work. Barrier certificates were first introduced for deterministic systems as Lyapunov-like tools for proving safety and reachability [13,14],

and later extended to stochastic systems for finite and infinite-horizon safety and reach-avoid analysis. Subsequent work developed probability bounds using Ville’s inequality [3, 5, 7, 15–18] and equation relaxations [8, 19–23], and applied barrier methods to probabilistic programs and ω -regular properties [4, 6, 24–26]. The above methods assume full knowledge of the system, including both dynamics and disturbance distributions. In contrast, this work considers systems with unknown dynamics and disturbance distributions.

On the other hand, data-driven methods for formal verification and design of black-box systems have received increasing attention, e.g., [27, 28]. A representative data-driven approach is scenario optimization, originally proposed in [29] to address robust optimization problems. It has since been integrated with barrier certificates for safety verification and controller synthesis in deterministic systems [9, 11, 30–32]. Later, [33–35] investigated finite-horizon safety guarantees for stochastic discrete-time systems with known dynamics but unknown disturbance distributions. Subsequently, [36, 37] addressed the more challenging case of black-box stochastic systems with both unknown dynamics and disturbance distributions. Furthermore, [38] and [39] aimed to reduce the sample complexity by employing the wait-and-judge technique [40] and the repetitive scenario technique [41], respectively. However, these works on black-box stochastic systems rely on prior knowledge of certain constants, such as the Lipschitz constants of the system dynamics and the barrier certificates, which is often unavailable in practice, particularly when the dynamics are unknown. In contrast, our approach eliminates the need for such prior constants.

Notations. Let \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^n , and \mathbb{N} denote real numbers, n -dimensional vectors, and non-negative integers. For $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{v}[j]$ is its j -th component. For sets \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} , $\mathbb{A} \setminus \mathbb{B}$ is the difference, $\overline{\mathbb{A}}$ the closure, and \mathbb{A}^c the complement. The indicator $1_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathbf{x})$ equals 1 if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}$, 0 otherwise. For a probability space $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}})$, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{y}}[\mathbb{E}]$ is the probability of \mathbb{E} , and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}}[\cdot]$ its expectation.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we define black-box stochastic systems and three PAC one-step safety certification problems, and then briefly review the scenario approach.

2.1 Problem Statement

We consider a class of black-box discrete-time stochastic systems

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{d}(t)), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state and $\mathbf{d}(t) \in \mathbb{D}$ is a stochastic disturbance. The disturbance sequence $\{\mathbf{d}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is i.i.d. with distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$ supported on \mathbb{D} . Both the dynamics \mathbf{f} and the disturbance distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$ are unknown.

Let the safe set be a compact set $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We equip \mathbb{X} with the probability space $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}})$, where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the uniform probability measure on \mathbb{X} (i.e.,

the normalized Lebesgue measure). Starting from any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ and under any disturbance $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$, the next state is given by $\mathbf{x}^+ = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})$.

We now formulate the three safety certification problems considered.

Problem 1 (PAC One-Step Safety Certification I). The objective is to design a certification procedure \mathcal{A} that provides one-step safety guarantees in the single-layer PAC sense by leveraging one-to-one state-disturbance samples. Specifically, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$ over the sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$, if $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S})$ accepts, then for at least a $(1 - \alpha_1)$ fraction of states \mathbf{x} in \mathbb{X} , the following holds: the probability that the system (1), starting from \mathbf{x} , remains within \mathbb{X} at the next step is no less than $1 - \alpha_2$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta \in (0, 1)$.

Formally, the single-layer one-step PAC safety certification is expressed as

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{S}} := (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}})^N$.

In Problem 1, the confidence level $1 - \delta$ corresponds to the joint probability measure $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}})^N$, which is the N -fold product of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$ defined on the sample space $(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{D})^N$ (the Cartesian product of $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{D}$ with itself $N \in \mathbb{N}$ times).

Problem 2 (PAC One-Step Safety Certification II). The goal is to design a certification procedure \mathcal{A} that provides one-step safety guarantees in the PAC sense by leveraging one-to-many state-disturbance samples. Specifically, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$ over the sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \{\mathbf{d}^{(i,j)}\}_{j=1}^M)\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$, where $\{\mathbf{d}^{(i,j)}\}_{j=1}^M \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$, if $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S})$ accepts, then for at least a $(1 - \alpha_1)$ fraction of states \mathbf{x} in \mathbb{X} , it holds: the probability that the system (1), starting from \mathbf{x} , remains within \mathbb{X} at the next step is no less than $1 - \alpha_2$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta \in (0, 1)$.

Formally, the PAC one-step safety certification is expressed as

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{S}} := (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M)^N$.

In Problem 2, the probability $1 - \delta$ corresponds to the joint probability $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M)^N$ (the product of the probability $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$ repeated N times) in the space $(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{D}^M)^N$ (the Cartesian product of $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{D}^M$ with itself N times). Setting $M = 1$ recovers Problem 1 from Problem 2. *However, we do not merge Problems 1 and 2 in this paper; see Remark 3 for an explanation.*

Problem 3 (PAC One-Step Safety Certification III). Similar to Problem 2, the goal is to design a certification procedure \mathcal{A} that yields PAC one-step safety guarantees using one-to-many state-disturbance samples. The key difference is that the fixed threshold α_2 is replaced by a state-dependent function $\epsilon(\cdot) : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which may also depend on the sampled dataset \mathbb{S} .

Formally, the PAC one-step safety requirement is

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \epsilon(\mathbf{x})] \geq 1 - \alpha_1] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{S}} := (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M)^N$ and $\alpha_1, \delta \in (0, 1)$.

Problems 1–3 form a hierarchy of PAC one-step safety guarantees with increasing flexibility. Problem 1 uses paired state–disturbance samples, which is simple but can be conservative when state samples are limited. Problem 2 improves this by drawing multiple i.i.d. disturbance samples per state, giving stronger guarantees. Problem 3 further generalizes by allowing state-dependent probability thresholds, making the PAC guarantee most flexible.

2.2 Scenario Optimization

We review the scenario optimization framework, based on the foundational work in [29], which addresses robust convex programs of the form:

$$\mathbf{z}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{z}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \Delta, \quad (2)$$

where the uncertain parameter $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \Delta$ follows a probability distribution \mathbb{P}_δ .

Assumption 1 $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a convex and closed set, $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta}$, and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) : \mathcal{Z} \times \Delta \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ is continuous and convex in \mathbf{z} , for any fixed value of $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \Delta$.

Since the constraint set is infinite, a fully robust solution \mathbf{z}^* is generally unattainable. Scenario optimization addresses this by enforcing the constraints only on a finite number of sampled scenarios. For N i.i.d. samples $\Delta^N = \{\boldsymbol{\delta}_i\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathbb{P}_\delta$, we consider the following scenario optimization:

$$\mathbf{z}_N^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{z}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\delta}_i) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3)$$

under the following assumption:

Assumption 2 ([29]) For any given set of N samples $\Delta^N = \{\boldsymbol{\delta}_i\}_{i=1}^N$, program (3) has a unique solution \mathbf{z}_N^* after applying a tie-break rule.

To assess the performance of a candidate solution \mathbf{z}_N^* across all uncertainties in Δ , we define the violation set $F(\mathbf{z}) = \{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \Delta \mid \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \not\leq 0\}$ and the violation probability $V(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{P}_\delta[\boldsymbol{\delta} \in F(\mathbf{z})]$ of a given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$, which is the probability of sampling a constant $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ to which \mathbf{z} is not robust. A central result in scenario optimization is as follows.

Proposition 1 ([42]). For α, β, N, m satisfying $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{2}{N}(\ln \frac{1}{\beta} + m)$, we have $\mathbb{P}_{\Delta^N}[V(\mathbf{z}_N^*) \leq \alpha] \geq 1 - \beta$, where $\mathbb{P}_{\Delta^N} = \mathbb{P}_\delta^N$ is the probability measure over N i.i.d. samples of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$.

3 PAC Safety Certification with One-to-One Samples

In this section, we introduce our data-driven method for solving Problem 1. Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 address it using two approaches: one combines robust barrier certificates (RBC) with VC-dimension theory, and the other uses the

scenario approach. The VC-based method accommodates more general classes of RBCs but typically requires a larger sample size, whereas the scenario approach achieves comparable guarantees with fewer samples but assumes convexity of the barrier certificate in its unknown parameters.

A RBC $h(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose existence ensures safety of system (1): if the system starts in \mathbb{X} , it will remain within \mathbb{X} for all future time steps.

Definition 1. *Given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and the safe set \mathbb{X} , a function $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a RBC for the system (1) if the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{cases} h(\mathbf{x}) < 0, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{X}, \\ h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \\ h(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{x}), & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \forall \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}. \end{cases} \quad \begin{matrix} (4a) \\ (4b) \\ (4c) \end{matrix}$$

Proposition 2 ([13]). *If there exists a RBC $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then for any disturbance $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$ and initial state $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$, the system (1) will remain within the safe set \mathbb{X} at the next time step, i.e., $\forall \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}$.*

In the following, we use the sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$ to solve (4a)–(4c) and thereby address Problem 1.

3.1 PAC Safety Certification Based on VC Dimension

In this section, we present our first method for addressing Problem 1. In this approach, the sample complexity required to achieve the desired safety guarantees is derived using the VC dimension.

We consider a parameterized function $h(\mathbf{a}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = 1_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + C \cdot 1_{\mathbb{X}^c}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (5)$$

where $C < 0$ is a fixed scalar. For $\mathbf{a} \in [0, U_a]^m$ and $\xi \in [0, \bar{\xi}]$ with $U_a > 0$ and $\bar{\xi} > -C$ being user-specified bounds for each component of \mathbf{a} and for ξ , respectively, we define the indicator function $\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{1}_{\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) : h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - \xi\}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})$, collect these classifiers in the family $\mathbb{H} = \{\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi} : \mathbf{a} \in [0, U_a]^m, \xi \in [0, \bar{\xi}]\}$, and impose the following assumptions: 1). The parametric real-valued function class $\{h(\mathbf{a}, \cdot) : \mathbf{a} \in [0, U_a]^m\}$ has finite pseudo-dimension (equivalently, finite VC-subgraph dimension); 2). $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{X} \times [0, U_a]^m$, and $h_1(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$. Under these assumptions, the induced classifier family \mathbb{H} has finite VC dimension; that is, $\text{vc}(\mathbb{H}) < \infty$.

Remark 1. Using the barrier function in (5) has two main advantages. First, it simplifies computation by avoiding the need to enforce $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ and $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) < 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbb{X}$, conditions that cannot be reliably checked by sampling. Second, the structure of (5) prevents the safety test from requiring the system to enter the unsafe set. If a prediction shows $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}^c$, we can simply set $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) = C$ without needing to observe the true next state, which could put the system at risk. This choice provides a practical balance between computational tractability, conservativeness, and safety. More general barrier forms will be explored in future work. \square

Then, we search for \mathbf{a} by solving the following optimization (6), which is constructed with the sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$ and the constraint (4c):

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \xi \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) - \xi, \\ \xi \in [0, \bar{\xi}]; \mathbf{a}[k] \in [0, U_a], \\ i = 1, \dots, N; k = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is a user-specified scalar. It is noted that (6) is always feasible, since $(\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}, \xi = -C)$ constitutes a feasible solution.

Let $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}]$ denote the empirical mean of $\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})$ over the sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$, i.e., $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})$. Since (6) always has solutions, there exists $(\mathbf{a}(\mathbb{S}), \xi(\mathbb{S}))$ with $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}(\mathbb{S}), \xi(\mathbb{S})}] = 0$. By Corollary 4 in [43], the value N can be explicitly bounded to ensure that the empirical probability/estimate $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}(\mathbb{S}), \xi(\mathbb{S})}]$ differs from the true probability $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}(\mathbb{S}), \xi(\mathbb{S})}]$ by at most α with confidence at least $1 - \delta$. Specifically,

$$N \geq \frac{5}{\alpha} \left(\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + \text{vc}(\mathbb{H}) \ln \frac{40}{\alpha} \right) \quad (7)$$

can guarantee $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}(\mathbb{S}), \xi(\mathbb{S})}] \leq \alpha] \geq 1 - \delta$, where $\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$.

Lemma 1 (Corollary 4, [43]). *Suppose $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ are given. Then, the probability of one-sided constrained failure $p(N, \alpha_1, 0)$ is smaller than δ , where $p(N, \alpha_1, 0)$ is defined as*

$$p(N, \alpha_1, 0) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\begin{aligned} & \exists (\mathbf{a}, \xi) \in [-U_a, U_a]^m \times [0, \bar{\xi}], \\ & \left(\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}] \leq 0 \wedge \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\phi_{\mathbf{a}, \xi}] > \alpha \right) \end{aligned} \right],$$

if the sample size N satisfies (7).

Based on Lemma 1 and Markov's inequality, we conclude that, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$ over the sample set \mathbb{S} , if the sampled program (6) returns $(\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0, \mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}))$, then at least a fraction $1 - \alpha_1$ of the states $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfy “the probability that $h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x})$ is at least $1 - \alpha_2$ ”,

$$\text{i.e., } \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} \left[\begin{aligned} & h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \\ & \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) \end{aligned} \right] \geq 1 - \alpha_2 \right] \geq 1 - \alpha_1 \right] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

further implying $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1] \geq 1 - \delta$. The above statements hold provided that N satisfies (7) with $\alpha = \alpha_1 \alpha_2$.

Theorem 1 (PAC Safety Certification I Based on VC Dimension). *Fix probability threshold $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$ and confidence level $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \xi^*(\mathbb{S}))$ denote the solution obtained by solving (6). Define the computational procedure:*

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) = 1_{\{\xi^*(\mathbb{S})=0\}}(\mathbb{S}). \quad (8)$$

If N satisfies (7) with $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2$, then, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$ over the sample set \mathbb{S} , if $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}\left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x})] \geq 1 - \alpha_2\right] \geq 1 - \alpha_1.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}\left[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}\left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2\right] \geq 1 - \alpha_1\right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Proof. The proof follows three steps.

1. PAC Guarantees Based on Lemma 1. According to Lemma 1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \alpha] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

if $N \geq \frac{5}{\alpha} \left(\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + \text{vc}(\mathbb{H}) \ln \frac{40}{\alpha} \right)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \leq \alpha] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

2. Guarantee Decomposition over $\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}$ Based on Markov's Inequality. Due to Markov's, we have for all \mathbb{S} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \mid \mathbf{x}] \geq \alpha_2] \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \mid \mathbf{x}]]}{\alpha_2} \\ & = \frac{\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})]}{\alpha_2} \leq \alpha_1, \end{aligned}$$

3. Conclusion. Thus, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \delta & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \leq \alpha] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \mid \mathbf{x}] \geq \alpha_2] \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha_2}] \\ & = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \mid \mathbf{x}] < \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1] \\ & = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \mid \mathbf{x}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1], \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}\left[\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}\left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}\left[\begin{array}{c} h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \\ \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) \end{array}\right] \geq 1 - \alpha_2\right] \geq 1 - \alpha_1\right] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}\left[\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1\right] \geq 1 - \delta$. This proves the claim. \square

Remark 2. As shown in the proof of Theorem 1, one can also derive $P_S[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow P_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha] \geq 1 - \delta$, where the inner probability is taken with respect to the joint distribution $P_{\mathbf{x}} \times P_{\mathbf{d}}$. In contrast, the guarantee provided in Theorem 1, i.e., $P_S[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow P_{\mathbf{x}}[P_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \alpha_1] \geq 1 - \delta$, explicitly decouples the uncertainty arising from the state and disturbance distributions. This separation yields a more refined probabilistic characterization over the state and disturbance spaces, resulting in a clearer and more interpretable one-step safety guarantee for the system. \square

The solution to Problem 1 is relatively general, since the function $h(\mathbf{a}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be nonlinear in both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{x} . This allows the use of expressive models, such as neural networks (e.g., ReLU networks with nonnegative weights for h_1 in (5)) with finite pseudo-dimension. However, this generality requires many samples, which can be computationally expensive when solving the program (6). To reduce this burden, we next focus on functions that are linear in the parameters \mathbf{a} , which lowers the sample complexity.

3.2 PAC Safety Certification Based on Scenario Approaches

In this subsection, we present an approach that integrates scenario optimization with RBCs to address Problem 1.

We consider a class of functions $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ of the form (5), where

$$h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1=0}^{\kappa} \dots \sum_{i_n=0}^{\kappa} a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \prod_{j=1}^n (\mathbf{x}[j] - \underline{\mathbb{X}}[j])^{i_j} (\overline{\mathbb{X}}[j] - \mathbf{x}[j])^{\kappa - i_j} \quad (9)$$

(Handelman Representation) with $a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \in [0, U_a]$ and $\underline{\mathbb{X}}, \overline{\mathbb{X}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $[\underline{\mathbb{X}}, \overline{\mathbb{X}}]$ is an interval containing the safe set \mathbb{X} . By construction, we have that $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \equiv C < 0, \forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{X} \times [0, U_a]^m$ and $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{X} \times [0, U_a]^m$. Thus, for any $\mathbf{a} \in [0, U_a]^m$, $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ satisfies constraints (4a) and (4b).

With $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$ and the constraint (4c), we solve the optimization (6), which is a linear optimization over (\mathbf{a}, ξ) . In this context, the optimization (6) is a scenario optimization to the following robust convex optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \xi \\ & \text{s.t.} \begin{cases} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - \xi, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \forall \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}, \\ \xi \in [0, \bar{\xi}]; \mathbf{a}[k] \in [0, U_a], \\ k = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It is observed that optimization (10) satisfies Assumption 1 and the optimization (6) satisfies Assumption 2. Following Proposition 1, we have the conclusion below.

Theorem 2 (PAC Safety Certification I Based on Scenario Approaches).

Fix probability thresholds $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$ and confidence level $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and let the sample size satisfy $N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\ln \frac{1}{\delta} + m + 1)$.

Let $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \xi^*(\mathbb{S}))$ be the solution to (6), with the computational procedure in (8). Then, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$ over the random draw of \mathbb{S} , if $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x})] \geq 1 - \alpha_2 \right] \geq 1 - \alpha_1$$

holds, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2 \right] \geq 1 - \alpha_1 \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Proof. According to Proposition 1, we have that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the sample \mathbb{S} of size N , the optimal solution $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \xi^*(\mathbb{S}))$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \leq \alpha_1 \alpha_2$, where $\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}$. Following the proof of Theorem 1, we obtain the conclusion. \square

When $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ takes the form (5) with $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ as in (9), Theorem 1 requires $N \geq \frac{5}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} \left(\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + (m + 1) \ln \frac{40}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} \right)$, whereas Theorem 2 only requires $N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (\ln \frac{1}{\delta} + m + 1)$. Clearly, Theorem 2 achieves the same probabilistic guarantee with significantly fewer samples.

4 PAC Safety Certification with One-to-Many Samples

In this section, we present our methods for solving Problem 2 and Problem 3. Subsection 4.1 addresses Problem 2 using RBCs with scenario approaches, Markov's inequality, and Hoeffding's inequality, while Subsection 4.2 tackles Problem 3 using stochastic barrier certificates (SBCs) with the same tools.

4.1 PAC Safety Certification for Problem 2

In this section, we present our data-driven approach to address Problem 2, which primarily involves solving a linear optimization problem.

We work with the class of functions $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ defined by (5), with h_1 given by (9). Then, we search for \mathbf{a} by solving the following optimization (11), which is constructed based on the condition (4c) and sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \{\mathbf{d}^{(i,j)}\}_{j=1}^M)\}_{i=1}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \xi \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i,j)})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) - \xi, \\ \xi \in [0, \bar{\xi}]; \mathbf{a}[k] \in [0, U_a], \\ i = 1, \dots, N; j = 1, \dots, M; k = 1, \dots, m, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and U_a and $\bar{\xi}$ are the same with the ones in (6). It is a scenario optimization to the following robust convex optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \xi \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} \bigwedge_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - \xi, \forall (\mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{D}^M, \\ \xi \in [0, \bar{\xi}]; \mathbf{a}[k] \in [0, U_a]; k = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

It is observed that the optimization (12) satisfies Assumption 1 and the optimization (11) satisfies Assumption 2. Assume a solution $(\xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}))$ is obtained by solving (11). Then, using scenario approach theory and Markov's inequality, we conclude: with confidence at least $1 - \delta_1$ over the sample set \mathbb{S} , if $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$, then for at least a $1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$ fraction of states $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$, the system (1), starting from \mathbf{x} , remains safe at the next step with probability at least $1 - \alpha_2$, provided that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta_1, \delta_2, l \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_1 < l\delta_2$, $N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta_1} + m + 1 \right)$, and $M \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha_2^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$.

Theorem 3 (PAC Safety Certification II Based on RBC). Fix $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$, and $l \in (0, 1)$, where $\alpha_1 < l\delta_2$. Let $N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta_1} + m + 1 \right)$ and $M \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha_2^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$.

Let $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \xi^*(\mathbb{S}))$ be the solution obtained by solving (11). Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} \left[\begin{aligned} & h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \\ & \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \end{aligned} \right] \geq 1 - \alpha_2 \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1$$

and thus,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} [\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in three main steps.

Step 1: Outer Layer Guarantee via Scenario Approaches

According to Proposition 1, we have that, with probability at least $1 - \delta_1$ over the sample \mathbb{S} , the solution satisfies:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{D}^M} [\bigvee_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \leq \alpha_1,$$

where $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ is a fresh, independent sample of M disturbances, and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{D}^M} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$. Let $\mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$ denote this event. We have $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}] \geq 1 - \delta_1$. Define for any \mathbb{S} and \mathbf{x} ,

$$\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\bigvee_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})].$$

The outer guarantee implies that for $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x})] \leq \alpha_1$ holds.

Step 2: Decomposition on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{D}^M}$ Based on Markov's Inequality.

Consider any $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$. By Markov's inequality applied to $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x})$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} [\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \geq l\delta_2] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x})]}{l\delta_2} \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}.$$

This implies $P_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$.

Now, for any \mathbf{x} with $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2$, we have

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\bigvee_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \right] \leq l\delta_2,$$

which implies $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \right] \geq 1 - l\delta_2$.

Step 3: Application of Hoeffding's Inequality

For fixed $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \xi)$, define the true violation probability,

$$\mu(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \xi) := P_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - \xi]$$

and the empirical violation probability based on fresh disturbances,

$$\hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \xi, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M 1_{\{h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) < \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - \xi\}}(\mathbf{d}_j).$$

By Hoeffding's inequality, for any fixed $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \xi)$, we have

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\mu(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \xi) \geq \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \xi, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \alpha_2 \right] \leq \exp(-2M\alpha_2^2).$$

Setting $M \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha_2^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$ ensures that for $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}))$,

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) \geq \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \alpha_2 \right] \leq (1-l)\delta_2.$$

This holds since $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M \in \mathbb{D}^M$ is independent of \mathbb{S} , so $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \xi^*(\mathbb{S}))$ is independent of $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M$.

Let

1. \mathbb{E}_1 : The event that $\bigwedge_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})$. On this event, $\hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) = 0$.
2. \mathbb{E}_2 : The event that $\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) < \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \alpha_2$.

We have $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_1] \geq 1 - l\delta_2$ and $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_2] \geq 1 - (1-l)\delta_2$. By the union bound, we have

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_1 \cap \mathbb{E}_2] \geq 1 - \delta_2.$$

Since $\hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) = 0$ for $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M \in \mathbb{E}_1$, we have

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\begin{aligned} &\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) < \alpha_2 + \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) \\ &\wedge \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S}), \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) = 0 \end{aligned} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_2. \quad (13)$$

Therefore, we conclude

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) < \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \delta_2. \quad (14)$$

Step 4. Conclusion. (14) holds for any \mathbf{x} with $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2$. Since $P_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$, we conclude that for $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$,

$$P_{\mathbf{x}} \left[P_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) < \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \delta_2 \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}.$$

Thus, we obtain $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) < \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \delta_2 \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1$ and further

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} \left[\begin{array}{l} h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \\ \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S}) \end{array} \right] \\ \geq 1 - \alpha_2 \end{array} \right] \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1.$$

Further, since $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \alpha_2$ is a deterministic event with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \alpha_2] > 0$ (as $1 - \delta_2 > 0$), it must be that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \alpha_2$ holds deterministically with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$ for such \mathbf{x} with $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2$. As a result, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})] \\ \geq 1 - \alpha_2 \end{array} \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1.$$

The proof is completed with $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$. \square

Remark 3. For $M > 1$, each sampled state is paired with multiple disturbance samples. If $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$, none of these disturbances lead to a violation, so the probability $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{S}]$ is generally higher than in the $M = 1$ case. This one-to-many state-disturbance sampling is particularly beneficial when only a limited number of states can be sampled. On the other hand, when $M = 1$, Theorem 3 can theoretically be reduced to Theorem 2, since the portion of the proof relying on Hoeffding's inequality is no longer needed (see the proof). However, the final guarantee in Theorem 3 for $M = 1$ does not exactly recover Theorem 2 and may even be looser in practice, which can be verified via a simple calculation. This looseness stems from our use of Hoeffding's inequality to handle the case $M > 1$ (see **Step 3. Application of Hoeffding's Inequality** in the proof), which is inherently conservative and leads to a looser probability bound. In future work, we plan to reduce this gap by exploring alternative concentration inequalities. \square

Remark 4. When proving Theorem 3, we obtain the nested PAC certification:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \geq 1 - \delta_2 \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1.$$

where $\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \xi^*(\mathbb{S})]$. Further, since $\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) \geq 1 - \alpha_2$ is deterministic with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) \geq 1 - \alpha_2] \in \{0, 1\}$. Also, since $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) \geq$

$1 - \alpha_2] > 0$ (as $1 - \delta_2 > 0$), $\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \xi^*(\mathbb{S})) \geq 1 - \alpha_2$ holds deterministically with respect to $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M$, which yields the conclusion of Theorem 3. *For more details, please refer to the proof.*

In Theorem 4 of [12], a nested PAC characterization similar to the above is established. The analysis is over (\mathbf{x}, t) rather than (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) , with t representing time. The result is obtained by applying the scenario approach twice: once for the outer layer \mathbf{x} and once for the inner layer t . However, this method reuses the same samples for t across both layers, creating a data-dependence issue that invalidates the PAC guarantee. Our approach resolves this by using Markov's inequality and fresh disturbance samples $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ in the inner confidence characterization $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M$, which are independent of the samples in \mathbb{S} . \square

If a more general parametric function $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ is used, e.g., one that is non-linear in \mathbf{a} rather than linear, then the VC-dimension method in Theorem 1 can replace the scenario approach. We leave this for future work.

4.2 PAC Safety Certification for Problem 3

In this section, we address Problem 3 using SBCs. The concept of SBCs adopted here is based on the formulation proposed in [14].

Definition 2 ([14]). *Given the safe set \mathbb{X} , a function $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a SBC for the system (1) if there exists a scalar $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ satisfying the condition:*

$$\begin{cases} h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, & (15a) \\ h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{X}, & (15b) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] - h(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}. & (15c) \end{cases}$$

Proposition 3 ([14]). *If there exist a SBC $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a scalar $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, then $P_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - \lambda - h(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$.*

Similarly, we parameterize $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ as follows:

$$h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = 1_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbf{x})h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + 1_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{X}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (16)$$

where $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i_1=0}^{\kappa} \cdots \sum_{i_n=0}^{\kappa} a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \prod_{j=1}^n \binom{\kappa}{i_j} \psi_j^{i_j} (1 - \psi_j)^{\kappa - i_j}$ is a Bernstein polynomial, $a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \in [0, U_a]$, $U_a \geq 1$, and $\psi_j = \frac{\mathbf{x}[j] - \mathbb{X}[j]}{\mathbb{X}[j] - \mathbb{X}[j]}$. Parameterization in the form of (16) allows constraints (15a) and (15b) to hold naturally. Moreover, compared with the polynomial in (9), parameterization in (16) ensures that $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \leq U_a$ for all $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{X} \times [0, U_a]^m$ [44]. Moreover, we obtain that $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \forall (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \in [0, U_a]^m \times \mathbb{X}$ and $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \equiv 1, \forall (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \in [0, U_a]^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{X}$.

We search for \mathbf{a} by solving the optimization (17) below, which is constructed using the condition (15c) and sample set $\mathbb{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \{\mathbf{d}^{(i,j)}\}_{j=1}^M)\}_{i=1}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \lambda + \frac{1}{N_o} \sum_{k=1}^{N_o} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}'_k) \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{d}^{(i,j)})) \leq h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}^{(i)}) + \lambda - \tau, \\ \lambda \in [0, 1]; \mathbf{a}[k] \in [0, U_a]; i = 1, \dots, N; k = 1, \dots, m, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\tau \in (0, 1)$ is a specified positive value and $\{\mathbf{x}'_i\}_{i=1}^{N_o}$ is a family of specified states distributed evenly over \mathbb{X} , which can be generated by random sampling from \mathbb{X} . This data set $\{\mathbf{x}'_i\}_{i=1}^{N_o}$ is fixed over the whole sampling process and is independent of \mathbb{S} . We can also see that (17) is feasible: the constant function $h_1(\mathbf{x}) \equiv U_a \in [0, U_a]$ on \mathbb{X} , together with $\lambda = \tau$, satisfies the constraints.

Remark 5. Ideally, program (17) searches for a function $\lambda + h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ that stays small over all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$, giving the tightest lower bound on the one-step safety probability. The natural objective would be the integral $\lambda + \int_{\mathbb{X}} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}), d\mathbf{x}$, but this integral is usually intractable. We therefore approximate it using samples, replacing the integral by the empirical sum $\sum_{k=1}^{N_o} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}'_k)$.

It is observed that the linear problem (17) is a scenario optimization to the following uncertain convex optimization (18):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \quad & \lambda + \frac{1}{N_o} \sum_{k=1}^{N_o} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}'_k) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j))}{M} \leq h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + \lambda - \tau, \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{D}^M, \\ \lambda \in [0, 1]; \quad \mathbf{a}[k] \in [0, U_a]; \quad k = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Condition (18) meets Assumption 1, and (17) meets Assumption 2. Let $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}))$ be the optimal solution of (17). By the scenario approach, Markov's inequality, and Hoeffding's inequality, with confidence at least $1 - \delta_1$ over the sampled set \mathbb{S} , at least a $1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$ fraction of states $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfy: the system (1), starting from such \mathbf{x} , stays safe at the next step with probability at least $1 - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})$, provided $\alpha_1, \delta_1, \delta_2, l \in (0, 1)$, $N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta_1} + m + 1 \right)$, and $M \geq \frac{U_a^2}{2\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$.

Theorem 4 (PAC Safety Certification III Based on SBC). Fix $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$, and $l \in (0, 1)$, where $\alpha_1 < l\delta_2$, and let $N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta_1} + m + 1 \right)$, and $M \geq \frac{U_a^2}{2\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$.

Let $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}))$ be the solution obtained by solving (17). Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}} [h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1,$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} [\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}} [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_1.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in three main steps.

Step 1: Outer Layer Guarantee via Scenario Approaches

According to Proposition 1, we have that, with probability at least $1 - \delta_1$ over the sample set \mathbb{S} , the solution satisfies:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{D}^M} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) > h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - \tau \right] \leq \alpha_1,$$

where $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M \in \mathbb{D}^M$ denotes a fresh, independent sample of M disturbances, and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{D}^M} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M$. Let $\mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$ denote this event. We have $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}] \geq 1 - \delta_1$. Define for any \mathbb{S} and \mathbf{x} ,

$$\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) > h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - \tau \right].$$

The outer guarantee implies that for $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x})] \leq \alpha_1$ holds.

Step 2: Decomposition on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbb{D}^M}$ Based on Markov's Inequality. Consider any $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$. By applying Markov's inequality to $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x})$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \geq l\delta_2] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x})]}{l\delta_2} \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}.$$

This implies $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$.

Now, for any \mathbf{x} with $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) > h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - \tau \right] \leq l\delta_2,$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - \tau \right] \geq 1 - l\delta_2.$$

Step 3: Application of Hoeffding's Inequality

For fixed (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) , define the empirical mean:

$$\hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j))$$

and the true expectation: $\mu(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))]$.

By Hoeffding's inequality, for any fixed (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \geq \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \tau] \leq \exp\left(\frac{-2M\tau^2}{U_a^2}\right).$$

Setting $M \geq \frac{U_a^2}{2\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$ ensures that for $(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x})$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}^M [\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) \geq \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \tau] \leq (1-l)\delta_2$$

holds. This holds since $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M$ is independent of \mathbb{S} , so $\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S})$ is independent of $\{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M$.

Let

1. \mathbb{E}_1 : The event that $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}_j)) \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - \tau$.
2. \mathbb{E}_2 : The event that $\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) < \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \tau$.

We have $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_1] \geq 1 - l\delta_2$ and $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_2] \geq 1 - (1 - l)\delta_2$. By the union bound, we obtain

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_1 \cap \mathbb{E}_2] \geq 1 - \delta_2.$$

On the event $\mathbb{E}_1 \cap \mathbb{E}_2$, we have

$$\mu(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) < \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \tau \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}).$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M \left[\begin{array}{l} E_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] < \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \tau \wedge \\ \hat{\mu}_M(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}, \{\mathbf{d}_j\}_{j=1}^M) + \tau \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) \end{array} \right] \geq 1 - \delta_2,$$

implying

$$P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[E_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \delta_2. \quad (19)$$

Since $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M[\mathbb{E}_1 \cap \mathbb{E}_2] > 0$ (as $1 - \delta_2 > 0$), we obtain $E_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})$ holds deterministically with respect to $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M$ for such \mathbf{x} satisfying $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \geq l\delta_2$.

Step 4: Conclusion. Since $E_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})$ holds deterministically with respect to $P_{\mathbf{d}}^M$ for such \mathbf{x} satisfying $\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \geq l\delta_2$ and $P_{\mathbf{x}}[\mu_M(\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{x}) \leq l\delta_2] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$, we conclude that for $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}$,

$$P_{\mathbf{x}}[E_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] \leq h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) + \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})] \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}.$$

Since $P_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{E}_{\text{outer}}] \geq 1 - \delta_1$, the overall probability is at least $1 - \delta_1$. Also, based on Proposition 3, we have the conclusion. \square

Similarly, if a more general parametric function $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ is used, e.g., one that is nonlinear in \mathbf{a} rather than linear, then the VC-dimension method in Theorem 1 can replace the scenario approach. We leave this for future work.

5 Experiments

This section provides several examples to evaluate our three PAC safety certification methods. To demonstrate practical applicability, a case study using the CARLA autonomous driving simulator is provided in Appendix A.5. For evaluation, we include white-box baselines that assume full knowledge of the system and disturbances. When $\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a known polynomial and \mathbb{D}, \mathbb{X} are semi-algebraic, constraint (4) can be formulated as an SOS program to produce **RBC-SOS**, which we compare with our PAC methods **RBC-I** (Theorem 2) and **RBC-II** (Theorem 3). Similarly, if both $\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the disturbance distribution

Table 1: Summary of performance and computation times.

EX	n	RBC-SOS		RBC-I		RBC-II		SBC-SOS		SBC-III	
		T	$\xi^*=0$	N	T	$\xi^*=0$	(N, M)	T	$\xi^*=0$	T	(N, M)
1	2	1.0	✗	15053	0.2	✓	(3764,45)	0.9	✓	2.8	1.3 (3764,1357)
2	2	1.3	✓	15053	0.2	✓	(3764,45)	0.9	✓	2.5	0.8 (3764,1357)
3	3	8.7	✓	18253	0.3	✓	(4564,45)	1.0	✓	2.4	1.6 (4564,1357)
4	4	1.4	✗	24653	0.3	✓	(6164,45)	1.8	✓	2.6	2.8 (6164,1357)
5	6	17.7	✓	63053	0.8	✓	(15764,45)	8.2	✓	21.4	16.1 (15764,1357)
6	2	1.0	✗	15053	0.2	✗	(3764,45)	0.9	✗	10.3	20.4 (27164,631)
7	2	-	-	15053	0.2	✗	(3764,45)	0.9	✗	-	19.2 (27164,631)
8	4	3.9	✗	24653	0.3	✗	(6164,45)	1.8	✗	153.4	9.2 (19164,340)
9	7	2.4	✗	114253	2.5	✗	(28564,45)	38.3	✗	84.4	17.6 (28564,340)

are known, constraint (15) can be cast as an SOS program to yield **SBC-SOS**, which we compare with **SBC-III** (Theorem 4).

For all examples, the settings are as follows. **RBC-I**: $\delta = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0.05$. **RBC-II**: $\delta_1 = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha_1 = 0.01$, $\delta_2 = 0.999$, $\alpha_2 = 0.05$, $l = 0.2$ ($1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2} \approx 0.95$). **SBC-III**: $\delta_1 = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha_1 = 0.01$, $\delta_2 = 0.999$, $l = 0.2$. Table 1 reports the results, where T denotes the total computation time in seconds, $\xi^* = 0$ indicates a valid safety guarantee, and N and M denote the numbers of state and disturbance samples, respectively. Additional experimental details are in Appendix A.2, and results for other hyperparameters are in Appendix A.4. Examples 1 and 6 are discussed as representative cases.

Example 1. Consider the following system adapted from [45]:

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = x(t) + 0.01(y(t) - x(t)(d(t) + 0.5)), \\ y(t+1) = y(t) + 0.01(-(1 - x^2(t))x(t) - y(t)), \end{cases}$$

where $d(t)$ follows a truncated normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation 0.1, limited to $[-0.7, 0.7]$. The safe set is $\mathbb{X} = \{(x, y) \mid x^2 + y^2 \leq 0.64\}$.

In this example, the RBC-SOS method fails to provide a valid RBC and some disturbances lead to the safety violation, as shown in Fig. 1(a). In contrast, RBC-I and RBC-II provide high-confidence probabilistic guarantees. For reference, we performed a Monte Carlo study by uniformly sampling 10^6 states from \mathbb{X} and simulating 10^3 successors for each; all sampled successors stayed within \mathbb{X} . This result agrees with the guarantees from RBC-I and RBC-II.

Besides, although RBC-II is more time-consuming, it would provide higher one-step safety probability by using multiple disturbance samples per state (see Remark 3). This becomes evident when we fix the sample size rather than parameters such as α_1 and α_2 . For RBC-I, using 10^3 samples of (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) gives the guarantee $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}\left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}\left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 0.80\right] \geq 0.80\right] \geq 1 - 10^{-6}$. For RBC-II, using 10^3 samples of \mathbf{x} and 10 samples of \mathbf{d} per \mathbf{x} (a one-to-many strategy not

possible in RBC-I) yields $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 0.96] \geq 0.80] \geq 1 - 10^{-6}$. The resulting safety probability $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathbf{d}}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}]$ from RBC-II is higher.

The contour plot of $1 - \lambda^* - h(\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{x})$ from SBC-SOS is shown in Fig. 1(b). In contrast, SBC-III yields $1 - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) \approx 0.99$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$. Although SBC-III provides only a one-step guarantee, the lower probability bound it delivers is significantly tighter than that of SBC-SOS.




Fig. 1: Results for Ex. 1

Example 6. Consider the discrete-time Lotka–Volterra model, widely used to describe the dynamics of interacting biological species [46]:

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = rx(t) - ay(t)x(t), \\ y(t+1) = sy(t) + acy(t)x(t), \end{cases}$$

where $r = 0.5$, $a = c = 1$, and $s = -0.5 + d(t)$ with $d(\cdot): \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{D} = [-1, 1]$ drawn from the uniform distribution on \mathbb{D} . The safe set is $\mathbb{X} = \{(x, y) \mid x^2 + y^2 \leq 1\}$.

In this example, five trajectories initialized at $(-0.8, -0.5)$ and simulated for five time steps are shown in Fig. 2(a). It is evident that the system leaves the safe set under certain disturbances, indicating that no RBC exists in this example. Therefore, RBC-SOS, RBC-I (for $\alpha_1 \leq 0.9$ and $\alpha_2 \leq 0.9$), and RBC-II (for $\alpha_1 \leq 0.15$, $\alpha_2 \leq 0.9$) cannot provide valid guarantees, and we focus instead on the SBC-based methods.

The contour plots of $1 - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x})$ from SBC-III and $1 - \lambda^* - h(\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{x})$ from SBC-SOS, are shown in Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(c), respectively. Fig. 2(c) shows that SBC-SOS provides probability lower bounds that quickly drop to zero as the system state approaches the boundary of the safe set \mathbb{X} , which will be trivial and uninformative. In contrast, SBC-III avoids this issue, though it provides only a PAC one-step safety guarantee. This performance advantage likely stems from the piecewise template in (16), which enforces constraints (15a) and (15b) by construction. By comparison, SBC-SOS seeks a single polynomial satisfying (15a), (15b), and (15c) simultaneously, imposing significantly stronger requirements on expressiveness and global approximation accuracy. We plan to investigate this issue in detail in future work. Tab. 3 (in Appendix A.3) compares

SBC-III and SBC-SOS along the purple trajectory shown in Fig. 2(a). For reference, we also report Monte Carlo estimates. As observed in Tab. 3, SBC-III gives a less conservative lower bound than SBC-SOS.




Fig. 2: Results for Example 6

Summary: Overall, the results demonstrate that the proposed methods provide formal PAC one-step safety guarantees without any model knowledge. In Examples 1 and 4, RBC-SOS fails to produce a valid certificate, while both RBC-I and RBC-II still succeed. Similarly, SBC-III consistently achieves probability lower bounds that match or exceed those of SBC-SOS. In addition, SOS-based methods require the system dynamics to be a known polynomial and the safe set \mathbb{X} to be semi-algebraic, whereas our methods have no such restrictions.

Our computational methods primarily involve solving linear programs, whose size mainly depends on the sample complexity. The sample complexity, in turn, depends only on parameters such as m , α_1 , α_2 , δ_1 , and/or (δ_2, l) , and is independent of the system dimension n . Hence, all three methods theoretically scale well to high-dimensional systems. In practice, RBC-I performs particularly efficiently, with minimal computation time across all examples. For SBC-III, the number of constraints in the optimization problem (17) depends only on the state sample size N and not on M , keeping the problem tractable. For example, in Example 9, solving SBC-III requires only 0.8 seconds, with most of the total time spent on data collection and preprocessing.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a data-driven framework for one-step safety certification of black-box discrete-time stochastic systems, where both the system dynamics and disturbance distributions are unknown and only sampled data are available. Based on robust and stochastic barrier certificates, we proposed three methods for establishing formal one-step safety guarantees based on scenario approaches, VC dimension, and Markov’s and Hoeffding’s inequalities. The effectiveness of our approaches was demonstrated through several examples.

Besides the future work discussed in Remarks 1 and 3, we plan to incorporate recent advances in scenario optimization [40] and other methods to further reduce sample complexity and improve computational efficiency, as well as to extend the proposed approaches to PAC verification for probabilistic programs [47] and quantum computations [48]. We also plan to extend our approach to (controlled) continuous-time systems, which are ubiquitous in the physical world.

References

1. Majid Zamani, Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani, Rupak Majumdar, Alessandro Abate, and John Lygeros. Symbolic control of stochastic systems via approximately bisimilar finite abstractions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(12):3135–3150, 2014.
2. Morteza Lahijanian, Sean B Andersson, and Calin Belta. Formal verification and synthesis for discrete-time stochastic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(8):2031–2045, 2015.
3. Stephen Prajna, Ali Jadbabaie, and George J Pappas. A framework for worst-case and stochastic safety verification using barrier certificates. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 52(8):1415–1428, 2007.
4. Aleksandar Chakarov and Sriram Sankaranarayanan. Probabilistic program analysis with martingales. In *Computer Aided Verification: 25th International Conference, CAV 2013, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 13-19, 2013. Proceedings* 25, pages 511–526. Springer, 2013.
5. Pushpak Jagtap, Sadegh Soudjani, and Majid Zamani. Formal synthesis of stochastic systems via control barrier certificates. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(7):3097–3110, 2020.
6. Andrew Kenyon-Roberts and C-H Luke Ong. Supermartingales, ranking functions and probabilistic lambda calculus. In *2021 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2021.
7. Dapeng Zhi, Peixin Wang, Si Liu, C-H Luke Ong, and Min Zhang. Unifying qualitative and quantitative safety verification of dnn-controlled systems. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 401–426. Springer, 2024.
8. Bai Xue. Sufficient and necessary barrier-like conditions for safety and reach-avoid verification of stochastic discrete-time systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15572*, 2024.
9. Ameneh Nejati, Abolfazl Lavaei, Pushpak Jagtap, Sadegh Soudjani, and Majid Zamani. Formal verification of unknown discrete-and continuous-time systems: A data-driven approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(5):3011–3024, 2023.
10. Mahdi Nazeri, Thom Badings, Sadegh Soudjani, and Alessandro Abate. Data-driven yet formal policy synthesis for stochastic nonlinear dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.01191*, 2025.
11. Taoran Wu, Yiling Xue, Jingduo Pan, Dejin Ren, Arvind Easwaran, and Bai Xue. Convex computations for controlled safety invariant sets of black-box discrete-time dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01638*, 2025.
12. Bai Xue, Miaomiao Zhang, Arvind Easwaran, and Qin Li. Pac model checking of black-box continuous-time dynamical systems. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 39(11):3944–3955, 2020.

13. Stephen Prajna and Ali Jadbabaie. Safety verification of hybrid systems using barrier certificates. In International workshop on hybrid systems: Computation and control, pages 477–492. Springer, 2004.
14. Stephen Prajna and Anders Rantzer. Convex programs for temporal verification of nonlinear dynamical systems. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 46(3):999–1021, 2007.
15. Jacob Steinhardt and Russ Tedrake. Finite-time regional verification of stochastic non-linear systems. The International Journal of Robotics Research, 31(7):901–923, 2012.
16. Pushpak Jagtap, Sadegh Soudjani, and Majid Zamani. Temporal logic verification of stochastic systems using barrier certificates. In International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis, pages 177–193. Springer, 2018.
17. Cesar Santoyo, Maxence Dutreix, and Samuel Coogan. A barrier function approach to finite-time stochastic system verification and control. Automatica, 125:109439, 2021.
18. Đorđe Žikelić, Mathias Lechner, Thomas A Henzinger, and Krishnendu Chatterjee. Learning control policies for stochastic systems with reach-avoid guarantees. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 37, pages 11926–11935, 2023.
19. Bai Xue, Renjue Li, Naijun Zhan, and Martin Fränzle. Reach-avoid analysis for stochastic discrete-time systems. In 2021 American Control Conference (ACC), pages 4879–4885. IEEE, 2021.
20. Bai Xue, Naijun Zhan, and Martin Fränzle. Reach-avoid analysis for polynomial stochastic differential equations. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 69(3):1882–1889, 2024.
21. Yiqing Yu, Taoran Wu, Bican Xia, Ji Wang, and Bai Xue. Safe probabilistic invariance verification for stochastic discrete-time dynamical systems. In 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 5804–5811. IEEE, 2023.
22. Bai Xue. Finite-time safety and reach-avoid verification of stochastic discrete-time systems. Information and Computation, 2025.
23. Yu Chen, Shaoyuan Li, and Xiang Yin. On the construction of barrier certificate: A dynamic programming perspective. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.17222, 2025.
24. Annabelle McIver, Carroll Morgan, Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, and Joost-Pieter Katoen. A new proof rule for almost-sure termination. Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages, 2(POPL):1–28, 2017.
25. Alessandro Abate, Mirco Giacobbe, and Diptarko Roy. Stochastic omega-regular verification and control with supermartingales. In International Conference on Computer Aided Verification, pages 395–419. Springer, 2024.
26. Peixin Wang, Jianhao Bai, Dapeng Zhi, Min Zhang, and Luke Ong. Verifying omega-regular properties of neural network-controlled systems via proof certificates. In ICLR 2025 Workshop: VerifAI: AI Verification in the Wild.
27. Behrad Samari, Omid Akbarzadeh, Mahdih Zaker, and Abolfazl Lavaei. From a single trajectory to safety controller synthesis of discrete-time nonlinear polynomial systems. IEEE Control Systems Letters, 2024.
28. Ben Wooding and Abolfazl Lavaei. Learning k-inductive control barrier certificates for unknown nonlinear dynamics beyond polynomials. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07232, 2024.
29. Giuseppe Carlo Calafiore and Marco C Campi. The scenario approach to robust control design. IEEE Transactions on automatic control, 51(5):742–753, 2006.

30. Bai Xue, Martin Fränzle, Hengjun Zhao, Naijun Zhan, and Arvind Easwaran. Probably approximate safety verification of hybrid dynamical systems. In International Conference on Formal Engineering Methods, pages 236–252. Springer, 2019.
31. Luke Rickard, Alessandro Abate, and Kostas Margellos. Data-driven neural certificate synthesis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05510, 2025.
32. Behrad Samari and Abolfazl Lavaei. Data-driven dynamic controller synthesis for discrete-time general nonlinear systems. In Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, pages 1–12, 2025.
33. Frederik Baymler Mathiesen, Licio Romao, Simeon C Calvert, Alessandro Abate, and Luca Laurenti. Inner approximations of stochastic programs for data-driven stochastic barrier function design. In 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 3073–3080. IEEE, 2023.
34. Ibon Gracia, Dimitris Boskos, Luca Laurenti, and Morteza Lahijanian. Data-driven strategy synthesis for stochastic systems with unknown nonlinear disturbances. In 6th Annual Learning for Dynamics & Control Conference, pages 1633–1645. PMLR, 2024.
35. Frederik Baymler Mathiesen, Licio Romao, Simeon C Calvert, Luca Laurenti, and Alessandro Abate. A data-driven approach for safety quantification of nonlinear stochastic systems with unknown additive noise distribution. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06662, 2024.
36. Ameneh Nejati and Majid Zamani. Data-driven synthesis of safety controllers via multiple control barrier certificates. IEEE Control Systems Letters, 7:2497–2502, 2023.
37. Ali Salamati, Abolfazl Lavaei, Sadegh Soudjani, and Majid Zamani. Data-driven verification and synthesis of stochastic systems via barrier certificates. Automatica, 159:111323, 2024.
38. Ali Salamati and Majid Zamani. Data-driven safety verification of stochastic systems via barrier certificates: A wait-and-judge approach. In Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference, pages 441–452. PMLR, 2022.
39. Ali Salamati and Majid Zamani. Safety verification of stochastic systems: A repetitive scenario approach. IEEE Control Systems Letters, 7:448–453, 2022.
40. Marco C Campi and Simone Garatti. Wait-and-judge scenario optimization. Mathematical Programming, 167:155–189, 2018.
41. Giuseppe C Calafiore. Repetitive scenario design. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 62(3):1125–1137, 2016.
42. Marco C Campi, Simone Garatti, and Maria Prandini. The scenario approach for systems and control design. Annual Reviews in Control, 33(2):149–157, 2009.
43. Teodoro Alamo, Roberto Tempo, and Eduardo F Camacho. Randomized strategies for probabilistic solutions of uncertain feasibility and optimization problems. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 54(11):2545–2559, 2009.
44. Rida T Farouki. The bernstein polynomial basis: A centennial retrospective. Computer Aided Geometric Design, 29(6):379–419, 2012.
45. Thomas L Vincent and Walter J Grantham. Nonlinear and optimal control systems. John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
46. Alfred J Lotka. Contribution to the theory of periodic reactions. The Journal of Physical Chemistry, 14(3):271–274, 2002.
47. Fabian Zaiser, Andrzej S Murawski, and C-H Luke Ong. Guaranteed bounds on posterior distributions of discrete probabilistic programs with loops. Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages, 9(POPL):1104–1135, 2025.

48. Mingsheng Ying. Quantum computation, quantum theory and ai. Artificial Intelligence, 174(2):162–176, 2010.
49. Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual, 2024.
50. Johan Lofberg. Yalmip: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in matlab. In 2004 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37508), pages 284–289. IEEE, 2004.
51. Mosek ApS. Mosek optimization toolbox for matlab. User’s Guide and Reference Manual, Version, 4(1):116, 2019.
52. Andrew Sogokon, Khalil Ghorbal, and Taylor T Johnson. Non-linear continuous systems for safety verification (benchmark proposal). In ARCH@ CPSWeek 2016-3rd International Workshop on Applied Verification for Continuous and Hybrid Systems, volume 43, pages 42–51. EasyChair, 2016.
53. Mohamed Amin Ben Sassi and Sriram Sankaranarayanan. Stability and stabilization of polynomial dynamical systems using bernstein polynomials. In Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, pages 291–292, 2015.
54. Alec Edwards, Andrea Peruffo, and Alessandro Abate. Fossil 2.0: Formal certificate synthesis for the verification and control of dynamical models. In Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, pages 1–10, 2024.
55. Graziano Chesi. Estimating the domain of attraction for non-polynomial systems via lmi optimizations. Automatica, 45(6):1536–1541, 2009.
56. Sriram Sankaranarayanan, Xin Chen, et al. Lyapunov function synthesis using handelmann representations. IFAC Proceedings Volumes, 46(23):576–581, 2013.
57. Edward N Lorenz. Predictability: A problem partly solved. In Proc. Seminar on predictability, volume 1. Reading, 1996.
58. Alexey Dosovitskiy, German Ros, Felipe Codevilla, Antonio Lopez, and Vladlen Koltun. CARLA: An open urban driving simulator. In Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference on Robot Learning, pages 1–16, 2017.

Appendix

A Additional Experimental Results and Implementation Details

A.1 Implementation of the Sum-of-Squares Programming Baselines

In this subsection, we present the details of the RBC-SOS and SBC-SOS baseline methods based on sum-of-squares programming. By leveraging the SOS decomposition for multivariate polynomials, constraints (4) in Definition (1) and (15) in Definition 2 can be recast as semidefinite programmings, which can be solved efficiently in polynomial time via interior-point methods. However, constraints (4a) and (15b) require the inequalities to hold for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{X}$, which is overly stringent in practice. To address this issue, we introduce relaxed formulations of the constraints that are better suited to SOS programming:

Definition 3. *Given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and a safe set \mathbb{X} , a function $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a RBC for the system (1) if the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{cases} h(\mathbf{x}) < 0, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \widehat{\mathbb{X}} \setminus \mathbb{X}, & (20a) \\ h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, & (20b) \\ h(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) \geq \gamma h(\mathbf{x}), & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \forall \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}. & (20c) \end{cases}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ is a set containing the union of the set \mathbb{X} and all reachable states starting from \mathbb{X} within one step, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{X}} \supset \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}\} \cup \mathbb{X}. \quad (21)$$

Definition 4 ([22]). *Given a safe set \mathbb{X} , a function $h(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a SBC for the system (1) if there exists a scalar $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{cases} h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, & (22a) \\ h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \widehat{\mathbb{X}} \setminus \mathbb{X}, & (22b) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] - h(\mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda, & \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, & (22c) \end{cases}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ is a set satisfying (21).

Compared with constraints (4) and (15), constraints (20) and (22) replace \mathbb{R}^n with the set $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$. This substitution substantially relaxes the constraints and makes them easier to satisfy. Assume that $\mathbb{X} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{X}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\}$, where $g(\mathbf{x})$ and $\hat{g}(\mathbf{x})$ are polynomial functions over $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and that the disturbance set is $\mathbb{D} = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid p(\mathbf{d}) \leq 0\}$, where $p(\mathbf{d})$ is a known polynomial function. Under these assumptions, constraint (20) can be recast as an SOS programming in (23), corresponding to the RBC-SOS baseline, while constraint (22) can be recast as an SOS programming in (24),

corresponding to the SBC-SOS baseline. In (23) and (24), $\sum[\mathbf{y}]$ denotes the set of sum-of-squares polynomials over variables \mathbf{y} , i.e.,

$$\sum[\mathbf{y}] = \{p \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{y}] \mid p = \sum_{i=1}^k q_i^2(\mathbf{y}), q_i(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{y}], i = 1, \dots, k\},$$

where $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{y}]$ denotes the ring of polynomials in variables \mathbf{y} .

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\xi, \mathbf{a}, s_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}), s_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}), s_3(\mathbf{x}), s_4(\mathbf{x}), s_5(\mathbf{x})} \xi \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})) - \gamma h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + \xi + s_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})g(\mathbf{x}) + s_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d})p(\mathbf{d}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}], \\ -h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - \epsilon_0 + s_3(\mathbf{x})\hat{g}(\mathbf{x}) - s_4(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \\ h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + s_5(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \\ s_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}), s_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}]; s_3(\mathbf{x}), s_4(\mathbf{x}), s_5(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\lambda, \mathbf{a}, s_i(\mathbf{x}), i=1, \dots, 4} \lambda + \frac{1}{N_o} \sum_{k=1}^{N_o} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}'_k) \\ \text{s.t. } & \begin{cases} h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + s_1(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \\ h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) - 1 + s_2(\mathbf{x})\hat{g}(\mathbf{x}) - s_3(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \\ h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) + \lambda - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{d}}[h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}))] + s_4(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \\ s_1(\mathbf{x}), s_2(\mathbf{x}), s_3(\mathbf{x}), s_4(\mathbf{x}) \in \sum[\mathbf{x}], \\ \lambda \in [0, 1], \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

For numerical stability, we constrain each coefficient in \mathbf{a} to lie within the interval $[-100, 100]$. In (23), we set $\epsilon_0 = 10^{-6}$ to ensure strict satisfaction of the inequality. The objective in (24) matches that of (17) to ensure a fair comparison. In the experiments, we keep the degree of $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ in the SOS-based methods as close as possible to the degree used in our methods. If the SOS solver encounters numerical issues or exceeds the time limit, we adjust the degree of $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ accordingly.

A.2 Experiments Settings and Hyperparameters

In this subsection, we describe the experimental setup and hyperparameter configurations used in Tab. 1.

All experiments were run on a system with Ubuntu 22.04, a 72-core Intel Xeon Gold 6154 CPU (3.00 GHz), an NVIDIA A100 GPU, and 512 GB of RAM. Linear programs were solved using Gurobi 11.0.3 [49], while sum-of-squares programs were handled with the YALMIP toolbox in MATLAB [50] and the Mosek 10.1.21 solver [51]. We impose a computation time limit of 0.5 hour for all examples.

The specific settings for examples 2-9 are shown below.

Example 2. Consider the following system adapted from [52]:

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = x(t) + 0.01(x(t) - x^3(t) + y(t) - x(t)y^2(t) + d_1(t)), \\ y(t+1) = y(t) + 0.01(-x(t) + y(t) - x^2(t)y(t) - y^3(t) + d_2(t)), \end{cases}$$

where $d_1(t)$ and $d_2(t)$ are independent and follow the uniform distribution on the interval $[-0.5, 0.5]$. The safe set is $\mathbb{X} = \{(x, y) \mid -3 \leq x, y \leq 3\}$.

Example 3. Consider the following system adapted from [53]:

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = x(t) + 0.01(-x(t) + y(t) - z(t) - x(t)d_1(t)), \\ y(t+1) = y(t) + 0.01(-x(t)(z(t) + 1) - y(t) - y(t)d_2(t)), \\ z(t+1) = z(t) + 0.01(0.76524x(t) - 4.7037z(t) - z(t)d_3(t)), \end{cases}$$

where $d_1(t)$, $d_2(t)$, and $d_3(t)$ are independent and follow uniform distributions on $[1, 2]$, $[1, 2]$, and $[2, 3]$, respectively. The safe set is $\mathbb{X} = \{(x, y, z) \mid -1 \leq x, y, z \leq 1\}$.

Example 4. Consider a four dimensional system:

$$\begin{cases} x_1(t+1) = x_1(t) + 0.01(-x_1(t) + d(t)), \\ x_2(t+1) = x_2(t) + 0.01(x_1(t) - 2x_2(t)), \\ x_3(t+1) = x_3(t) + 0.01(x_1(t) - 4x_3(t)), \\ x_4(t+1) = x_4(t) + 0.01(x_1(t) - 3x_4(t)), \end{cases}$$

where $d(t)$ follows a Beta(10, 10) distribution. The safe set is $\mathbb{X} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_4)^\top \mid \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i^2 \leq 1\}$.

Example 5. Consider a model adapted from [54] with a discrete time $\tau_s = 0.01$,

$$\begin{cases} x_1(t+1) = x_1(t) + \tau_s(x_2(t)x_4(t) - x_1^3(t)), \\ x_2(t+1) = x_2(t) + \tau_s(-3x_1(t)x_4(t) - x_2^3(t)), \\ x_3(t+1) = x_3(t) + \tau_s(-x_3(t) - 3x_1(t)x_4^3(t)), \\ x_4(t+1) = x_4(t) + \tau_s(-x_4(t) + x_1(t)x_3(t)), \\ x_5(t+1) = x_5(t) + \tau_s(-x_5(t) + x_6^3(t)), \\ x_6(t+1) = x_6(t) + \tau_s(-x_5(t) - x_6(t) + x_3^4(t) - x_6(t)d(t)), \end{cases}$$

with the safe set $\mathbb{X} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_6) \mid \sum_{i=1}^6 x_i^2 - 1 \leq 0\}$. The disturbance $d(t)$ follows the uniform distribution on the interval $[0.5, 1.0]$.

Example 7. Consider a discrete-time system describing a whirling pendulum [55]:

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = x(t) + 0.1y(t), \\ y(t+1) = y(t) + 0.1(-\frac{2y(t)}{d(t)} + 0.81 \sin(x(t)) \cos(x(t)) - \sin(x(t))), \end{cases}$$

where $d(\cdot)$ is uniformly distributed over $[0.9, 1.1]$. The safe set is $\mathbb{X} = \{(x, y) \mid -1 \leq x, y \leq 1\}$.

Example 8. Consider a model adapted from [56] with a discrete time 0.01,

$$\begin{cases} x_1(t+1) = x_1(t) + \tau_s(-x_1(t) + x_2^3(t) - 3x_3(t)x_4(t) + d(t)), \\ x_2(t+1) = x_2(t) + \tau_s(-x_1(t) - x_2^3(t)), \\ x_3(t+1) = x_3(t) + \tau_s(x_1(t)x_4(t) - x_3(t)), \\ x_4(t+1) = x_4(t) + \tau_s(x_1(t)x_3(t) - x_4^3(t)), \end{cases}$$

with $\tau_s = 0.01$ and the safe set $\mathbb{X} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^\top \mid \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i^2 \leq 1\}$. The disturbance $d(t)$ follows the uniform distribution on the interval $[-1, 1]$.

Example 9. Consider a 7-dimensional Lorenz model adapted from [57]:

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \tau_s \left((x_{i+1}(t) - x_{i-2}(t))x_{i-1}(t) - x_i(t) + d_i(t) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, 7$$

with $\tau_s = 0.01$, $x_0(t) = x_7(t)$, $x_{-1}(t) = x_6(t)$, and $x_8(t) = x_1(t)$. The disturbance terms $d_1(t), \dots, d_7(t)$ are independently and uniformly distributed over $[-1, 1]$. The safe set is defined as $\mathbb{X} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_7) \mid -1 \leq x_1, \dots, x_7 \leq 1\}$.

All experiments reported in Tab. 1 are conducted with the random number seed set to 0. Next, we summarize the parameter settings used in the experiments reported in Tab. 1. In all experiments, the number of state samples N_o used in the objective is fixed at 1000. For RBC-I and RBC-II, we set γ in Definition 1 to 0.01, the constant C in (5) to -1 , and κ in (9) to 1. The upper bound $U_{\mathbf{a}}$ on the coefficients \mathbf{a} is set to 10, and the upper bound $\bar{\xi}$ on ξ is also set to 10. For SBC-III, the degree of $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ in (16), parameter τ used in (17), and the upper bound $U_{\mathbf{a}}$ on the coefficients \mathbf{a} follow the specifications listed in Tab. 2.

Table 2: Degree of h_1 , τ , and $U_{\mathbf{a}}$ settings of SBC-III in Tab. 1 experiments.

Examples	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Degree	2	2	3	4	6	20	20	8	7
τ	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
$U_{\mathbf{a}}$	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.5	1.1	1.1

A.3 Additional Results

In this subsection, we present additional experimental results. We begin with Table 3 from Example 6, which compares the SBC-III, SBC-SOS, and Monte Carlo methods. We then report the detailed optimization results obtained by SBC-SOS and SBC-III for the experiments reported in Tab. 1.

We first present Tab. 3 from Example 6. In Tab. 3, $P_{\text{SBC-III}}(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x})$ and $P_{\text{SBC-SOS}}(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - \lambda^* - h(\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{x})$ denote the results computed by the two methods, respectively. Moreover, $P_{MC}(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the Monte Carlo estimate, computed by generating 10^6 successor samples for each state \mathbf{x} and calculating the fraction that remains in the safe set \mathbb{X} .

Table 3: Comparison in Example 6.

Step	State	$P_{\text{SBC-III}}(\mathbf{x})$	$P_{\text{SBC-SOS}}(\mathbf{x})$	$P_{MC}(\mathbf{x})$
0	$(-0.8000, -0.5000)$	0.2993	0.0000	0.4448
1	$(-0.8000, 0.5902)$	0.5440	0.0230	0.6901
2	$(0.0721, -0.8994)$	0.7107	0.4341	0.8337
3	$(0.1009, 0.8400)$	0.7558	0.6622	0.8980
4	$(-0.0343, 0.1541)$	0.9668	0.9987	1.0000
5	$(-0.0119, -0.1044)$	0.9678	0.9984	1.0000

The detailed optimization results obtained by SBC-SOS and SBC-III are listed in Tab. 4. In Tab. 4, $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ denotes the optimum of the optimization problem (17), i.e., $J^*(\mathbb{S}) = \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) + \frac{1}{N_o} \sum_{k=1}^{N_o} h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}'_k)$. Similarly, J^* denotes the optimum of (24). $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ and J^* indicate, to some extent, the conservatism of the resulting lower probability bounds $1 - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S})$ and $1 - h(\mathbf{a}^*, \mathbf{x}) - \lambda^*$, respectively, and smaller values are more desirable. As shown in Tab. 4, our method attains values of $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ comparable to or better than J^* obtained by SBC-SOS, demonstrating its effectiveness.

Table 4: Results of SBC-SOS and SBC-III in Table 1 Experiments

EX	SBC-SOS		SBC-III	
	J^*	λ^*	$J^*(\mathbb{S})$	$\lambda^*(\mathbb{S})$
1	0.1308	0.0008	0.0100	0.0100
2	0.0007	0.0003	0.0100	0.0100
3	0.1218	0.0031	0.0100	0.0100
4	0.2353	0.0034	0.0100	0.0100
5	0.4035	0.0000	0.0100	0.0100
6	0.3256	0.0007	0.1760	0.0218
7	-	-	0.2892	0.0790
8	0.4624	0.0000	0.1949	0.1870
9	1.0000	0.0000	0.5141	0.3767

A.4 Impact of Hyperparameters

In this part, we summarize the behavior of RBC-I, RBC-II, and SBC-III under different hyperparameter settings.

RBC-I under Varying Hyperparameters. We use Example 1 to examine how different hyperparameters affect the performance of RBC-I. Fig. 3(a) reports the computation times for different choices of α_1 and α_2 . For all settings shown

in Fig. 3(a), RBC-I yields $\xi^* = 0$, thereby providing a valid guarantee stated in Theorem 2. Its computation time also remains consistently small.

Moreover, the influence of δ on the required sample size N is mild. Hence, δ can typically be set extremely close to zero to obtain a very high confidence level, as in Tab. 1 where $\delta = 10^{-6}$. In addition, due to the template structure in (5), RBC-I does not require a high polynomial degree for $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$. Other hyperparameters, including $\bar{\xi}$, $U_{\mathbf{a}}$, and C , have only a minor influence on both the guarantee results and the computation time.

RBC-II under Varying Hyperparameters. We analyze the influence of hyperparameters on RBC-II using Example 1. The values of $1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$ and computation times under different α_1 and l are shown in Fig. 3(b) and 3(c), while the computation times under different α_2 are presented in Fig. 4. Across all settings, RBC-II consistently yields $\xi^* = 0$ and thus provides the valid guarantee stated in Theorem 3. Since the required sample sizes N and M satisfy

$$N \geq \frac{2}{\alpha_1} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta_1} + m + 1 \right), \quad M \geq \frac{1}{2\alpha_2^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2},$$

smaller α_1 or α_2 , or a larger l , lead to stronger probabilistic guarantees but increase the sample size, which leads to longer computation times. In practice, α_1 , α_2 , and l should be chosen to balance conservativeness and computational efficiency.





Fig. 3: Performance and computation time.

Similar to RBC-I, δ_1 can be set to a value extremely close to zero, such as 10^{-6} , to ensure a high confidence level, and the polynomial degree of $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ can be kept low to reduce the disturbance sample size M . For δ_2 , choosing a value close to one reduces the required disturbance sample size and increases the value of $1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$, thereby yielding a less conservative guarantee. Other hyperparameters, including $\bar{\xi}$, $U_{\mathbf{a}}$, and C , have only a minor impact on both the guarantee results and the computation time.


 Fig. 4: Computation time of RBC-II under different α_2 .

SBC-III under Varying Hyperparameters. We analyze the influence of hyperparameters on SBC-III using Example 6. Fig. 5 reports the optimal values $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ and the computation times of SBC-III as we vary τ , U_a , and the polynomial degree of $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$. Since the polynomial degree also influences the performance of the SBC-SOS baseline, we include its results and computation times in the third subfigure of Fig. 5 for comparison.




Fig. 5: $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ and computation times of SBC-III under different hyperparameters. Blue lines show the values of $J^*(\mathbb{S})$, and red lines show the computation times. In the third subfigure, solid lines correspond to our SBC-III method, and dashed lines correspond to the SBC-SOS baseline.

For parameter τ , a smaller value relaxes the constraint in (17), which leads to a better $J^*(\mathbb{S})$. However, the disturbance sample size M in SBC-III must satisfy $M \geq \frac{U_a^2}{2\tau^2} \ln \frac{1}{(1-l)\delta_2}$, so decreasing τ requires more disturbance samples and leads

to longer computation times. For parameter $U_{\mathbf{a}}$, increasing its value expands the feasible region of \mathbf{a} , which enables better $J^*(\mathbb{S})$, though this effect gradually saturates as $U_{\mathbf{a}}$ becomes sufficiently large. A larger $U_{\mathbf{a}}$ also enlarges the required disturbance sample size M , which further increases computation time. Regarding the degree of $h_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$, Fig. 5 shows that our method consistently yields better J^* than the white-box SBC-SOS baseline across all degrees, highlighting the strength of our approach. A higher degree enhances the expressive power of $h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ and reduces $J^*(\mathbb{S})$, but it also increases the dimension m of \mathbf{a} , thereby increasing the required state-sample size N and consequently the computation time.

The optimal values $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ and computation times under different α_1 and l settings are listed in Fig. 6. Across these settings, $J^*(\mathbb{S})$ varies only slightly, indicating that SBC-III is robust to variations in α_1 and l . The trends in sample size and computation time with respect to α_1 and l are similar to those observed for RBC-II.




Fig. 6: The values of $1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{l\delta_2}$, $J^*(\mathbb{S})$, and computation times of SBC-III under different α_1 and δ_2 .

A.5 Application of Our Method in CARLA

To further demonstrate the practical applicability of the proposed method, we evaluate our PAC one-step safety certification approaches in the CARLA 0.9.15 simulator [58], a high-fidelity platform for autonomous driving research. Specifically, we consider two application cases: a speed-maintenance case and a car-following case, as shown in Fig. 7. In both cases, the precise mathematical form of system dynamics is unknown and stochastic.

Case 1 (Speed Maintenance). Consider an autonomous vehicle driving along a straight road, with the objective of maintaining its speed v within the range of 20 km/h to 60 km/h. The vehicle is controlled by CARLA’s built-in PID



Fig. 7: Illustration of the CARLA simulation environment

controller, which attempts to regulate the speed around 40 km/h . We apply our method to assess whether the closed-loop system can be certified to remain within the prescribed safe speed range.

We first apply RBC-I with $\delta = 10^{-6}$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0.05$, and we obtain $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$, which yields the following formal guarantee:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_d[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 0.95 \right] \geq 0.95 \right] \geq 1 - 10^{-6}.$$

For RBC-II, we set $\delta_1 = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha_1 = 0.005$, $\alpha_2 = 0.05$, $\delta_2 = 0.999$, and $l = 0.1$. RBC-II gives $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0$, leading to the guarantee

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X} \right] \geq 0.95 \right] \geq 1 - 10^{-6}.$$

For SBC-III, we use $\delta_1 = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha_1 = 0.005$, $\delta_2 = 0.999$, $\tau = 0.02$ and $l = 0.1$. Solving (17) yields $J^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0.0200$ and the guarantee

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{S}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\mathbb{P}_d[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{d}) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq 1 - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) \right] \geq 0.95 \right] \geq 1 - 10^{-6}.$$

where SBC-III further satisfies $1 - \lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) - h(\mathbf{a}^*(\mathbb{S}), \mathbf{x}) \approx 0.98$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$.

Overall, all three methods provide highly non-conservative guarantees for this case. Using Monte Carlo simulation with 1000 randomly sampled initial speeds, the evolution of the vehicle speed over time is shown in Fig. 8. In all sampled trajectories, the system remains strictly within the safe speed range, which is consistent with the guarantees delivered by the three certification methods.

Case 2 (Car Following). We next consider a car-following case involving a leading vehicle and a following vehicle, where the goal is to keep their relative distance and relative speed within prescribed safe bounds. The system state is defined by the relative distance d between the two vehicles and the relative speed $v = v_f - v_l$, where v_f and v_l denote the speeds of the following and leading vehicles, respectively. The system is considered safe when $d \in [5, 15]$ meters and




Fig. 8: Simulated system trajectories for Case 1.

$v \in [-20, 20]$ km/h . The speed of the leading vehicle v_l is modeled as a random variable uniformly distributed over $[45, 75]$ km/h , introducing stochasticity into the system dynamics. The following vehicle is controlled by a fixed policy obtained using the proximal policy optimization algorithm.

In this case, RBC-I fails to provide a valid guarantee for $\alpha_1 \leq 0.5$ and $\alpha_2 \leq 0.5$, as it consistently results in $\xi^*(\mathbb{S}) > 0$. Similarly, RBC-II is unable to provide a valid guarantee for $\alpha_1 \leq 0.25$, $\alpha_2 \leq 0.5$ and $\delta_2 \leq 0.5$. Therefore, we focus on the SBC-III method. Setting $\delta_1 = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha_1 = 0.01$, $\delta_2 = 0.999$, and $l = 0.2$, SBC-III yields $J^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0.1592$ and $\lambda^*(\mathbb{S}) = 0.0611$. A video included at <https://github.com/TaoranWu/PSC-BDSS> demonstrates the system simulation starting from the initial state $d = 14$ m and $v = -15$ km/h , together with the corresponding safety certification provided by SBC-III.